



Designated Quality Body
in England

Assessment for Variation of Degree Awarding Powers

The London Institute of Banking & Finance



Review Report

May 2021

Contents

Summary of the assessment team's findings	1
About this report	1
Provider information	1
About the London Institute of Banking & Finance	2
How the assessment was conducted	3
Explanation of findings	5
Criterion A: Academic governance	5
Criterion A1 - Academic governance	5
Criterion B: Academic standards and quality assurance	14
Criterion B1 - Regulatory frameworks	14
Criterion B2 - Academic standards	21
Criterion B3 - Quality of the academic experience	27
Criterion C: Scholarship and the pedagogical effectiveness of staff	42
Criterion C1 - The role of academic and professional staff	42
Criterion D: Environment for supporting students	49
Criterion D1 - Enabling student development and achievement	49
Criterion E: Evaluation of performance	56
Criterion E1 - Evaluation of performance	56
Full Degree Awarding Powers overarching criterion	61
Annex	63

Summary of the assessment team's findings

Underpinning DAPs criteria	
Criterion A: Academic governance	Met
Criterion B1: Regulatory frameworks	Met
Criterion B2: Academic standards	Met
Criterion B3: Quality of the academic experience	Met
Criterion C: Scholarship and the pedagogical effectiveness of staff	Met
Criterion D: Environment for supporting students	Met
Criterion E: Evaluation of performance	Met
Overarching criterion	
The provider is a self-critical, cohesive academic community with a proven commitment to the assurance of standards supported by effective quality systems	Met

About this report

This is a report of an assessment of The London Institute of Banking & Finance conducted by QAA in May 2021 in accordance with the process outlined in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment for Variation and Revocation of Degree Awarding Powers, December 2019*.

Assessment for the variation and revocation of degree awarding powers (DAPs) is the process QAA uses to provide advice to the Office for Students (OfS) about the quality of, and the standards applied to, higher education delivered by a provider in England that has an existing DAPs authorisation and where variation or revocation is to be considered.

The assessment was conducted in order to inform advice to the OfS on whether the provider's existing renewable powers be granted on an indefinite basis.

Provider information

Legal name	The London Institute of Banking & Finance
Trading name	The London Institute of Banking & Finance
UKPRN	10008289
Type of institution	Higher Education Institution
Date founded	1879
Date of first HE provision	1995
Application route	Assessment for the variation of powers from time-limited to indefinite powers

Level of powers applied for	Taught Degree Awarding Powers (Up to and including Level 7)
Location(s) of teaching/delivery	London Online
Subject(s) applied for	All subjects
Current powers held	Taught Degree Awarding Powers
Date current powers granted (if applicable)	2010
Number of current programmes as at January 2021, Provider Information Form	2 x master's 2 x postgraduate certificates 3 x bachelor's 5 professional courses (2 at Level 7, 2 at Level 6 and 1 at Level 5)
Number of students as at January 2021, Provider Information Form	Full-time = 207 Part-time = 81
Number of staff as at June 2021, Provider Information	Total staff supporting higher education provision = 79 Management = 8 Administration = 21 Academic = 22 Visiting lecturers = 28
Current awarding body arrangements (if applicable)	N/A

About The London Institute of Banking & Finance

The London Institute of Banking and Finance (LIBF) is an independent higher education provider operating in London and delivering on-site and online provision. LIBF has been delivering higher education provision since 1995 when it was known as ifs School of Finance and was delivering an honours degree on behalf of the University of Manchester. In January 2010, the Privy Council awarded LIBF (which was then known as ifs University College) taught degree-awarding powers (TDAP) for a period of six years. This was extended by the Privy Council for a further six years from January 2016.

LIBF offers a range of higher education provision at Levels 5, 6 and 7 in the areas of banking and finance. As well as master's and bachelor's programmes, LIBF also offers higher apprenticeships and professional courses. The programmes are: MSc Banking Practice & Management, MSc Banking & Finance, Executive Certificate in Sustainable Finance, Executive Certificate in FinTech, BSc (Hons) Banking Practice & Management (Apprenticeship), BSc (Hons) Banking Practice & Management (Apprenticeship), BSc (Hons) Banking Practice & Management, BSc (Hons) in Finance Investment and Risk, Professional Diploma in Banking Practice and Management, BSc (Hons) Banking & Finance, BSc (Hons) Finance, Investment & Risk, Chartered Associate Programme (Financial Services Management) and Chartered Associate Programme (Finance & Investment).

LIBF's governance structure includes a Board of Governors which has ultimate responsibility for academic governance but delegates those responsibilities to Academic Board. The Board of Governors also has three other committees reporting to it: the Remuneration and Nominations Committee, the Audit Committee and the Senior Executive Team. Academic Board has overall monitoring and approval responsibility of the higher education provision but operationally the Learning and Teaching Committee, which reports to Academic Board,

has responsibility of the quality of programme content, delivery and ongoing enhancement involving monitoring and reviewing of the provision. From September 2020 the Student Experience Committee assumed responsibility for the student experience. The Academic Standards and Quality Committee is another committee reporting to Academic Board and has responsibility for securing standards by managing LIBF's regulations and LIBF's Code of Practice (CoP) for Quality Assurance which is the framework for managing continuing assurance and enhancement of the academic quality of its higher education provision.

