

Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students

JSA Education Group Ltd

Review Report

December 2019



Working as the Designated Quality Body for England

Contents

Summary of findings and reasons	1
About this report.....	10
About JSA Education Group Ltd	10
How the review was conducted.....	11
Explanation of findings	13
S1 The provider ensures that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks	13
S2 The provider ensures that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers	17
S3 Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them.....	21
S4 The provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent.....	25
Q1 The provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system.....	29
Q2 The provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses	34
Q3 The provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience	39
Q4 The provider has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience.....	44
Q5 The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience	49
Q6 The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students.....	53
Q8 Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them	57
Q9 The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes	60

Summary of findings and reasons

Ref	Core practice	Outcome	Confidence	Summary of reasons
S1	The provider ensures that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks.	Met	High	<p>From the evidence seen, the review team considers that the standards set for the Academy's courses are in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS regulatory framework. The review team also considers that the standards described in the approved programme documentation are set at levels that are consistent with these sector-recognised standards and the Academy's academic regulations and policies should ensure that standards are maintained appropriately.</p> <p>The review team considers that, based on the evidence scrutinised, the standards that will be achieved by the Academy's students are expected to be in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS regulatory framework. Based on this information the review team also considers that the Academy's academic regulations and policies will ensure that these standards are maintained. The review team considers that staff fully understand the Academy's approach to maintaining these standards and that the evidence seen demonstrates they are committed to implementing this approach. Therefore, based on its scrutiny of the evidence provided, the review team concludes that this Core practice is met.</p>
S2	The provider ensures that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably	Met	High	The review team, based on the evidence presented, determined that the standards set for students to achieve beyond the threshold on the Academy's courses are reasonably comparable with those set by other UK providers. The review team considered that the

	comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.			<p>standards described in the approved programme documentation and the Academy's academic regulations and policies should ensure that such standards are maintained appropriately.</p> <p>The review team determined that the standards that will be achieved by the Academy's students beyond the threshold are expected to be reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers. The team considered that the Academy's academic regulations and policies should ensure that standards beyond the threshold are maintained. Based on the detailed scrutiny of the evidence, the review team considered that staff fully understand the Academy's approach to maintaining such standards and have opportunities for engagement with peers and external experts in teaching and assessment activities. The review team considers the Academy's plans for maintaining comparable standards appropriate, well documented and understood by staff members.</p> <p>Therefore the review team concludes, based on the evidence described above, that students who are awarded qualifications should have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers and this Core practice is met.</p>
S3	Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them.	Met	High	The Academy has well-developed plans for the management of the partnership, to ensure that the standards of the awards made by the awarding body are credible and secure. The Institutional Agreement and the Validation Agreement are clear and comprehensive in the articulation of the respective roles of the Academy and the University. The University sets the standards of

				<p>awards granted in its name and will provide oversight of the maintenance of standards through the University's Academic Partnership Link Tutor and the University's Academic Partnership annual and periodic reviews. The Academy will follow the University's academic regulations, to secure academic standards. The Academy has robust and credible plans to secure standards in provision delivered in partnership, which include plans for external examining and monitoring and review by the Academy, and the Academic Partnership annual and periodic reviews undertaken by the University. Staff from both the Academy and the University understand their respective responsibilities for academic standards and were able to explain their responsibilities for the maintenance of standards through delivery, assessment and monitoring which will ensure the academic standards are credible and secure. The review team concludes, therefore, that the Academy has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of the awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them, and the Core practice is met.</p>
S4	The provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent.	Met	High	<p>The Academy uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent. The Academy follows the University's clear and comprehensive regulations and policies which describe the requirements for using external expertise in maintaining academic standards. The approaches for using external examiners and for assessment and classification are reliable, fair and transparent, and discussions with staff demonstrate that these are well understood. Plans for the use of external examiners and their reports are robust and credible because they are embedded within key documents, are in line with the</p>

				University's Academic Regulations, and staff who will operate these plans understand the requirements for the use of external expertise. Appropriate external expertise is used at the course approval stage in line with the awarding body's procedures. The review team concludes therefore that the Academy uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent, and that the Core practice is met.
Q1	The provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system.	Met	High	The Academy has a clear policy for the recruitment and admission of students, which demonstrates how the Academy plans to operate an admissions system that is reliable, fair and inclusive. The Admissions Policy makes explicit reference to the opportunity for an applicant to complain about the admissions process. However, it states clearly that students cannot complain or appeal where this is a disagreement with the judgement of an admissions decision. The plans for monitoring admissions are robust and credible because, as outlined in the Admissions Policy, student feedback on admissions will be collected through student survey and admissions data and will be monitored and reviewed as part of the programme monitoring and review process. Information for applicants on the Academy's draft website is transparent, accessible and fit for purpose. The admissions requirements set out in programme specifications are consistent with the Academy's Admissions Policy. Based on reviewing core admissions, staff job descriptions, CVs, considering admissions training materials, and meeting with staff, the review team confirmed staff involved in admissions understand their role and are appropriately skilled. The

				review team therefore concludes on balance that the Core practice is met.
Q2	The provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses.	Met	High	The Academy has robust and credible plans for designing and delivering high-quality courses. This is because the Academy follows the University's approach to course design as outlined in the University's Academic Partnerships Handbook and the University's Quality Handbook and develops its pedagogical approach to delivering high-quality courses as outlined in the learning, teaching and assessment policy. These policies for course design and delivery facilitate the design and delivery of high-quality courses. Given that the course monitoring and evaluation processes are in place and external examiners will provide externality in monitoring the course delivery, the review team considers that the Academy has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for delivering high-quality courses. Approved course documentation, including programme and module specifications, and module study guides, indicates that the teaching, learning and assessment design should enable students to meet and demonstrate the intended learning outcomes. Staff are able to articulate what 'high quality' means in the context of the provider and to show how the provision meets that definition. The review team, therefore, concludes that the Core practice is met.
Q3	The provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience.	Met	Moderate	The Academy has the potential to ensure sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff are in place to deliver a high-quality academic experience. The detailed policies and procedures for the recruitment, appointment, induction, and support for staff are in place, which should provide for a sufficient number of appropriately qualified and skilled staff. The staffing

				<p>structure is appropriate for the delivery and support of the programme under review. The Academy has detailed plans for monitoring and reviewing staff performance within the quality cycle to ensure the delivery of a high-quality learning experience. The job descriptions of academic and professional services staff are appropriate and will enable adequate support for students. The CVs of existing academic and professional support staff demonstrate that the Academy has appointed appropriately qualified and experienced staff to fulfil the roles and that these appointments are consistent with the role descriptors. Staff who met the review team could articulate their teaching and learning ethos and how they will support high-quality course delivery. The review team concludes that on balance the Core practice is met.</p>
Q4	<p>The provider has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience.</p>	Met	High	<p>The Academy has the potential to ensure sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support are services in place to deliver a high-quality academic experience. The Academy's approaches to the development of facilities, learning resources and student support services are clearly explained in the policies and Student Handbook. As outlined in the resource plans, learning resources and teaching facilities are sufficient and of high quality. Students will be able to access all library items via the library online catalogue and course content via the VLE. Students can present their work in a blogging system. Plans for the development of facilities, learning resources and student support services are credible, robust and evidence-based because has the Academy has a deliberative review structure that takes physical and staffing resources into consideration. The ongoing review of resources is contained within module and programme</p>

				evaluation and monitoring procedures. The staffing structure, job descriptions and staff CVs demonstrate that academic and professional support staff are appropriately qualified and skilled and will enable adequate support for students. A direct examination by the team of facilities and resources revealed appropriate and well-equipped teaching facilities and a well-structured Moodle site. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.
Q5	The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.	Met	High	The Academy has clear policies and credible plans to actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience. The Academy has a Student Engagement Policy which explains how student feedback will be individually and collectively sought, how actions resulting from student feedback will be taken, which bodies will be accountable for such actions, and how actions taken will be communicated back to students. Individual student feedback gathered through completion of Module Evaluation Questionnaires and discussions with personal tutors will feed into module and programme evaluation and monitoring procedures, and subsequently the Academy's annual monitoring review. Students can also share their views via student representatives, who present student voice on key committees and groups meetings. The Academy has credible and robust plans to ensure the effectiveness of the Academy's approach to student engagement, including a clear committee reporting structure to consider student feedback, ensuring all student representatives are trained by the student experience team, and having Student Experience Committee at the senior level to provide oversight for the development, implementation and monitoring of the Academy's

				Student Experience Strategy. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.
Q6	The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students.	Met	High	The Academy has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students. This is because the Academy's Student Complaints Policy and Procedures and the University's Appeal Regulations clearly explain what situations can or cannot be applied to complaints or appeals, what process should be followed or when they should be escalated to the University or OIA, and the timeline for each step. The policies and processes for addressing complaints and appeals are clear and will be accessible for all students on the Academy's website, VLE, in student handbooks and explained to students at induction. The Academy has a clear procedure for recording formal complaints and monitoring and reviewing complaints through Student Experience Committee meetings. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.
Q8	Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them.	Met	High	Where the Academy works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them. This is because the Institutional Agreement and the Validation Agreement are clear and comprehensive in articulation of the respective roles of the Academy and the University. The Academy will use the procedures set out in the University's Academic Regulations, Quality Handbook and Academic Partnerships Handbook to assure the quality of the academic experience. The University maintains oversight of the Academy's quality of the academic experience through the University's Academic

				Partnerships annual and periodic reviews and an Academic Partnership Link Tutor from the University. The Academy has credible and robust plans for monitoring and reviewing the quality of partnership work within the quality cycle to ensure a high-quality academic experience. Staff from both the awarding body and the provider fully understand their respective roles and can articulate credible plans for the delivery of high-quality provision. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.
Q9	The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.	Met	High	The Academy's approach to student support has the potential to facilitate successful academic and professional outcomes. The Academy's approaches are detailed in the Student Support Disability Policy, the Incubation Strategy, and the University's Quality Handbook. The Academy will use the Personal Development Planning process to identify and monitor student progress. Issues identified from an individual's Personal Development Plan will be considered at Programme Committees and may be escalated to the Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee and the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee. Academic and professional support staff demonstrated a clear understanding of their roles in supporting student achievement and staff are appropriately skilled and supported through a range of staff development opportunities. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.

About this report

This is a report detailing the outcomes of the Quality and Standards Review for providers applying to register with the Office for Students (OfS), conducted by QAA in December 2019 for JSA Education Group Ltd.

A Quality and Standards Review (QSR) is a method of review QAA uses to provide the OfS with evidence about whether new providers applying to be on the OfS Register meet the Core practices of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the Quality Code), based on evidence reviewed by expert assessors. This report is structured to outline the review team's decisions about the provider's ability to meet the Core practices through detailing the key pieces of evidence scrutinised and linking that evidence to the judgements made.

The team for this review was:

Name: Mrs Catherine Fairhurst
Institution: University of Manchester
Role in review team: Subject reviewer Creative Arts and Design

Name: Dr Mary Hannon Fletcher
Institution: Ulster University
Role in review team: Institutional reviewer

The QAA Officer for the review was: Dr Yue Song

The size and composition of this review team is in line with published guidance and as such is comprised of experts with significant experience and expertise across the higher education sector. The team included members with experience of a similar provider to the institution, knowledge of the academic awards offered and included academics with expertise in subject areas relevant to the provider's provision. Collectively the team had experience of the management and delivery of higher education programmes from academic and professional services perspectives, included members with regulatory and investigative experience, and had at least one member able to represent the interests of students. The team included at least one senior academic leader qualified to doctoral level. Details of team members were shared with the provider prior to the review to identify and resolve any possible conflicts of interest.

About JSA Education Group Ltd

JSA Education Group Ltd, trading as 'JCA London Fashion Academy' (the Academy), was founded in 2017. It is a specialist higher education provider located at one site in Mayfair, Central London.

In April 2017, the Academy entered into a Memorandum of Understanding as a collaborative partner of University of West London (the University). In September 2017, the University validated the following undergraduate and postgraduate degree programmes to be delivered by the Academy from September 2020. The Academy is planning for no more than 30 students enrolled on each of its franchised and postgraduate programmes and no more than 60 students enrolled onto its validated degree programmes:

- BA (Hons) Fashion: Design and Accessories [franchised]
- BA (Hons) Fashion: Design, Branding and Entrepreneurship
- MA Fashion Entrepreneurship in Design and Brand Innovation.

Arrangements for quality assurance will be the same for franchised and validated provision as the Academy will use the procedures set out in the University's Academic Regulations, the University Quality Handbook and the University Academic Partnership Handbook.

The leadership and management of the Academy are through the Chief Executive Officer supported by a Board of Directors (the Executive Committee). The Academy's Academic Committee, chaired by the Director of Learning and Teaching, is responsible to the Executive Committee and the Board of Governors, which assures the management, operation and effectiveness of the Academy's academic governance. The Academy's Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee has delegated authority from the Academic Committee to oversee the operation of procedures for the maintenance of standards and assurance of quality for all courses. The annual monitoring report and associated action plans will be considered by the Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee and approved by the Academic Committee.

How the review was conducted

The review was conducted according to the process set out in [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

When undertaking a QSR, all 13 of the Core practices are considered by the review team. However, for this review it was clear that the provider does not offer a research degree programme. Therefore, the review team did not consider Q7 (where the provider offers research degrees, it delivers these in appropriate and supportive research environments).

To form its judgements about the provider's ability to meet the Core practices, the review team considered a range of evidence that was submitted prior to the review visit and evidence gathered at the review visit itself. To ensure that the review team focused on the principles embedded in the Core practices, and that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews, the team used Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers to construct this report and detail the key pieces of evidence seen. Annex 4 expects that review teams will sample certain types of key evidence using a combination of representative sampling, risk-based sampling and randomised sampling. In this review, the review team sampled the following areas for evidence for the reasons given below:

- The review team considered programme specifications, module specifications and the module study guides for all three higher education programmes, in order to test that specified threshold standards for courses sampled are consistent with relevant national qualifications' frameworks, to test that specified threshold standards for courses sampled are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers, to test whether admissions requirements for courses sampled reflect the Academy's Admissions Policy, to test that all elements of the courses sampled are high quality (curriculum design, content and organisation, learning, teaching and assessment approaches) and that the teaching, learning and assessment design will enable students to demonstrate the intended learning outcomes and to assess the reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes for the courses sampled.
- To assess whether the staff sampled are appropriately qualified and skilled to perform their roles effectively, and to determine whether the roles are consistent with the delivery of a high-quality learning experience, the review team considered all job descriptions that have been finalised at the time of the visit for academic and

professional support staff and a random sample of three academic staff CVs and three professional support staff CVs.

Further details of all the evidence the review team considered are provided in Annex 1 of this report.

Explanation of findings

S1 The provider ensures that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks

1 To meet this Core practice a provider must ensure that threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks. The threshold standards for its qualifications must be articulated clearly and must be met, or exceeded, through the delivery of the qualification and the assessment of students.

2 The sector-recognised standards that are used in relation to this Core practice are those that apply in England, as defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS regulatory framework. That is, those set out in Table 1, in paragraphs 4.10, 4.12, 4.15, 4.17, 4.18, in paragraphs 6.13-6.18 and in the Table in Annex C, in the version of [The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies](#) (FHEQ) published in October 2014. These sector-recognised standards represent the threshold academic standards for each level of the FHEQ and the minimum volumes of credit typically associated with qualifications at each level.

3 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

4 The QAA review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a The Validation Agreement
- b The Institutional Agreement
- c The University's academic regulation
- d The University Academic Partnerships Handbook
- e The University's Quality Handbook
- f Programme specifications
- g Module specifications
- h Module study guides
- i The University Course Approval Panel Outcomes Reports
- j Module Monitoring and Review Procedure
- k Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Procedure
- l Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Report template
- m Governance Structure
- n Application form for approval of an External Examiner
- o Meeting with the University representatives, and the Academy's senior staff
- p Meeting with the Academy's academic and professional support staff

5 Some of the key pieces of evidence, outlined in Annex 4, were not considered by the review team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this review are outlined below:

6 Third party endorsements, as none are available for the provision on offer at the Academy.

7 The courses have not yet commenced, so there is no assessed student work.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

8 To test that specified threshold standards for courses sampled are consistent with relevant national qualifications frameworks, the review team considered programme specifications, module specifications and the module study guides for all three higher education programmes.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

9 As highlighted, all the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

10 To identify the Academy's institutional approach to course and assessment design, marking and moderation, and approaches for classification as the underlying basis for the standards of awards, the review team considered the Validation Agreement, Institutional Agreement, University's academic regulation, University Academic Partnerships Handbook, University's Quality Handbook, programme specifications, and the University Course Approval Panel Outcomes Reports.

11 To interrogate the robustness and credibility of the Academy's plans for ensuring threshold standards, the review team considered the Module Monitoring and Review Procedure, Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Procedure, Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Report template, Governance Structure, University's Academic Partnerships Handbook, and the University's Quality Handbook: External Examiners.

12 To test that the threshold standards described in definitive course documentation are consistent with relevant national qualifications framework, the review team considered programme specifications, module specifications, and the module study guides.

13 There are no external examiner reports as the programmes have not yet been delivered. Therefore, the review team considered the University's Academic Partnerships Handbook, University's Quality Handbook: External Examiner procedures, Application form for approval of an External Examiner and the University representatives' view in the meeting.

14 To test that staff understand and apply the Academy's approach to maintaining threshold standards, the review team met with senior staff and academic and professional support staff.

What the evidence shows

15 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

16 The Academy's approach to maintaining sector-recognised standards is to follow University academic regulations, University assessment framework and through the use of external examiners outlined in the University Academic Partnerships Handbook and the University's Quality Handbook. Programme specifications for all three courses have been approved through the University approval process as confirmed in the Course Approval Panel Outcomes Reports and so meet the University's required standards. The requirements for different levels of awards, which are consistent with the table of credit in Annex C in the FHEQ, are clearly defined in the programme specifications.

17 The Academy's plans for maintaining sector-recognised standards include its internal review and reporting cycle and the involvement of external examiners. The internal review and reporting cycle is clearly outlined in JSA's Module Monitoring and Review Procedure and Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Procedure, and in the Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Report template. As detailed in the Academy's Governance Structure, which includes the Terms of Reference for all committees, the programme/module monitoring and evaluation will be managed by the Academy's Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee which reports to the Academic Board. The external examining procedure explained in the University's Academic Partnerships Handbook indicates that external examiners are appointed by the University. As outlined in the University's Quality Handbook: External Examiners, the roles of external examiners are to confirm that sector-recognised standards are consistent with national qualification frameworks and that credit and qualifications are awarded only where those sector-recognised standards have been met.

18 The sector-recognised standards described in all sampled programme and module specifications are set at Level 4 to Level 7 in line with the FHEQ. Definitive course documentation clearly outlines the assessment framework, classification, grading bands and grading criteria with appropriate references to the FHEQ. The programme specifications set out the progression criteria and credit framework for each exit award, assessment and reassessment, including relevant weightings and thresholds which correspond to the University regulations and the table of credit in Annex C in the FHEQ. The Academy has also developed module guides that the team agreed were very detailed, explaining the teaching approach, teaching schedule, the resources, assessment regulations, assessment brief, and the marking criteria.

19 There are no external examiner reports as the programmes have not yet commenced. However, the external examiner appointment process is clearly outlined in the University's Academic Partnerships Handbook. The University's Quality Handbook: External Examiners also explained that external examiners are appointed by the University, and their role is to comment on the processes of assessment and the standards of awards by considering marked student work and attending Assessment Boards. External examiners report to the Academy and the University and their recommendations for improvement feed into the Academy's programme evaluation and monitoring procedures and the University's annual Academic Partnership annual and periodic reviews. In line with the process, the Academy and University have nominated an external examiner and the University representative confirmed that proposal for appointing the external examiner has gone to the University's External Examiners Appointments Committee (EEAC) for approval. The review team therefore concludes that the Academy will follow the University's procedure to ensure external examiners are used in maintaining sector-recognised standards.

20 The Academy's senior and academic staff demonstrated a clear understanding of applying the Academy's approach to maintaining sector-recognised standards. The Director of Learning and Teaching and the Programme Leader, who developed and will deliver the programmes, demonstrated that they were fully aware of their responsibilities in maintaining sector-recognised standards, as they were able to explain how they will deliver, assess and monitor the courses, and take feedback from the University link tutor and external examiners into consideration. They explained they knew that credit level and values, classifications and certification rules are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' framework, because of their wide experience of validation and examining in public higher education institutions. Two representatives from the University clearly articulated the University's roles in setting and maintaining standards. As part of the course design process for the franchised BA (Hons) Fashion: Design and Accessories, the University's School of Film, Media and Design led the curriculum design. Representatives of the University referred to the University academic regulation and explained that the University will provide oversight of the standards through the University Award Board attended by the external examiner, which will confirm final awards and assessment outcomes.

Conclusions

21 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

22 From the evidence seen, the review team considers that the standards set for the Academy's courses are in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS regulatory framework. The review team also considers that the standards described in the approved programme documentation are set at levels that are consistent with these sector-recognised standards and the Academy's academic regulations and policies should ensure that standards are maintained appropriately.

23 The team considers that, based on the evidence scrutinised, the standards that will be achieved by the Academy's students are expected to be in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS regulatory framework. Based on this information the review team also considers that the Academy's academic regulations and policies will ensure that these standards are maintained. The review team considers that staff fully understand the Academy's approach to maintaining these standards and that the evidence seen demonstrates they are committed to implementing this approach. Therefore, based on its scrutiny of the evidence provided, the review team concludes that this Core practice is met.

24 The lack of evidence relating to assessed student work, external examiner reports and third-party endorsements, while reflecting the Academy's current stage in the programme delivery cycle, means that the effectiveness of the Academy's arrangements in ensuring that the sector-recognised standards for the qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks could not be tested. However, considering that the Academy's approaches and plans are credible and robust, and that the University has oversight of standards, the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

S2 The provider ensures that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers

25 This Core practice expects that the provider ensures that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.

26 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

27 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a The Validation Agreement
- b The Institutional Agreement
- c The University's academic regulation
- d The University Academic Partnerships Handbook
- e The University's Quality Handbook
- f Teaching, Learning and Assessment policy
- g An example of an assessment rubric
- h Programme specifications
- i Module specifications
- j The University Course Approval Panel Outcomes Reports
- k Module Monitoring and Review Procedure
- l Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Procedure
- m Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Report template
- n Evidence considered in Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Reports
- o Governance Structure
- p Staff CVs
- q Meeting with the University representatives, and the Academy's senior staff
- r Meeting with the Academy's academic and professional support staff.

28 Some of the key pieces of evidence, outlined in Annex 4, were not considered by the review team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this review are outlined below:

29 Third party endorsements, as none are available for the provision on offer at the Academy.

30 The courses have not yet commenced, so there is no assessed student work.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

31 To test that specified threshold standards for courses sampled are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers, the review team considered programme specifications, module specifications and the module study guides for all three higher education programmes.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

32 As highlighted, all the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

33 To identify the institutional approach to course and assessment design, marking and moderation, requirements for awards and approaches to classification as the underlying basis for the standards of awards, the review team considered the Validation Agreement, the Institutional Agreement, University academic regulations, Quality Handbook Section 3 - Validation and Approval of Higher Education Courses, Quality Handbook Assessment Supplement, Quality Handbook Section 6 External Examiners, Teaching, Learning and Assessment policy, an example of an assessment rubric.

34 To interrogate the robustness of the Academy's plans for maintaining comparable standards and ensuring that plans are credible and evidence-based, the review team considered programme specifications, University Academic Partnerships Handbook, Quality Handbook: External Examiners, Module Monitoring and Review Procedure, Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Procedure, Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Report template, evidence considered in Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Reports, and the Governance Structure.

35 To test that specified standards beyond the threshold for courses sampled are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers, the review team considered programme specifications, module specifications and the University Course Approval Panel Outcomes Reports.

36 To test that staff understand and apply the Academy's approach to maintaining comparable standards, the review team met with senior staff, academic and professional support staff and considered their teaching, assessing and external examining experience from staff CVs.

What the evidence shows

37 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

38 The Validation Agreement and Institutional Agreement confirm that the University is responsible for setting the standards of its awards. The Academy's approach to maintaining sector-recognised standards is to adopt the University academic regulations, which clearly explain credit levels and values, assessment setting and marking arrangements, progression and award requirements as well as classification and certification rules. The Academy also uses the University Quality Handbook which details the approaches to course design and approval, assessment design and moderation, and external examining. The Academy will use the University's generic marking scheme grid of descriptors for grade categories which are in line with the FHEQ and together with art, and design-based assessment criteria will

enable students to achieve standards comparable with those achieved in other UK providers. Each assignment brief will carry a detailed grading rubric, which sets out assessment criteria that details what students need to do to achieve beyond sector-recognised standards. The assignment brief with grading rubric will be used across assessment teams to ensure comparability and standards. The review team therefore concludes that the use of the University's regulations and procedures will support the Academy's maintenance of academic standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.

39 The Academy's plans for maintaining comparable standards include module/programme evaluation and monitoring processes and the involvement of external examiners. The module/programme evaluation and monitoring processes are outlined in the Module Monitoring and Review Procedure and the Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Procedure. As outlined in the evidence considered in Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Reports, Programme Leaders and academic coordinators will consider eight sources of information including data from admissions and registry, external examiner comments, data from exam boards, student, staff and employers' feedback, Module Monitoring and Review reports and programme committee meeting minutes to produce programme evaluation and monitoring reports. The reports will be discussed in further detail at the Academic Board which is responsible for strategic oversight, monitoring and evaluation of the maintenance of academic standards within the Academy, and its subcommittees including the Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee, the Learning Teaching and Assessment Committee, to produce the Academy's Annual Monitoring Report and associated action plans; these are provided to the University and feed into its quality procedures outlined in the University Academic Partnerships Handbook. Given that detailed policies and procedures are in place, the review team concludes that the Academy has clear monitoring and evaluation processes which contribute to the robustness and credibility of the Academy's plans for maintaining comparable standards.

40 As specified in the University Academic Partnerships Handbook and Quality Handbook: External Examiners, the external examiners will be appointed by the University, and their role is to ensure the standards set and maintained are appropriate for the award, with reference to published national standards, and that the standards of student performance are comparable with the standards of similar courses in other UK higher education institutions. The review team confirms that external verification will be sought, which contributes to the robustness and credibility of the Academy's plans for maintaining comparable standards.

41 The Academy has mapped subject-based learning outcomes in programme specifications to the appropriate FHEQ levels together with assessment criteria which illustrate how students will be able to meet the sector-recognised standards. The sector-recognised standards described in programme specifications and module specifications are consistent with the FHEQ and meet the expectations of the University which are confirmed in the University Course Approval Panel Outcomes Reports. All programme specifications and module specifications clearly outline the assessment framework, credit framework, progression criteria, classification, grading bands and grading criteria and have appropriate references to the FHEQ. All programme specifications and module specifications detail learning outcomes, and what students must do to achieve beyond the sector-recognised standards. The review team found that the standards beyond the threshold described in definitive course documentation are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.

42 The Academy's staff, including Director of Learning and Teaching and the Programme Leader, who have wide experience of validating programmes, teaching, assessing and external examining at undergraduate and postgraduate level at several public

sector universities, demonstrated a clear understanding of how they ensure the standards are comparable with those in other UK providers. Although the Academy does not yet have a full complement of staff, the Director of Learning and Teaching demonstrated a full understanding of the Academy's approach to maintaining comparable standards and explained to the review team the course structures and how they had related the learning outcomes to relevant national qualifications' frameworks. The Director of Learning and Teaching and the Programme Leader explained that the course documents contain the award requirements, the undergraduate classification bands and the requirements for a master's award with merit or distinction in order to give the students the opportunities to achieve standards beyond the sector-recognised level. The Director of Learning and Teaching and the Programme Leader also clearly articulated the role of the external examiner and how the Academy will use the external examiner reports to monitor the programmes for comparable standards. The review team concludes that staff understand and apply the Academy's approach to maintaining sector-recognised standards.

Conclusions

43 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

44 The review team, based on the evidence presented to them, determined that the standards set for students to achieve beyond the threshold on the Academy's courses are reasonably comparable with those set by other UK providers. The review team considered that the standards described in the approved programme documentation and the Academy's academic regulations and policies should ensure that such standards are maintained appropriately.

45 The review team determined that the standards that will be achieved by the Academy's students beyond the threshold are expected to be reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers. The team considers that the Academy's academic regulations and policies should ensure that standards beyond the threshold are maintained. Based on the detailed scrutiny of the evidence, the review team considers that staff at the Academy fully understand the Academy's approach to maintaining such standards and have opportunities for engagement with peers and external experts in teaching and assessment activities. The review team considers the Academy's plans for maintaining comparable standards appropriate, well documented and understood by staff members.

46 Therefore, the review team concludes, based on the evidence described above, that students who are awarded qualifications should have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers and this Core practice is met.

47 The lack of evidence relating to student views, assessed student work, external examiner reports and third-party endorsements, while reflecting the Academy's current stage in the programme delivery cycle, means that the effectiveness of the Academy's approaches to maintaining comparable standards beyond the threshold level could not be tested. However, considering that the Academy's approaches and plans are credible and robust, and the University's oversight of standards, the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

S3 Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them

48 This Core practice expects that where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them.

49 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

50 The QAA review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a The Institutional Agreement
- b The Validation Agreement
- c The University Course Approval Panel Outcomes Reports
- d The University's Academic Regulations
- e The University's Academic Partnerships Handbook
- f The University's Quality Handbook
- g The University Academic Partnership Link Tutor responsibilities
- h Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Procedure
- i Meeting with the University representatives, and the Academy's senior staff
- j Meeting with the Academy's academic and professional support staff.

51 Some of the key pieces of evidence, outlined in Annex 4, were not considered by the review team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this review are outlined below:

52 Third party endorsements, as none are available for the provision on offer at the Academy.

53 The courses have not yet commenced, therefore there is no assessed student work.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

54 The sampling of evidence was not applicable as there were no external examiners' reports or assessed student work.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

55 As highlighted, all the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

56 To identify how the Academy works with its awarding body to ensure the standards of awards are credible and secure, and to interrogate the basis for the maintenance of standards, the review team considered the Institutional Agreement, the Validation Agreement, University's Academic Regulations, University's Academic Partnerships Handbook, and the University's Quality Handbook.

57 To assess whether the Academy has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for securing standards in partnership work, the review team considered the Responsibilities of the University Academic Partnership Link Tutor, Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Procedure, and the University's Academic Partnership Handbook.

58 To test that staff understand and discharge their responsibilities effectively to the awarding body and to test the awarding body's understanding of its responsibilities and how this is implemented and monitored in practice, the review team met with the Academy's senior staff including representatives of the University and the Academy's academic and professional support staff.

What the evidence shows

59 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

60 The Institutional Agreement and the Validation Agreement between the University and the Academy and the University Course Approval Panel Outcomes Reports, the University's Academic Partnerships Handbook and the University's Quality Handbook, indicate that the Academy will follow the University's Academic Regulations in order to secure academic standards.

61 The partnership agreements are clear and comprehensive in the articulation of the respective roles of the Academy and the University. The University is always directly responsible for the security and credibility of the academic standards of the awards granted in its name. The University ensures that its responsibility for the setting of academic standards is clearly communicated and is implemented through formal course approval processes as outlined in the University's Quality Handbook: Course design and approval. All new awards to be delivered at the Academy require final approval by the University's Academic Quality Office as evidenced in the University Course Approval Panel Outcomes Reports. The Academy will use the University's Quality Handbook Assessment Supplement and External Examining procedures to set the arrangements for assessment management, marking and moderation, and external examining.

62 To ensure the standards of the University's awards are credible and secure, academic delivery will be overseen by the University via a trained University Academic Partnership Link Tutor and via the University's Academic Partnership annual and periodic reviews. The Deputy Head of the University's London School of Film Media and Design is the University's Academic Partnership Link Tutor, whose duties will include monitoring the assessment processes such as approval of assessments, marking arrangements (including moderation, and double marking for all student assessed work during the first year of

operation), invigilation, mitigation and deferral, and liaising with the external examiners to ensure that assessments are conducted in line with University regulations. The Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Procedure details how the University Academic Partnership Link Tutor is involved in the Academy's monitoring and review processes, and how the Academy's programme monitoring reports feed into the University Academic Partnership annual and periodic reviews. The academic partnership's annual and periodic reviews, as explained in the University's Academic Partnership Handbook, will not only consider the management and strategic direction of the partnership, but also the assurance of quality and academic standards through discussing external examiner reports and the Academy's programme monitoring and evaluation reports. Given that detailed policies and procedures are in place, the review team therefore concludes that the Academy has credible and robust plans for securing standards in partnership work.

63 Senior staff who met the review team are fully aware of what their responsibilities will be towards the University. The Director of Learning and Teaching was able to explain the Academy's responsibilities as the maintenance of standards through delivery, assessment monitoring and the external examining process. The Programme Leader described the process and activities undertaken to develop the programmes with the University's London School of Media Film and Design. This was confirmed by the awarding body representative who met the team, who confirmed also that the oversight arrangements will be rigorous and supportive for a new provider with newly developed higher education programmes.

Conclusions

64 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

65 The Academy has well-developed plans for the management of the partnership, to ensure that the standards of the awards made by the awarding body are credible and secure. The institutional agreement and the validation agreement are clear and comprehensive in the articulation of the respective roles of the Academy and the University. The University sets the standards of awards granted in its name and will provide oversight of the maintenance of standards through the University's Academic Partnership Link Tutor and the University's academic partnership annual and periodic reviews. The Academy will follow the University's academic regulations to secure academic standards. The Academy has robust and credible plans to secure standards in provision delivered in partnership, which include plans for external examining and monitoring and review by the Academy, and the Academic Partnership annual and periodic reviews undertaken by the University. Staff from both the Academy and the University understand their respective responsibilities for academic standards and were able to explain their responsibilities for the maintenance of standards through delivery, assessment and monitoring which will ensure the academic standards are credible and secure. The review team concludes, therefore, that the Academy has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of the awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them, and the Core practice is met.

66 The lack of evidence relating to student views, assessed student work, external examiner reports and third-party endorsements, while reflecting the Academy's current stage in the programme delivery cycle, means that the effectiveness of the Academy's approaches to maintaining comparable standards beyond the threshold level could not be tested. However, considering that the Academy's approaches and plans are credible and robust,

and the University's oversight of standards and partnership working, the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

S4 The provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent

67 This Core practice expects that the provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent.

68 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

69 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a The Institutional Agreement
- b The Validation Agreement
- c The University Course Approval Panel Outcomes Reports
- d The University's Academic Regulations
- e The University's Academic Partnerships Handbook
- f The University's Quality Handbook
- g The University Academic Partnership Link Tutor responsibilities
- h Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Procedure
- i Meeting with the University representatives, and the Academy's senior staff
- j Meeting with the Academy's academic and professional support staff.

70 Some of the key pieces of evidence, outlined in Annex 4, were not considered by the review team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this review are outlined below:

71 Third party endorsements, as none are available for the provision on offer at the Academy.

72 The courses have not yet commenced, so there is no assessed student work.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

73 To assess the reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes for all courses, the review team considered programme specifications, module specifications and the module study guides for all three higher education programmes.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

74 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the providers ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to

ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

75 To identify how external experts will be used in maintaining academic standards, and how the Academy's assessment and classification processes operate, the review team considered Course Development external advice, University Academic Regulations, Quality Handbook Assessment Supplement, Quality Handbook Section 6 - External Examiners, Module Monitoring and Review Procedure, Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Procedure, Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Report template, Academic Partnerships Handbook, module specifications, Governance Structure, module study guides, and an example of assessment rubric.

76 To assess whether plans for using external expertise in ensuring academic standards and plans for assessment and classification processes are credible, robust and evidence-based, the review team considered the University's Academic Regulations, Application form for approval of an External Examiner, Module Monitoring and Review Procedure, Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Procedure, the Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Report template, and met with senior staff and university representatives.

77 To assess the reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes for all courses, the review team considered programme specifications, module specifications, module study guides, Moodle screengrab, the Student Handbook, in hard copy and on the students' virtual learning environment (VLE) Moodle screen grab, and the University's Quality Handbook.

78 To test that external experts were used according to the University's regulations and policies, the review team considered The University Quality Handbook Section 3 - Validation and Approval of Higher Education Courses, Initial advice from the external expertise, Approval Validation Developmental Event Notes - July 17, Course Approval Panel meeting agenda, and The University Course Approval Panel Outcomes Reports.

79 To test that staff understand the requirements for the use of external expertise, and the Academy's assessment and classification processes, the review team met with senior and academic staff and considered the CV of the Director of Learning and Teaching who has external examining experience.

What the evidence shows

80 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

81 The University's Academic Regulations, University's Quality Handbook Validation and approval of courses and external examiners explain how external experts are used in maintaining academic standards. The Academy consulted with external experts, including entrepreneurs, designers and professionals from the fashion industry to inform programme design and content. As required by the University, an external academic with subject expertise joined the University approval panel when designing and developing the courses. External examiners will be appointed by the University External Examiners Appointments Committee (EEAC) on behalf of the University's Academic Board in order to secure standards. Their role is to comment on the standards of marking and student achievement, approve the assignment briefs and marking schemes, to identify any causes of concern in relation to academic standards, to attend the Assessment Board, and to participate fully in decision making for final awards and to submit an annual report.

82 The external examiners' reports will be used to inform the Academy's module/programme evaluation and monitoring processes outlined in the Module Monitoring and Review Procedure and Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Procedure. The external examiners' reports will feed into programme monitoring reports which will be discussed in further detail at the Academic Board and its subcommittees, including the Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee, the Learning Teaching and Assessment Committee, to produce the Academy's Annual Monitoring Report and associated action plans, which then becomes part of the University Academic Partnership annual and periodic reviews, ensuring the University's formal oversight of academic standards. The roles of the committees mentioned above are also evidenced in the Governance Structure, which includes Terms of Reference for all committees.

83 The University's Academic Partnership Handbook and the University's Quality Handbook provide a reliable, fair and transparent quality framework for the operation of assessment and classification processes for the Academy. This framework defines the course assessment strategy, arrangements for designing and setting assessment tasks, first and second marking and moderation, grade and classification criteria, full information on assessment feedback to students, reassessment, mitigating circumstances and personalised assessment arrangements. The University quality framework covers peer and group assessment, which is particularly relevant to the fashion design programmes to be delivered and assessed at the Academy. This is because the assessment of design modules, explained in module specifications, module study guides and the example of assessment rubric will be based on practical projects, and formative assessments will be through critiques and peer assessment.

84 The Academy will use external examiners according to the University's Academic Regulations. The Academy and University have identified a prospective external examiner who has appropriate experience and expertise and is awaiting formal confirmation of their appointment from the University. There will be at least one external examiner for each programme whose reports will feed into the Academy's programme evaluation and monitoring procedure. The Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Report template allows for the recording of any issues raised by external examiners. The Programme Leader is required to respond to all external examiners' comments in the programme review report. The external examiner reports and the Programme Leader's responses will be further discussed by the Academy's Academic Board and its subcommittees, and feed into the Academy's annual monitoring reports and associated action plans. The review team therefore concludes that the Academy's plans for the use of external examiners and their reports are robust and credible because they are embedded within key documents and are in line with the University's Academic Regulations.

85 The programme specifications, module specifications, and module study guides indicate that the assessment and classification processes are reliable, fair and transparent. This is because the programme and module specifications and module study guides on the students' virtual learning environment (VLE) clearly set out the assessment methods for each module and the percentage weightings of each assessment task. The Student Handbook on the students' VLE provides detailed information on the conduct and type of the assessment including grade boundaries, regulations for time extensions and retakes, mitigating circumstances, an explanation of the role of the external examiner and makes explicit reference to the University's assessment regulations.

86 The University Quality Handbook Section 3 - Validation and Approval of Higher Education Courses clearly describes how the Academy will use external experts in course approval processes. The course team was required by the University to draw upon the subject expertise of external academic staff when designing and developing the courses. This external academic was confirmed by the University at a validation development event

and then became a member of the University approval panel. The panel included University and one external academic to confirm academic standards were set appropriately. There was also a representative of the fashion industry who provided expertise on the needs of the sector. The University Course Approval Panel Outcomes Reports confirm that the Academy has addressed all conditions and recommendations from the programme approval event, meets the expectations of the University, and external experts were used according to its regulations and policies to set academic standards at the relevant sector-recognised level.

87 The Director of Learning and Teaching and the Programme Leader displayed a clear understanding of the requirements for the use of external expertise in maintaining sector-recognised standards and in assessment processes. The Director of Teaching and Learning has experience of external examining at UK universities delivering fashion-related programmes. This experience will help the Academy's staff to understand the use of external expertise in maintaining sector-recognised standards. The academics in the meeting clearly described the approach to the Academy's assessment strategies. The Programme Leader explained that each assignment brief carries a detailed grading rubric which will be used across assessment teams to ensure comparability and the maintenance of sector-recognised standards.

Conclusions

88 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing, the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

89 The Academy uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent. The Academy follows the University's clear and comprehensive regulations and policies which describe the requirements for using external expertise in maintaining academic standards. The approaches for using external examiners and for assessment and classification are reliable, fair and transparent, and discussions with staff demonstrate that these are well understood. Plans for the use of external examiners and their reports are robust and credible because they are embedded within key documents, are in line with the University's Academic Regulations, and staff who will operate these plans understand the requirements for the use of external expertise. Appropriate external expertise is used at the course approval stage in line with the awarding body's procedures. The review team concludes, therefore, that the Academy uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent, and that the Core practice is met.

90 The lack of evidence relating to assessed student work, external examiner reports, and third-party endorsements, while reflecting the Academy's current stage in the programme delivery cycle, means that the effectiveness of the Academy's approaches to the use of external expertise could not be tested and the reliability, fairness and transparency of the assessment and classification processes could not be fully confirmed in practice. However, considering that the Academy's approaches and plans are credible and robust, and that the University has oversight of the use of external expertise and assessment and classification processes, the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q1 The provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system

91 This Core practice expects that the provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system.

92 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

93 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a The University's Academic Regulation
- b The Admissions Policy
- c The screengrab of the Academy's draft website (the website had not yet gone live to the public at the time of the visit, so only screengrabs of the draft of the website are available.)
- d Programme specifications
- e Interview form
- f Progress checklist
- g Decision form
- h Access and Participation Statement
- i Equality and Diversity Statement
- j Evidence considered in Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Reports
- k Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Procedure
- l Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Report template
- m The University's Academic Partnerships Handbook
- n Public Information Policy and Approval Procedure
- o The University's Course Approval Panel Outcomes Reports
- p Director of Learning and Teaching CV
- q Professional support staff CVs
- r Admissions training on qualification check, training for the admissions process and academic interview
- s Student Support Disability Policy
- t Meeting with the Academy's academic and professional support staff.

94 Some of the key pieces of evidence, outlined in Annex 4, were not considered by the review team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this review are outlined below:

95 Arrangements with recruitment agents, because the Academy reported that they do not use recruitment agents.

96 The courses have not yet commenced, so there is no evidence of admissions records.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

97 To test whether admissions requirements for courses sampled reflect the Academy's overall regulations and/or policy, the review team considered programme specifications for all three higher education programmes.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

98 As highlighted, all the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

99 To identify institutional policy relating to the selection and admission of students and to assess whether the Academy's procedure relating to the recruitment, selection and admission of students is reliable, fair and inclusive, and how it handles complaints and appeals, the review team considered the University's Academic Regulations, the Admissions Policy, website screengrab, programme specifications, interview form, progress checklist, decision form, Access and Participation statement, and Equality and Diversity Statement.

100 To assess whether the Academy has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for ensuring that admissions systems are reliable, fair and inclusive, the review team considered the Admissions Policy, evidence considered in Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Reports, Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Procedure, Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Report template, and the University's Academic Partnerships Handbook.

101 To test whether the information given to applicants is transparent, inclusive and fit for purpose the review team considered the screengrab of the Academy's draft website which is not yet publicly available and the Public Information Policy and Approval Procedure.

102 To test whether admissions requirements for all courses reflect the Academy's policy, the review team considered the Admissions Policy, programme specifications, the University's Course Approval Panel Outcomes Reports.

103 To test whether staff involved in admissions understand their responsibilities and are appropriately skilled and supported, the team reviewed the job descriptions and CVs of staff involved in admissions, including the Admissions Manager, the Head of Registry, Student Support Manager, and the Director of Learning and Teaching, as well as the Admissions Policy and admissions training on qualification check, training for admissions process and academic interview, Student Support Disability Policy, including admissions support for students with disabilities, and met with academic and professional support staff.

What the evidence shows

104 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

105 The Academy's Admissions Policy provides detailed guidance on the application and selection process. Applicants' prior qualifications will be checked in the first instance against the course entry requirements detailed on the Academy's website and in programme specifications. Application for each course requires the submission of an appropriate

portfolio of work. An admissions decision is based on the quality of the creative and written work as part of the portfolio submission. All applicants will be interviewed, and applicants will receive information about interviews and portfolios, or any form of assessment applied during the application process. Once the decision has been made, information, including conditions of the offer, next steps for enrolment, registration and induction, and any orientation for international students before the start of the course will be provided to the successful applicants. Feedback will be given, when requested, to applicants who have not been offered a place, and advice about alternatives and future options will be offered. The review team considered that the Admissions Policy outlines a clear process for recruitment, selection and admission of students.

106 As stated in the Admissions Policy, entry requirements will be transparent and consistently used for all applicants when considering ability, aptitude, skills, qualifications and prior learning or experience (acquired in the workplace or elsewhere) that indicates their potential to succeed on the course. Entry requirements set out in all programme specifications are formally approved by the University and are consistent with the Academy's Admissions Policy. Entry requirements listed in all programme specifications clearly stated that recruitment will be selective based on academic and creative potential through prior qualifications checks, assessment of the portfolio of work and interview.

107 The Admissions Policy makes explicit reference to the opportunity for applicants to complain about the admissions process and includes the relevant procedures for handling admissions complaints. If an applicant has reason to believe that their application has not been handled fairly, objectively or in accordance with the published procedures, they should write to the Registrar setting out their reasons. The Registrar will nominate a member of staff as an investigator to review the handling of the application in the light of the applicant's written statement, and report to the Registrar in writing within fifteen working days. The Admissions Policy, however, clearly states that 'An applicant cannot complain or appeal where this is a disagreement with the judgement of an admissions decision'.

108 The review team considered the procedure for the recruitment and admission of students reliable because the admission process outlined in the Admissions Policy is clearly evidenced by the paper trail which includes an interview form, progress checklist and decision form. The review team found the process to be fair because applicants are considered based on their previous attainment (for example, qualifications and experience) and, where relevant, advanced standing for individuals with prior academic credit can be awarded through Recognition of Prior Certificated Learning (RPCL) or Recognition of Prior Experiential Learning (RPEL) or a combination of both. Following the University's Academic Regulations, the Academy will admit students to courses if it considers them to have a reasonable expectation of completing the award and achieving the required standard. The Academy states clearly in the Admissions Policy that all admission procedures and criteria by which applicants are selected will be fair, clear and consistently applied.

109 The review team considered the process to be inclusive because the Admissions Policy is informed by the Academy's Access and Participation statement and Equality and Diversity Statement and commits the Academy to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the *Equality Act 2010*, advance equality of opportunity between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and people who do not share it, foster good relations between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and people who do not share it. To ensure inclusivity of admissions, as explained in the Admissions Policy, every reasonable adjustment will be made to support applicants who have disclosed a physical or sensory disability, specific learning or unseen difficulties. On the application form, at any interview or other selection activity, applicants will be encouraged to disclose and discuss their needs. In addition, the Academy has an AP(E)L process, the Accreditation of Prior Experiential

Learning process, in place to evidence the candidate's previous non-certificated achievement or prior learning gained through other experience, allowing non-standard applicants entry on to programmes.

110 To inform future development in recruitment and admissions, the Admissions Policy outlines its plans for monitoring and reviewing the admissions system, including introducing student surveys to collect student feedback on their experience of the application process, monitoring data regarding applications, offers made, the take-up of offers, and reviewing recruitment materials and any pre-entry information and activities. As clearly shown in the evidence considered in Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Reports, student feedback on admissions, review of application data and recruitment information will be considered by the Programme Leader and Programme Coordinator as part of the Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Procedure and feed into the Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Report. The Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Report will be discussed in further detail at the Academic Board and its subcommittees including the Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee, and the Learning Teaching and Assessment Committee, to produce the Academy's Annual Monitoring Report and associated action plans which are then provided to the University and feed into its quality procedures outlined in the University's Academic Partnerships Handbook, ensuring the University's oversight of the quality of the admissions systems. Given the detailed policies and procedures that are in place, the Academy's plans for monitoring and reviewing the admissions system are considered to be credible and robust.

111 The Admissions Policy will be available on the public website accessible to all applicants. As with all its policy documents, the Academy intends this policy to be transparent for both internally (for staff and students) and externally. The team considered that the policy is well written in clear English and appropriate for both audiences. Each course webpage includes information on entry requirements, course structure, fees, and career expectations. The review team considered that entry requirements listed on the website are suitable for students from a wide range of backgrounds and experiences and concluded that information for applicants is inclusive. To provide information to prospective students, the Academy holds advertised open days/evenings, taster days and undertakes school visits. To ensure the publication of information is accurate and consistent, the Public Information Policy and Approval Procedure specifies the ownership of public information and the process of information approval. All changes to public information will be recorded and monitored by the Registry, and the Executive Committee has the ultimate responsibility for the accuracy of all published materials. Therefore, the review team concludes that the information for applicants is transparent, accessible and fit for purpose.

112 CVs of staff involved in admissions, including CVs of the Recruitment and Admissions Manager, Head of Registry, the Student Support Manager, and the Director of Learning and Teaching indicate that the staff involved in admissions are appropriately qualified and skilled because they have experience in student recruitment and admissions from similar posts in the past in other higher education providers. Both academic and professional support staff provided detailed explanations of their previous experience and how they could contribute to student recruitment and admissions based on their work experience and expertise. Staff involved in admissions, including Director of Learning and Teaching, the Head of Registry, the Admissions Manager and Student Support Manager explained the process to be applied in admissions and how this process will be monitored and audited. The Student Support Manager also explained how students with disabilities will be supported during admissions with clear reference to the Student Support Disability Policy which covers admissions for students with disabilities. To ensure the staff are appropriately supported and are able to deal with applications in a consistent way, the Academy will provide detailed training for staff covering UCAS training and training on qualification checks, assessment of portfolio work and undertaking interviews. The review team is therefore

confident that all staff involved in admissions understand their role and will be appropriately trained and skilled.

Conclusions

113 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

114 The Academy has a clear policy for the recruitment and admission of students, which demonstrates how the Academy plans to operate an admissions system that is reliable, fair and inclusive. The Admissions Policy makes explicit reference to the opportunity for an applicant to complain about the admissions process. However, it states clearly that students cannot complain or appeal where this is a disagreement with the judgement of an admissions decision. The plans for monitoring admissions are robust and credible because as outlined in the Admissions Policy, student feedback on admissions will be collected through student survey and admissions data and will be monitored and reviewed as part of the programme monitoring and review process. Information for applicants on the Academy's draft website is transparent, accessible and fit for purpose. The admissions requirements set out in programme specifications are consistent with the Academy's Admissions Policy. Based on review of job descriptions of core admissions staff, CVs, considering admissions training materials, and meeting with staff, the review team confirmed that staff involved in admissions understand their role and are appropriately skilled. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.

115 The lack of evidence relating to admissions records and students' views, while reflecting the Academy's current stage in the programme delivery cycle, means the effectiveness of the Academy's approaches to ensuring a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system could not be fully tested. However, the Academy's approaches and plans are credible and robust, and therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement

Q2 The provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses

116 This Core practice expects that the provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses.

117 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

118 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a The University's Academic Partnerships Handbook
- b The University's Quality Handbook
- c Validation Developmental Event notes
- d Course Development external advice
- e Learning, teaching and assessment policy
- f Moodle screenshots
- g The University course approval report
- h Module Monitoring and Review Procedure
- i Module Evaluation Questionnaires
- j Programme evaluation and monitoring procedure
- k Evidence considered in Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Reports
- l Programme Evaluation and Monitoring reports
- m Job description student representative
- n Student Engagement Policy
- o The Governance Structure
- p Programme specifications
- q Module specifications
- r Module study guides
- s Examples of course materials
- t Meeting with the University representatives, and the Academy's senior staff
- u Meeting with the Academy's academic and professional support staff.

119 Some of the key pieces of evidence, outlined in Annex 4, were not considered by the review team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this review are outlined below:

120 Third party endorsements, as none are available for the provision on offer at the Academy.

121 The courses have not yet commenced, so there is no evidence of student views or observations of learning and teaching.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

122 To test that all elements of the courses sampled are high quality (curriculum design, content and organisation, learning, teaching and assessment approaches) and that the teaching, learning and assessment design will enable students to demonstrate the intended learning outcomes, the review team considered programme specifications, module specifications and the module study guides for all three higher education programmes.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

123 As highlighted, all the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

124 To identify the Academy's approach to designing and delivering high-quality courses, the review team considered the University's Academic Partnerships Handbook, the University's Quality Handbook, Validation Developmental Event notes, Course Development external advice, learning, teaching and assessment policy, Moodle screenshots, University course approval report.

125 To assess whether the Academy has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for delivering high-quality courses, the review team considered Module Monitoring and Review Procedure, Module Evaluation Questionnaires, programme evaluation and monitoring procedure, evidence considered in Programme Evaluation and Monitoring reports, Programme Evaluation and Monitoring reports, Job description student representative, Student Engagement Policy, the Governance Structure, the University's Academic Partnerships Handbook, the University's Quality Handbook: External Examiners, and meeting with representatives of the University.

126 To test that all elements of the courses sampled are high quality (curriculum design, content and organisation, learning, teaching and assessment approaches) and that the teaching, learning and assessment design will enable students to demonstrate the intended learning outcomes, the review team considered programme specifications, module specifications, module study guides and examples of course materials.

127 To assess how staff ensure courses are high quality, the review team considered meeting with University representatives and the academy's senior, academic and professional support staff.

What the evidence shows

128 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

129 The Academy follows the University's approach to course design as outlined in the University's Academic Partnerships Handbook and the University's Quality Handbook. The programmes were designed in close collaboration with the London School of Film Media and Design of the University of West London to ensure academic rigour, and the Academy consulted with external experts, including entrepreneurs and designers from the fashion industry to ensure currency with industry.

130 The Academy's learning, teaching and assessment policy outlines the Academy's pedagogical approach to delivering high-quality courses, which includes professional studio

practice, tutorial support, industry engagement, work-related learning, contextual assessment, learning and pastoral support for students. As explained in the learning, teaching and assessment policy, courses will be delivered in professional studios where individual and group teaching takes place through a variety of teaching and learning methods that include group critiques, tutorials, live projects, competition briefs and other forms of work-related learning. In addition, the use of the VLE will provide opportunities to foster effective interactive teaching and learning and for staff to demonstrate innovative techniques such as visual blogs. Design theory is contextualised and reinforced through debate, reflection, and importantly through practices in projects linked to the fashion industry and business. This combination and balance of industry, business and education within the course was commended as good practice in the University course-approval report and facilitates the delivery of the high-quality courses.

131 The Academy has detailed plans for monitoring and reviewing the quality of courses within the quality cycle to ensure high-quality course delivery. At module level, Module Monitoring and Review reports will capture student feedback from their completion of Student Module Evaluation Questionnaires, discussion with the module lecturing team, and through data and commentary made at the Examination Board. These reports will be considered at Programme Committees and are escalated to the Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee and to the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee.

132 At programme level, the Academy will undertake programme evaluation and monitoring. Programme Leaders and their teams will conduct a detailed evaluation of their courses taking into consideration Module Monitoring and Review reports conducted throughout the year, external examiner reports, staff and student feedback and data provided by Admissions, Registry and Examination Offices, as outlined in evidence considered in Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Reports. Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Reports, which will include strengths and areas for development, will be produced by curriculum teams, along with a detailed action plan that is subject to continuous monitoring by the Programme Committee. This action plan and accompanying report will be escalated to the Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee and to the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee for further discussion which will feed into the Academy's annual monitoring report and associated action plans.

133 The involvement of external examiners further ensures the credibility and robustness of the Academy's plans for delivering high-quality courses. As detailed in the University's Academic Partnerships Handbook and the University's Quality Handbook: External Examiners, external examiners will be appointed by the University for each course to ensure the integrity of the award and will play an advisory or developmental role for the module or course development. External examiner reports will feed into the Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Reports as part of the programme evaluation and monitoring procedure and will be escalated to the Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee and to the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee for further discussions.

134 Programme specifications clearly outline course content for each module, course delivery plans for each semester, course learning outcomes, skills development requirements, teaching and learning approaches, teaching and learning tools and technologies, assessment approaches, opportunities for personal development, work experience and employer engagement. The assessment matrix in the programme specifications details the assessment types and learning outcomes for each module, providing clear links between the learning outcomes and the assessment types to test student achievement.

135 Students are provided with module study guides which give clear information about each module including course delivery schedules, assessment expectations and requirements with assignment submission deadlines. Each module's weekly schedule, submission details, references and resources are also available on the VLE with a link to the module study guides. Examples of course materials include detailed illustrations, fashion plates and photographs for seminars, case studies and workshops. In addition, the module specifications set out learning outcomes and how students are assessed. The assessment briefs in the module specifications are described in detail with the assessment criteria, the marking process, the teaching schedule, submission dates, attendance requirements, the support available and a definition of terms. The modules integrate theory with practice at all levels, each containing a project as a focus for learning and for assessment. The subject of each of these projects is carefully selected to progressively extend the depth and breadth of entrepreneurial and creative skills, knowledge and comprehension. The review team therefore concludes that all the elements of courses outlined in course documentation, including curriculum design, content and organisation, learning, teaching and assessment approaches are of high quality, and the teaching, learning and assessment design will enable students to demonstrate the intended learning outcomes.

136 Correspondence from representatives of the University confirmed that the University is satisfied with the quality of the programmes and considered that the Academy's approach should enable it to deliver high-quality courses. The Academy staff who met the review team demonstrated extensive knowledge and experience of programme and assessment design. The Director of Learning and Teaching and the Programme Leader were able to articulate what 'high quality' means in the context of the Academy with reference to the Teaching, Learning and Assessment Policy as described above. The Programme Leader explained how to ensure high-quality course delivery through peer support and observation, monitoring and evaluation processes and how the external examiner reports and student surveys will feed into the Academy's quality cycle through the module and programme monitoring and review reports as described above.

Conclusions

137 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

138 The Academy has robust and credible plans for designing and delivering high-quality courses. This is because the Academy follows the University's approach to course design as outlined in the University's Academic Partnerships Handbook and the University's Quality Handbook and develops its pedagogical approach to delivering high-quality courses as outlined in the learning, teaching and assessment policy. These policies for course design and delivery facilitate the design and delivery of high-quality courses. Given that the course monitoring and evaluation processes are in place and external examiners will provide externality in monitoring the course delivery, the review team considered that the Academy has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for delivering high-quality courses. Approved course documentation, including programme and module specifications, and module study guides, indicates that the teaching, learning and assessment design should enable students to meet and demonstrate the intended learning outcomes. Staff are able to articulate what 'high quality' means in the context of the provider and to show how the provision meets that definition. The review team, therefore, concludes that the Core practice is met.

139 The lack of external examiner reports, observations of teaching and learning and students' views, while reflecting the Academy's current stage in the programme delivery cycle, means that the quality of the courses' delivery could not be tested. However, considering the Academy's approaches and plans are credible and robust, the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q3 The provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience

140 This Core practice expects that the provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience.

141 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

142 The QAA review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a Recruitment information on Jobs.ac.uk
- b Staff records
- c New staff induction checklist
- d Teaching Observation Form
- e Staff Appraisal Form
- f Staff Development Policy, extract from Staff Policy regards PGCE
- g Staff Development Planning in Quality Assurance
- h Staff Training Planning
- i Staff Development Approvals
- j Academic Skills Matrix
- k Academic Staff Number Projections
- l Academic Work Planner Spreadsheet
- m Academic Staff Teaching Allocation projection
- n Student Module Evaluation Questionnaires
- o The University's Quality Handbook: External Examiners
- p Module Monitoring and Evaluation Procedure
- q Programme monitoring and evaluation procedure
- r The University's Academic Partnerships Handbook
- s Staffing structure
- t Governance Structure
- u Job Descriptions: Director of Teaching and Learning, Lecturer/Senior Lecturer, Director of Enterprise and Incubation, Director of Marketing Brand and Communications, Head of Registry, Recruitment and Admissions Manager, Head of IT Systems, Head of Financial Planning, Technical Instructor, Director of Student Experience
- v Academic staff CVs
- w Professional support staff CVs
- x Meeting with senior staff and Representatives of the University
- y Meeting with academic and professional support staff
- z VLE demonstration.

143 Some of the key pieces of evidence, outlined in Annex 4, were not considered by the review team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this review are outlined below:

144 Third party endorsements, as none are available for the provision on offer at the Academy.

145 The courses have not yet commenced, so there is no evidence of student views or observations of learning and teaching.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

146 To assess whether the staff sampled are appropriately qualified and skilled to perform their roles effectively, the review team considered all job descriptions finalised at the time of the visit for academic and for professional support staff and a random sample of three academic staff CVs and three professional support staff CVs.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

147 As highlighted, all the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

148 To identify how the Academy recruits, appoints, inducts and supports staff so that it meets the outcome, the review team considered recruitment information on jobs.ac.uk, staff records, Job descriptions- lecturers/senior lecturers, new staff induction checklist, Academic Skills Matrix, Teaching Observation Form, Staff Appraisal Form, Staff Development Policy, Extract from Staff Policy regards PGCE, Staff Development Planning in Quality Assurance, Staff Training Planning, Staff Development Approvals, and meeting with senior staff.

149 To assess whether the Academy has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for ensuring that it has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality learning experience, the review team considered Academic Staff Number Projections, Academic Work Planner Spreadsheet, Academic Staff Teaching Allocation projection, Staff Development Policy, Staff Appraisal Form, Student Module Evaluation Questionnaires, the University's Quality Handbook: External Examiners, Module Monitoring and Evaluation Procedure, Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Procedure, the University's Academic Partnerships Handbook, and met with senior staff and representatives of the University. To identify the roles or posts the Academy has to deliver a high-quality learning experience and assess whether they are sufficient, the review team considered staffing structure and governance structure.

150 To assess whether the staff sampled are appropriately qualified and skilled to perform their roles effectively, the review team considered Job Descriptions for Director of Teaching and Learning, Lecturer/Senior Lecturer, Director of Enterprise and Incubation, Director of Marketing Brand and Communications, Head of Registry, Recruitment and Admissions Manager, Head of IT Systems, Head of Financial Planning, Technical Instructor, Director of Student Experience, Academic staff CVs, professional support staff CVs, and meeting with academic and professional support staff and VLE demonstration.

What the evidence shows

151 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

152 Recruitment of new staff will be made through higher education job portals such as jobs.ac.uk. Information on the webpages clearly outlines the job description, qualifications requirements and teaching to be undertaken. No policy or procedure document details the Academy's approach to staff recruitment and appointment but, as evidenced in the staff records, all applications for academic staff posts are assessed and reviewed in accordance with the person specification, which includes checking on staff attainment, experience, competencies and other relevant information. As explained in the job descriptions, shortlisted applicants for lecturer/senior lecturer posts will be interviewed and undertake a micro-teaching exercise. Applications will be considered by the Director of the Academy and Director of Learning and Teaching in a fair and coherent approach based on the application form, interview, micro-teaching and qualifications check.

153 New staff will go through the induction process during which they will undertake a number of briefing and training sessions on Equality and Diversity, Managing Teaching and Learning, eLearning technologies, Public Information Policy, Copyright, Health and Safety. Each new staff member will be assigned to a more experienced staff mentor ('Buddy scheme') who will provide ongoing support. The Academy has developed an Academic Skills Matrix which clearly outlines the teaching skills and knowledge required for each module. The Director of Learning and Teaching and Programme Leaders will check whether new teaching staff have all prerequisite skills and expertise before delivering the course. To monitor the quality of teaching of new staff, informal lesson observations will be conducted two weeks after the appointment, and a formal lesson observation will be undertaken within two months of appointment. As evidenced in the standard teaching observation form, constructive written feedback on strengths, areas for development and recommendations will be given to new staff, and this will feed into the staff appraisals. In addition, as listed in the induction checklist, new staff will have an initial meeting with the line manager to discuss any additional training requirements. The staff records, which includes initial meeting notes for all new staff, show that any additional training requirements on software or technology learning, or professional development to achieve academic priorities are discussed at the initial meeting with the line manager and plans put in place for the training to be undertaken.

154 The Staff Development Policy details training provided to academic and non-academic staff to ensure they are appropriately qualified and skilled. It is a requirement for all teaching staff to hold a postgraduate certificate in education (PGCE), if the newly appointed staff member does not already hold this qualification then they are required to enrol on a PGCE within six months of appointment. All teaching staff will be encouraged to seek professional recognition through the Advance HE/HEA fellowship scheme. Supporting this further, in-house staff training is planned to take place on a regular basis for both new and existing staff and will cover topics including the UK Quality Code, Equality Act, Neuro-Diverse Learning, Recognising and Managing Mental Health, and Advances in Wearable Technology and Smart Textiles. Specialist training will be provided for professional services staff, for example, Universities and Colleges Admission Service training for admissions staff and Association of University Administrators training for operations staff.

155 Based on the evidence discussed above, the review team concludes that the policies and procedures for the recruitment, appointment, induction, and support for staff are in place, which should provide for appropriately qualified and skilled staff.

156 The Academy has credible and robust plans for ensuring sufficient staff in place to deliver a high-quality learning experience. The Academy provided a current staffing structure

which includes the staff recruited so far. Comparing the final version of the staffing structure with the interim staffing structure shows that the Academy is still in the early stage of recruiting and appointing staff. The Academy's staffing structure, in line with the Governance Structure, displays the wide-ranging posts that will be in place to deliver a high-quality learning experience. The review team considered the roles outlined in the staffing structure and the Governance Structure are appropriate and proportional to the size of the organisation. In addition, the Academic Staff Number Projections outlines how staff capacity will be increased year by year in accordance with increasing student numbers. Staff capacity is calculated from the total number of teaching hours required for both undergraduates and postgraduates over three years. The Academic Work Planner Spreadsheet and Academic Staff Teaching Allocation projection set out planned teaching duties allocated to staff teaching on each course based on the modules that will be taught in Sept 2020 to August 2021. Apart from hours allocated for teaching and assessment, the Academic Work Planner Spreadsheet also includes hours specifically for Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and training to ensure staff have sufficient time for CPD, and hours for administrative tasks, student support and mentoring, all of which supports staff to deliver a high-quality learning experience.

157 The Academy has detailed plans for monitoring and reviewing staff performance. As outlined in the Staff Appraisal Form, staff performance will be reviewed based on achievements against objectives, performance on competencies, feedback from formal teaching observations, student success (attendance, retention and achievement) and CPD completion. As confirmed with the Director of Learning and Teaching in the meeting, all staff will have formal performance review meetings with line managers to identify ongoing needs to support staff development. The Staff Appraisal Form will be fully discussed between staff and line managers to ensure detailed feedback is provided to staff, and the objectives and training requirements are updated for the next period staff development. Student feedback on academic staff performance on teaching, mentoring, student support and assessment will be captured from Student Module Evaluation Questionnaires. Issues about staffing identified from staff performance review and student feedback would feed into the Academy's Module and Programme monitoring and review processes which may be escalated to the Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee and to the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee for further discussion which feeds into the Academy's annual monitoring report and associated action plans.

158 By way of governance for academic staff, the University has final approval over staffing through its School of Film, Media and Design. As explained in the University's Academic Partnerships Handbook and confirmed in the meeting, the University's Academic Partnership Link Tutor will make annual visits (termly visits in the first year of partnership) to check any new teaching staff CVs and forward them to Head of School of Film, Media and Design for approval. The University's Academic Partnership Link Tutor will also check whether professional development opportunities and training available to academics and professional support staff are able to support staff to deliver a high-quality learning experience. The report produced by the Academic Partnership Link Tutor at the end of each visit will feed into the discussions on the sufficiency of resources including staffing and staff development in the University's Academic Partnerships annual and periodic reviews.

159 The job descriptions of academic and professional services staff are appropriate and enable adequate support for students. For example, all academic staff are expected to have relevant and appropriate academic and professional experience along with a proven desire to develop their knowledge, understanding and approach to pedagogy. The CVs of existing academic and professional support staff demonstrate that the Academy has appointed appropriately qualified and experienced staff to fulfil the roles and that these appointments are consistent with the role descriptors. All appointed academic staff hold postgraduate degrees and have wide experience in engaging with the Fashion industry

and have extensive experience in the course and assessment design and delivery. All professional support staff have previous relevant experience at a level that is applicable to their current role. For example, the appointed Student Support Manager has worked as a mental health administrator and student support officer in other higher education providers. All staff whose CVs have been reviewed by the team also met with the team and provided an in-depth explanation of their previous experience and how they could contribute to the delivery of high-quality learning experience based on their work experience and expertise. They could articulate their teaching and learning ethos and how they will support high-quality course delivery, including using Moodle and other online learning technologies.

Conclusions

160 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

161 The Academy has the potential to ensure sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff in place to deliver a high-quality academic experience. The detailed policies and procedures for the recruitment, appointment, induction, and support for staff are in place, which should provide for a sufficient number of appropriately qualified and skilled staff. The staffing structure is appropriate for the delivery and support of the programme under review. The Academy has detailed plans for monitoring and reviewing staff performance within the quality cycle to ensure the delivery of a high-quality learning experience. The job descriptions of academic and professional services staff are appropriate and will enable adequate support for students. The CVs of existing academic and professional support staff demonstrate that the Academy has appointed appropriately qualified and experienced staff to fulfil the roles and that these appointments are consistent with the role descriptors. Staff who met the review team could articulate their teaching and learning ethos and how they will support high-quality course delivery. The review team concludes that on balance the Core practice is met.

162 The lack of evidence relating to student views and direct observations of learning and teaching, while reflecting the Academy's current stage in the programme delivery cycle, means that the effectiveness of the Academy's approaches to recruiting appropriately qualified and skilled staff could not be fully tested. Furthermore, although the job descriptions and organisational structures were judged to be appropriate to the delivery of a high-quality academic experience, at the time of the review the Academy is still in the early stage of recruiting and appointing staff. Therefore, the review team could only have a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q4 The provider has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience

163 This Core practice expects that the provider has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience.

164 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

165 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a The Student Handbook
- b Moodle screenshot
- c Example of library resource list for a module
- d The University's Course Approval Panel Outcomes Reports
- e The VLE policy
- f The Teaching, Learning and Assessment policy
- g The Student Support Disability Policy
- h Equality and Diversity Statement
- i Access and Participation statement
- j Resources plan
- k Module evaluation and monitoring procedure
- l Programme evaluation and monitoring procedure
- m Student module evaluation questionnaire
- n The University's Quality Handbook: External Examiners
- o Committee reporting structure
- p Job descriptions academic staff, job descriptions support staff
- q CVs of existing academic and support staff
- r Staff training plan
- s Observation of facilities and learning resources, including VLE demonstration
- t Meeting with the University representatives and the Academy's senior staff
- u Meeting with the Academy's academic and professional support staff.

166 Some of the key pieces of evidence, outlined in Annex 4, were not considered by the review team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this review are outlined below:

167 Third party endorsements, as none are available for the provision on offer at the Academy nor external examiner reports.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

168 To determine whether the roles are consistent with the delivery of a high-quality learning experience, the review team considered all job descriptions that had been finalised at the time of the visit for academic and professional support staff and a random sample of three academic staff CVs and three Professional support staff CVs.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

169 As highlighted, all the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

170 To identify how the Academy's facilities, learning resources and student support services contribute to delivering a high-quality academic experience, the review team considered the Student Handbook, Moodle screenshot, the Academy's resources plan, example of library resource list for a module, the University's Course Approval Panel Outcomes Reports, the VLE policy, the Teaching, Learning and Assessment policy, the Student Support Disability Policy, Equality and Diversity Statement and Access and Participation statement.

171 To assess whether the Academy has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for ensuring that they have sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience, the review team considered the module evaluation and monitoring procedure, programme evaluation and monitoring procedure, student module evaluation questionnaire, the University's Quality Handbook: External Examiners, and the committee reporting structure.

172 To determine whether staff roles are consistent with the delivery of a high-quality learning experience, and to test whether staff are appropriately qualified and skilled, and understand their roles and responsibilities, the review team considered job descriptions of academic staff, job descriptions of support staff, CVs of existing academic and support staff, staff training plan, and meeting with academic and professional support staff.

173 To test that the facilities, resources and services under assessment deliver a high-quality academic experience, the review team considered observation of facilities and learning resources including the resources plan, and a Moodle screenshot.

What the evidence shows

174 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

175 For facilities and learning resources, the Academy's resources plan outlines the plans for machine resources, manufacturing hardware, IT hardware/software and studio facilities. It details how many facilities and learning resources are needed for each lesson within each module based on student numbers. It also explains how the facilities and learning resources will be used for teaching and assessment, ensuring sufficient facilities are in place for the delivery of a high-quality learning experience for students. The identification of appropriate library resources for each module was made during the course development and scrutiny, and approval was made during the validation process as evidenced in the University's Course Approval Panel Outcomes Reports.

176 For e-learning resources, all library items (including books and magazines) are located on the library online catalogue. In addition, students are able to access a variety of course content through the Academy's VLE, including lecture notes, learning materials, reading lists, assessment briefs and guidance, and the Academy's policies and regulations. The VLE allows any member of staff or student to communicate through the discussion forums. Students will submit assignments, receive marking and feedback via the VLE. To support academic teams in their use of the VLE, the VLE policy sets out minimum expectations of what staff are required to upload and guidelines for how staff interact with students online. Moreover, the Academy has developed a blogging system where students will be encouraged to present their learner journey and assessment portfolio for each module and seek comments from their tutors and peers. Some part of student work may be chosen to be published on the Academy's website to a wider audience.

177 As set out in the Student Handbook, each student is assigned an academic member of staff as a personal tutor who will provide one-to-one academic and career guidance to support individual progression, in line with the Teaching, Learning and Assessment policy. The personal tutors may also signpost students to other appropriate student support services teams for specialist support. For example, the Academy's incubation team provides students and graduates with career guidance and practical advice on developing employability skills, including CV writing and job interview preparations.

178 The Student Experience team is responsible for securing the wellbeing of students during their time at the Academy. As detailed in the Student Support Disability Policy, students with specific learning difficulties, disabilities, or mental health concerns are given tailored support from the student experience team and, if required, directed to the University's student counselling services. The Equality and Diversity Statement and Access and Participation Statement include further guidance and clear expectations around inclusivity, equality and diversity.

179 Noting that the initial investment in facilities, learning resources and student support services will require ongoing observation and maintenance, the Academy has a deliberative review structure that takes physical and staffing resources into consideration. The ongoing review over resources is contained within module and programme evaluation and monitoring procedures. Student module evaluation questionnaire and external examiners' responsibilities as outlined in the University's Quality Handbook indicate that feedback from students and external examiners on the provision of facilities, learning resources and student support services would feed into the module and programme review procedures to underpin the delivery of a high-quality academic experience. These are considered by programme teams and are escalated through committee structures for approval and procurement. The review team, therefore, found the plan for ensuring sufficient facilities, learning resources, and student support services to be credible, robust and evidence based.

180 The Academy is planning for no more than 30 students on each of its franchised and postgraduate programmes and no more than 60 students enrolled on its validated degree programme. The proposed staffing structure suggests that appropriate structures and resources are made available based on student numbers. The job descriptions of academic and professional support staff include detailed requirements on qualification, experience and skills, ensuring staff recruited are appropriately qualified and skilled to support students. The CVs of existing academic and support staff demonstrate that the Academy has appointed appropriately qualified and experienced staff to fulfil the roles and that these appointments are consistent with the role descriptors.

181 Staff involved in student support, including Head of Registry and the Student Support Manager provided details of student support services and their contribution to supporting a high-quality student experience. They confirmed that their roles are an integral

part of the delivery of a high-quality learning experience and were familiar with student support plans in place. Staff also made clear reference to the staff training plan to clarify training available for staff. Some examples of staff training provided by the Student Support Manager who provides oversight of student pastoral care across the Academy included workshops on understanding mental health and neurodiversity in creative and design-based learning. From reviewing the CVs of existing academic and support staff and meeting with staff, the review team is confident that all staff are appropriately qualified and skilled and understand their roles and responsibilities.

182 A direct examination by the team of physical facilities and resources revealed appropriate and well-equipped teaching facilities, including the comprehensive provision of IT, projection and display arrangements, break-out spaces suitable for teaching, workshops, small seminars and student support areas. The resources plan was used to explain to the review team where the resources would be placed in the finished building, including the professional studios, subject-specific workshops, and CAD studios with industry-standard software. There is a library at the Academy which is still in development. Students are also able to access online texts and resources and the University's online resources.

183 The Academy operates a VLE which contains all the module information for students and course materials are uploaded in advance of teaching sessions. The discussion forums on the VLE are easily accessed. The navigation of the VLE is intuitive and easy to follow. Observations by the team of the VLE confirm that it is well structured and supports course delivery with appropriate teaching materials, guidance on module structures and links to further resources. The level of detail of learning materials provided, which were prepared by academic members of staff, indicate that teaching staff are appropriately qualified and skilled to deliver high-quality learning.

184 Having visited the Academy's planned site and reviewed the facilities and learning resources, the review team can confirm that the Academy's facilities, learning resources and student support services contribute to delivering a high-quality academic experience.

Conclusions

185 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

186 The Academy has the potential to ensure sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services in place to deliver a high-quality academic experience. The Academy's approaches to the development of facilities, learning resources and student support services are clearly explained in the policies and Student Handbook. As outlined in the resource plans, learning resources and teaching facilities are sufficient and of high quality. Students will be able to access all library items via the library online catalogue and course content via the VLE. Students can present their work in a blogging system. Plans for the development of facilities, learning resources and student support services are credible, robust and evidence-based because the Academy has a deliberative review structure that takes physical and staffing resources into consideration. The ongoing review of resources is contained within module and programme evaluation and monitoring procedures. The staffing structure, job descriptions and staff CVs demonstrate that academic and professional support staff are appropriately qualified and skilled and will enable adequate support for students. A direct examination by the team of facilities and

resources revealed appropriate and well-equipped teaching facilities and a well-structured Moodle site. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.

187 The lack of evidence relating to student views about facilities, learning resources and support services, and direct observations of student support services, while reflecting the Academy's current stage in the programme delivery cycle, means that the effectiveness of the Academy's approaches to the development of facilities, learning resources and student support services could not be fully tested. However, the Academy's approaches and plans are credible and robust. Therefore, the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q5 The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience

188 This Core practice expects that the provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.

189 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

190 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a Student Engagement Policy
- b Module Evaluation Questionnaire
- c Module Monitoring and Review Procedure
- d Programme evaluation and monitoring procedure
- e Personal Tutor responsibilities
- f Student Representative Job Description
- g Governance structure
- h Student Handbook
- i Reporting structure of the committees
- j Job descriptions
- k Governance Structure
- l Meeting with academic and professional support staff.

191 Some of the key pieces of evidence as outlined in Annex 4 were not considered by the review team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this review are outlined below.

192 The courses have not yet commenced, so there is no evidence of student views or examples of the Academy changing or improving provision as a result of student engagement.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

193 The sampling of evidence was not applicable as there were no students' views or examples of the Academy acting upon student feedback.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

194 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to

ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

195 To identify how the Academy actively engages students in the quality of their educational experience, the review team considered the Student Engagement Policy, Module Evaluation Questionnaire, Module Monitoring and Review Procedure, programme evaluation and monitoring procedure, Personal Tutor responsibilities, Student Representative Job Description, Governance structure, the Student Handbook, Moodle screenshot, and the Student Support Manager's statement in the meeting.

196 To assess whether the Academy has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for engaging students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience, the review team considered the Academy's reporting structure of the committees, Student Engagement Policy, job descriptions, Module Monitoring and Review Procedure, programme evaluation and monitoring procedure, governance structure, and the Student Support Manager's statement in the meeting.

What the evidence shows

197 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

198 The Academy's Student Engagement Policy clearly outlines the Academy's approach to engaging students in the quality of their educational experience. It explains how individual and collective feedback is obtained and how student feedback will be fed into relevant groups, committees and bodies.

199 Individual feedback will be gathered through Module Evaluation Questionnaires which ask students to comment on their experience of learning, teaching and assessment of the module, along with commenting on resources and the general learning experience. Completed Student Module Evaluation Questionnaires will be analysed by the Module Coordinator and reported to the Programme Leader and Director of Teaching and Learning as part of the Module Monitoring and Review Procedure. Individual feedback will also be collected through the personal tutor system, where each student will be allocated a staff member as a point of first contact should they need the support of any kind or wish to provide feedback. Issues raised in one-to-one tutorial meetings may be further considered by the Programme Leader and Director of Teaching and Learning in the Module Monitoring and Review Procedure. A summary of student feedback and any action points from Module Monitoring and Review reports will be considered at Programme Committee meetings as part of the programme evaluation and monitoring procedure. This may be escalated to the Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee and to the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee for further discussion, which will feed into the Academy's annual monitoring report.

200 Collective feedback will be gathered through student representatives. As confirmed in the Student Engagement Policy, each course will have one student democratically elected to represent their peers as a Student Representative. The responsibilities of student representatives are detailed in the Student Engagement Policy and the Student Representative Job Description. Student representatives will be full members of Programme Committees and will be expected to meet regularly with the Student Support Manager to share student views and to represent the student voice for their fellow students in programme committee meetings which will feed into the programme evaluation and monitoring procedure.

201 The Student Engagement Policy also confirms that the Academy will close the loop in relation to all student feedback so that any action taken as a result of student

feedback will be communicated to students through student representatives' feedback to all students and via key committees' reports and briefings. Therefore, it is clear that student feedback will be individually and collectively sought, how actions resulting from student feedback will be taken, which bodies will be accountable for such actions, and how actions taken will be communicated back to students.

202 The Student Engagement Policy is on the VLE and the Student Support Manager confirmed that the Academy's approaches to student engagement including how to elect student representatives and how to collect student feedback would be explained to students at inductions.

203 The Academy has detailed plans for monitoring and reviewing student engagement within the quality cycle. The Academy's reporting structure, in line with the Student Engagement Policy, explains how individual and collective student feedback will be collected from various mechanisms which will feed into the module and programme monitoring and reviews and subsequently the Academy's annual monitoring review. The module and programme evaluation and monitoring procedures also clearly explain the use of student feedback alongside other key data sources, to evaluate modules and programmes, to identify key themes, any areas for concern, and to agree on action plans. In addition, at the institutional level, the Academy's Governance Structure includes a Student Experience Committee which will provide oversight for the development, implementation and monitoring of the Academy's Student Experience Strategy. The Committee will be chaired by the Student Support Manager and will include student representatives. It will meet twice per year and consider all student feedback collected from various mechanisms, including student feedback gathered from one-to-one tutorial meetings, student surveys, and student representatives. Issues identified from student feedback will be reported directly to the Executive Committee and Governance and Corporation Board.

204 To ensure the effectiveness of student representatives' work on student engagement, as stated in the Student Engagement Policy and confirmed with the Student Support Manager in the meeting, the Student Experience team will provide training to student representatives and act as a key liaison point between student representatives, management and staff. Staff having responsibilities for student engagement, including the Director of Student Experience, Student Support Manager and personal tutors, are particularly required to have experience and skills working with students as evidenced in their job descriptions.

Conclusions

205 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

206 The Academy has clear policies and credible plans to actively engage students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience. The Academy has a Student Engagement Policy which explains how student feedback will be individually and collectively sought, how actions resulting from student feedback will be taken, which bodies will be accountable for such actions, and how actions taken will be communicated back to students. Individual student feedback gathered through completion of Module Evaluation Questionnaires and discussions with personal tutors will feed into module and programme evaluation and monitoring procedures, and subsequently the Academy's annual monitoring review. Students can also share their views via student representatives, who represent the

student voice on key committees and group meetings. The Academy has credible and robust plans to ensure the effectiveness of the Academy's approach to student engagement, including a clear committee reporting structure, to consider student feedback, ensuring all student representatives are trained by the Student Experience team, and having Student Experience Committee at the senior level to provide oversight for the development, implementation and monitoring of the Academy's Student Experience Strategy. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.

207 The lack of evidence relating to the views of students and evidence of the Academy acting upon student feedback, while reflecting the Academy's current stage in the programme delivery cycle, means that the effectiveness of the Academy's approach to student engagement could not be tested. However, the Academy's approaches and plans for student engagement are credible and robust. Therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q6 The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students

208 This Core practice expects that the provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students.

209 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

210 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a Student Complaints Policy and Procedures
- b Complaints forms
- c The UWL Appeal Regulations which is section 14 of the University's Academic Regulation
- d The University's Academic Partnership Handbook
- e Moodle screenshots
- f Student Handbook
- g Governance structure
- h Meeting with the University representatives and the Academy's senior staff
- i Meeting with the Academy's academic and professional support staff.

211 Some of the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 were not considered by the review team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this review are outlined below:

212 The courses have not yet commenced, so there is no evidence of student views and no examples of complaint or appeals.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

213 The sampling of evidence was not applicable as there were no students' views or examples of complaints and appeals.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

214 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key

pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

215 To assess how the Academy ensures courses are high quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them and to test the partnership arrangements are in line with the Academy's regulations or policies, the review team considered the Institutional Agreement, Validation Agreement, the University's Academic regulations, the University's Academic Partnerships Handbook, the University's Quality Handbook, and the University's Academic Partnership Link Tutor responsibilities.

216 To assess whether the Academy has credible, robust and evidence-based approaches for ensuring a high-quality academic experience in partnership work, the review team considered programme monitoring and review procedures, the University's Academic Partnerships Handbook, and the University's two-day annual partnership conference agenda.

217 To test whether staff understand and discharge their responsibilities effectively to the awarding body and to test that the awarding body is meeting its responsibilities, the review team held meetings with the Academy's senior staff and representatives of the University and the Academy's academic and professional support staff.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

218 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

219 To identify the Academy's processes for handling complaints and appeals and to confirm that these processes are fair and transparent, the review team considered Student Complaints Policy and Procedures, Complaints forms, University Appeal Regulations, which is Section 14 of the University's Academic Regulation, and meetings with the Academy's senior staff including representatives of the University and the Academy's academic and professional support staff.

220 To assess whether the Academy has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for developing and operating fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students, the review team considered Student Complaints Policy and Procedures, University Appeal Regulations, the University's Academic Partnership Handbook, governance structure and meetings with professional support staff.

221 To assess whether information for potential and actual complainants and appellants is clear and accessible, the review team considered the Student Complaints Policy and Procedures, Complaints forms, University Appeal Regulations (Section 14 of the University's Academic Regulation), Moodle screenshots, the Student Handbook, and meetings with professional support staff.

What the evidence shows

222 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

223 The Academy's Student Complaints Policy and Procedures sets out the Academy's approach to handling complaints. It explains the purpose of the policy, the scope of the policy, and the types of issues which do or not apply. It explains the three-stage process that will be followed within the Academy to handle complaints and the timeline for each stage. The Academy has structured forms for each of the three stages of the process. Stage 1 is an informal investigation, which may lead to a resolution without the need for escalation to Stage 2, which is a formal investigation. Stage 3 comes into play if the complainant is dissatisfied with the outcome of Stage 2, at which point the case would be reviewed by the Director of Student Experience whose decision is final. Where students are dissatisfied with the Academy's decision and have exhausted the Academy's internal complaints procedure, they have a right of appeal to the University following the University's procedure. If the issue remains unresolved, the issues can be escalated to the Office for the Independent Adjudicator (OIA). The Student Complaints Policy and Procedures refers students to their personal tutors, student representatives or the Student Support team should they wish to seek advice or support in respect of making a complaint. The review team discussed the Academy's approaches to handling complaints with the Senior Management team and academic and professional support staff. Staff involved in handling complaints, including the Head of Registry and Student Support Manager, can articulate the process with a clear reference to the policy and forms.

224 All appeals, including appeals against the outcome of an assessment board and cases of alleged plagiarism will be handled by the University following the University's Appeal Regulations set out in Section 14 of the University's Academic Regulations. The grounds for appeal and the appeal procedure are described in detail in the University's Appeal Regulations with a clear timeline. The review team discussed the appeal process with two representatives from the University and it was clear the members from the Academy and the University understood their role and clearly explained how they plan to handle appeals in line with the appeal regulations. University staff clearly outlined the process and explained how students will be directed to the University process by contacting their personal tutor or the Student Support Manager.

225 The approaches to handling complaints and appeals can be considered as fair because the procedures with timelines are clearly defined in the policies, and both the Academy and the University staff demonstrated a clear understanding of their roles in handling complaints and appeals. The approaches to handling complaints and appeals can be considered as transparent because Student Complaints Policy and Procedures with three-stage forms and the University's Academic Regulation, which includes the appeals regulations, will be available to students on the Academy's website, and will be discussed with all students at induction and key dates throughout the year.

226 The Academy has a system for logging and monitoring formal complaints. Records of Stage 2 formal complaints and their resolution will be kept and monitored by the Registry to ensure that appropriate action is taken. The Student Experience Committee at the senior level provides oversight of the development of policy and procedure related to complaints and its implementation. The Student Experience Committee reports directly to Executive Committee and Governance and Corporation Board which feeds into the Academy's annual monitoring report and associated action plans that go to the University's Academic Partnership annual and periodic reviews.

227 There is some lack of clarity about how informal Stage 1 complaints will be recorded and tracked. The policy does not specify how the Academy will be made aware of informal complaints, nor how these informal complaint cases will be recorded locally. The Head of Registry explained that staff at the local level will notify the Registry of any informal complaints that arise and that the Registry will keep a central record of informal complaints as well as formal complaints.

228 The University's Academic Partnership Handbook explains that responsibility for handling student complaints is delegated to the Academy, but the University Academic Partnership Link Tutor has a responsibility to check that complaints are dealt with appropriately. The Academy's procedure for handling complaints is checked for compliance with University protocols during the Academic Partnership Audit.

229 Given that the detailed policies for handling complaints and appeals and the clear procedure for monitoring and reviewing complaints are in place, the review team concludes that the Academy has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for handling complaints and appeals.

230 The Student Complaints Policy and Procedure, three-stage forms, and the University's Academic Regulations, which includes the appeals regulations, will be available on the Academy's website (once the website goes live) and the VLE, and therefore accessible to all students. The Student Handbook also details the scope and procedure for making complaints and makes explicit reference to the University's Academic Regulations for more information about appeals. Information provided for all students, including policies and forms, is written in easy-to-understand language, with clear explanations and without exclusionary terminology. The Complaints Policy explains that a student can seek advice from the Student Support team and can be accompanied and supported by anyone of their choosing at meetings as part of the process. The Student Support Manager clarified in the meeting that both the Student Support team and the student's personal tutor could provide an explanation of the processes and help students complete the forms for making complaints or direct students to the University's Appeals procedure. Students would also be briefed on the procedures for making complaints and appeals at induction. Therefore, the Academy's procedures for handling complaints and appeals are accessible and clear to students so should be found and understood easily.

Conclusions

231 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

232 The Academy has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students. This is because the Academy's Student Complaints Policy and Procedures and the University's Appeal Regulations clearly explain what situations can or cannot be applied to complaints or appeals, what process should be followed and when they should be escalated to the University or OIA, and the timeline for each step. The policies and processes for addressing complaints and appeals are clear and will be accessible for all students on the Academy's website, VLE, in student handbooks and explained to students at induction. The Academy has a clear procedure for recording formal complaints and monitoring and reviewing complaints through Student Experience Committee meetings. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.

233 The lack of evidence relating to the views of students and data on complaints and appeals, while reflecting the Academy's current stage in the programme delivery cycle, means that the effectiveness of the implementation of the procedures could not be fully tested. However, the Academy's approaches and plans for handling and monitoring complaints and appeals are credible and robust. Therefore, the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q8 Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them

234 This Core practice expects that where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them.

235 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

236 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a The Institutional Agreement
- b The Validation Agreement
- c The University's Academic Regulations
- d The University's Academic Partnerships Handbook
- e The University's Quality Handbook
- f The University Academic Partnership Link Tutor responsibilities
- g Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Procedure
- h The University's two-day annual partnership conference agenda
- i Meeting with the University representatives and the Academy's senior staff
- j Meeting with the Academy's academic and professional support staff.

237 Some of the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 were not considered by the review team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this review are outlined below:

238 Third party endorsements, as none are available for the provision on offer at the Academy.

239 The courses have not yet commenced, so there is no evidence of students' views or external examiners' reports.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

240 The sampling of evidence was not applicable as there were no students' views or external examiners' reports.

What the evidence shows

241 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

242 The Institutional Agreement and the Validation Agreement are clear and comprehensive and form the basis for the Academy's partnership work. The agreements assign clear responsibilities both to the Academy and the University for ensuring a high-quality academic experience for students.

243 The University maintains oversight of the Academy's quality of the academic experience through regular monitoring of the partnership arrangements through the University's Academic Partnerships annual and periodic reviews and the appointment of an Academic Partnership Link Tutor. The University's Academic Partnership annual and periodic review will consider the operation of the Academic Partnership and the procedures in place for quality assurance and enhancement and the maintenance of academic standards. The minutes of the periodic and annual partnership reviews are reported to the University's Academic Partnerships Committee and become part of the University's monitoring and evaluation processes.

244 To ensure that the quality of the academic experience is maintained, there will be regular communication between the University Academic Partnership Link Tutor and the Academy. The Link Tutor will undertake two formal visits in the first year of the partnership and one visit per year in subsequent years to meet students and staff and gather their views on the quality of learning and teaching, learning resources, student support and student representation. Issues identified from the University Academic Partnership Link Tutor's contact with the Academy will feed into the University's Academic Partnership annual and periodic review.

245 The Academy has credible and robust plans for monitoring and reviewing the quality of partnership work within the quality cycle. The Academy's programme evaluation and monitoring procedures will review the partnership arrangements through the consideration of the Module Monitoring and Review reports conducted throughout the year, external examiner reports, staff and student feedback, and data provided by Admissions, Registry and Examination Offices. The resultant action plan and accompanying report will be escalated to the Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee and the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee for further discussion and will feed into the Academy's annual monitoring report and associated action plans and subsequently into the University's Academic Partnership annual and periodic reviews.

246 University representatives and senior and academic and professional support staff understand their respective roles and responsibilities. The University Academic Partnership Link Tutor explained how they will manage the quality of the learning experience through the University's Academic Partnerships annual and periodic reviews and oversight by the University Academic Partnership Link Tutor. The Head of the University's London School of Film, Media and Design described how the two partners had worked together not only in course design and development but also with plans to develop the course materials and assessment briefs. The University's Director of Quality and Standards confirmed that the University is satisfied with the development of the partnership to date and that the Academy's course arrangements have met all their requirements as confirmed in the course approval documents. The Academy's senior and academic staff explained how the Academy would fulfil its responsibilities to the University for maintaining the quality of the academic experience through high-quality teaching by subject-specialist staff, specialised resources assessment, staff development and providing student academic support, advice and guidance.

Conclusions

247 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this

judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

248 Where the Academy works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them. This is because the Institutional Agreement and the Validation Agreement are clear and comprehensive in their articulation of the respective roles of the Academy and the University. The Academy will use the procedures set out in the University's Academic Regulations, Quality Handbook and Academic Partnerships Handbook to assure the quality of the academic experience. The University maintains oversight of the Academy's quality of the academic experience through the University's Academic Partnerships annual and periodic reviews and an Academic Partnership Link Tutor from the University. The Academy has credible and robust plans for monitoring and reviewing the quality of partnership work within the quality cycle to ensure a high-quality academic experience. Staff from both the awarding body and the provider fully understand their respective roles and can articulate credible plans for the delivery of high-quality provision. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.

249 The lack of evidence relating to student views, and external examiner reports, while reflecting the Academy's current stage in the programme delivery cycle, means that the effectiveness of the Academy's approaches to partnership working could not be fully tested. However, the Academy's approaches and plans for partnership working are credible and robust. Therefore, the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q9 The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes

250 This Core practice expects that the provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.

251 The QAA review team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

The evidence the team considered

252 The review team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The review team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a The Student Experience Strategy
- b The Introduction to Personal Development Planning
- c The University's Quality Handbook
- d The Student Support Disability Policy
- e The Incubation Strategy
- f The Personal Development Plan form
- g An example of grading rubric
- h Course handbooks
- i Module study guides
- j Staff Appraisal Form
- k Academic staff job descriptions
- l Personal tutor's role descriptor
- m Staff Development Policy, extract from Staff Policy regarding PGCE
- n The teaching observation form
- o Evidence considered in Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Reports
- p Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Procedure
- q Meeting with the University representatives, and the Academy's senior staff
- r Meeting with the Academy's academic and professional support staff.

253 Some of the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 were not considered by the review team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this review are outlined below:

254 The courses have not yet commenced, so there is no evidence of student views or assessed student work.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

255 The sampling of evidence was not applicable as there were no student views or assessed student work.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

256 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider was considered by the review team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

257 To identify the Academy's approach to student support, including how it identifies and monitors the needs of individual students, the review team considered the Student Experience Strategy, Introduction to Personal Development Planning, the University's Quality Handbook, Student Support Disability Policy, the Incubation Strategy, Personal Development Plan form, an example of grading rubric, course handbooks, module study guides, and meeting with the Director of Learning and Teaching and Director of Enterprise and Incubation.

258 To assess whether the Academy has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for ensuring that all students are supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes, the review team considered the Staff Appraisal Form, Academic staff job descriptions, Personal Tutor Responsibilities, Staff Development Policy, extract from Staff Policy regarding PGCE, Lesson Observation Form, evidence considered in Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Reports, and Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Procedure.

259 To test whether staff understand their responsibilities and are appropriately skilled and supported, the review team met with senior staff and the University representatives, academic and professional support staff.

What the evidence shows

260 The review team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

261 As stated in the Student Experience Strategy, the Academy 'seeks to educate the most committed and potential designers through its sustained focus on the learner experience, academic and enterprise development, and the creation and incubated support of entrepreneurs'. The Academy's approaches to supporting students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes are detailed in the Student Support Disability Policy, Incubation Strategy, and the University's Quality Handbook.

262 The Student Support Disability Policy sets out how additional learning support will be provided. Additional Learning Support will be accessed at any time through referrals from personal tutors or any member of the course team, or through students' self-referrals. The Student Experience team will be responsible for dealing with referrals and offering professional and impartial advice to any students who are experiencing a difficulty that is having an impact on their learning. Additional learning support will be delivered in a variety of ways, which include on-course support, specialist workshops and counselling. The Student Experience team will work with individuals to determine the options available which will allow the student to make informed choices and decisions and work with appropriate external agencies (including charities) to ensure the student has the best level of support available.

263 To ensure students achieve successful academic outcomes, the Academy follows the University's Quality Handbook to manage assessment. The setting of assessment is undertaken by the Module Coordinator in consultation with the Programme Leader and in accordance with the definitive programme and module specification. This is then subject to

approval by the University. The assessment takes into account the type of work to be assessed and the intended learning outcomes that are to be achieved and measured. The University's Quality Handbook and Student Handbook clearly explain the nature and purpose of feedback and specify the turnaround time for marked work. To ensure students clearly understand how to achieve successful academic outcomes, students are provided with course handbooks, which make explicit the expectations of the course, its aims and outcomes and course structure. At the start of each module, students are provided with detailed module study guides, which make clear the purpose of the module, the learning outcomes, delivery schedule and the assessment briefs. Each assignment brief carries a detailed grading rubric by which grading decisions are made. Given that detailed policies and procedures are in place as described above, the review team is confident that students will be given comprehensive, helpful and timely feedback.

264 The Academy's Incubation Strategy explains how students at the Academy will be professionally 'incubated' as aspiring designers and develop their craft in professional studios. This progressive engagement will include training in industry-standard software, commercially sponsored 'live' project work, industrial visits, competition entries and professional practice-based reflection. The modules at all levels integrate theory with practice, each containing a project as a focus for learning. The subject of each of these projects is carefully selected to progressively extend the depth and breadth of business/entrepreneurial, creative skills and knowledge. Students are supported to develop professionalism through links with employers and alumni (including work-related learning modules and networking events), embedding of professional skills into the curriculum (including live briefs, guest speakers and provision of industry-standard software), and opportunities to develop employability skills (such as CV writing sessions and practice job interviews).

265 The Academy's approach to identifying and monitoring the needs of individual students is through the Personal Development Planning process, which is a structured and supported process to develop the capacity of individuals to reflect on their own learning and achievement and to plan for their own personal and educational career development. The Personal Development Plan form will be completed by all students at the start of their programme and in the one-to-one tutorial meetings with their personal tutors. Personal tutors will arrange regular formal one-to-one meetings with students to review the Personal Development Plan and update students' targets, tasks and associated achievement timelines. Students will also be able to request additional one-to-one tutorials with personal tutors to discuss and assess their educational experience where personal tutors will provide guidance and support or signpost students to specialist support if required. Concerns about individual student progress or student support will be identified from the one-to-one meetings with personal tutors, and subsequent plans will be developed by personal tutors and the course team to support underperforming students to achieve successful academic outcomes. Issues about the progress of individual students identified by personal tutors and in progression and completion data will be considered at Programme Committees as part of programme evaluation and monitoring procedure and may be escalated to the Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee and the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee.

266 All staff are required to undertake continuous professional development (CPD) which is reviewed during the annual staff appraisal. All new academics, including those who will provide one-to-one academic support to students, should hold postgraduate degrees and are required to enrol on a postgraduate certificate in education (PGCE) within six months of appointment, if they do not have a teaching qualification. The University representative also confirmed that academic staff can have access to all the University's academic support training. In addition, all teachers will be observed and graded at least annually and receive constructive written feedback on strengths, areas for development and recommendations

which feed into the staff appraisals. The Director of Learning and Teaching confirmed that a range of staff development opportunities will be provided to support staff understanding of their roles in supporting student achievement, including peer observations, exam board training, encouragement and support to gain Higher Education Academy membership and partner institution staff development programmes. The review team therefore concludes that staff will be appropriately qualified and skilled to support students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.

267 The Director of Learning and Teaching and the Programme Leader demonstrated in the meetings with the review team that there is a clear commitment to supporting students through their courses of study and that a strong and effective framework of academic and non-academic student support is in place, in particular through the work of the personal tutor roles. All academic and professional support staff met by the team fully understood their roles and were able to articulate clearly how their role contributes to student outcomes. For example, the Student Support Manager explained how to support students with additional learning needs and the Director of Enterprise and Incubation explained how to develop students' employability.

Conclusions

268 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

269 The Academy's approach to student support has the potential to facilitate successful academic and professional outcomes. The Academy's approaches are detailed in the Student Support Disability Policy, the Incubation Strategy, and the University's Quality Handbook. The Academy will use the Personal Development Planning process to identify and monitor student progress. Issues identified from an individual's Personal Development Plan will be considered at Programme Committees and may be escalated to the Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee and the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee. Academic and professional support staff demonstrated a clear understanding of their roles in supporting student achievement and staff are appropriately skilled and supported through a range of staff development opportunities. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.

270 The lack of evidence relating to student views and feedback on assessed student work, while reflecting the Academy's current stage in the programme delivery cycle, means that the effectiveness of the approaches could not be tested. However, the Academy's approaches and plans for supporting students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes are credible and robust. Therefore, the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

QAA2557 - R10915 - Sept 20

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2020
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB
Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786

Tel: 01452 557000
Web: www.qaa.ac.uk