Since achieving TDAP, LIBF has implemented the following major changes:

Following retirement in 2015 of the previous incumbent, LIBF appointed a new Chief Executive Officer, and a strategic review followed where a new mission and a change of name to its current iteration emerged. In response to the growth of its student numbers, LIBF implemented a new staffing model, moving away from a reliance on associate lecturers and extending the number of permanent staff. In 2016-17, LIBF changed its marking practice, which was more aligned to professional body practice where assessments were independently managed, and moved to practice more aligned to the higher education sector where LIBF's staff became responsible for setting and marking LIBF's assessments. In February 2019, LIBF was registered as an approved (fee cap) provider by OfS.

How the assessment was conducted

The QAA assessment team completed an assessment of the provider according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment by QAA* (October 2019)

The QAA assessment team completed an assessment of the provider according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment for Variation and Revocation of Degree Awarding Powers, December 2019*.

The team appointed to conduct the assessment was as follows:

Name: Mark Cooper
Institution: University of Portsmouth
Role in assessment team: Institutional assessor

Name: Liz Crolley
Institution: University of Liverpool
Role in assessment team: Institutional assessor and subject assessor (Business and Management)

Name: Christina Cunliffe
Institution: McTimoney College of Chiropractic and College of Health
Role in assessment team: Institutional assessor

The QAA Officer for the assessment was Siobhain O'Mahony.

The size and composition of this 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 subject expertise. 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 assessment to identify and resolve any possible conflicts of interest.

The assessment team conducted the assessment by reference to a range of evidence gathered according to the process described in the Guidance for Providers. The criteria used in relation to this assessment are those that apply in England as set out paragraphs 215-216 and in Annex C in the OfS's regulatory framework. To support the clarity of communication between providers and QAA, the DAPs criteria and evidence requirements from the OfS's regulatory framework have been given unique identifiers and are reproduced in Annex 4 of *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment by QAA*.

In the course of the assessment, the team read 648 documents in support of the application, which included a provider submission document and a student submission. An initial 484 documents were provided as supporting evidence with LIBF's submission document. Following a desk-based assessment of this initial evidence, against the DAPs criteria, a request for additional evidence was made. This request covered areas from five DAPs criteria which had been identified as requiring further evidence and clarification. An additional 162 documents were provided in response. The assessment had been referred by OfS as a desk-based assessment only and after the receipt of the additional evidence the team agreed that it had sufficient evidence to reach judgements about LIBF's provision and a visit was not warranted.

As LIBF initially provided a significant number of evidence documents, the team found that there was no need to request samples of further evidence and instead requested specific examples of evidence following lines of enquiry across five areas of the DAPs criteria.

Details of the evidence assessment team considered are provided in the 'Explanation of findings' below.

Explanation of findings

Criterion A: Academic governance

Criterion A1 - Academic governance

- 1 This criterion states that:
- A1.1 *An organisation granted degree awarding powers has effective academic governance, with clear and appropriate lines of accountability for its academic responsibilities.*
- A1.2 *Academic governance, including all aspects of the control and oversight of its higher education provision, is conducted in partnership with its students.*
- A1.3 *Where an organisation granted degree awarding powers works with other organisations to deliver learning opportunities, it ensures that its governance and management of such opportunities is robust and effective and that decisions to work with other organisations are the result of a strategic approach rather than opportunism.*

2 The QAA assessment team conducted an assessment of this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment for Variation and Revocation of Degree Awarding Powers (December 2019)*.

The evidence considered, and why and how the team considered this evidence

3 The QAA assessment team assessed this criterion by reference to a range of evidence gathered according to the process described in the Guidance for Providers, in particular the suggested evidence outlined in Annex 5 and the provider's submission.

Specifically, the review team considered or assessed:

- a To determine that LIBF's mission, strategy and associated policies are clear coherent, published, understood and applied consistently and that its academic policies supports its higher education mission, aims and objectives, the team evaluated and considered the Higher Education Strategic Statement [037] and the institution's website, which details the associated component parts of its strategy [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/academic-quality/strategies> accessed 19/04/2021]. The team also examined the process for the review and development of the strategy by scrutinising relevant documentation detailing the processes for stakeholder engagement and the formal review of the strategy by the Board of Governors [Statement to response to evidence request #1 485; CC report ifs 010615 486; Board of Governors (BoG) Minutes extract 230915 Strategy approval 487; BoG Mins extract 25112015 Strategy presentation 488; Evidence ifs member alumni questions 489; ifs student questions 490]. The team also reviewed the accompanying strategy documents: Learning Teaching and Assessment Strategy [038], Quality Assurance [491], HE Enhancement [043], Thought Leadership [492], Careers and Employability [040], The Collaborative Provision [039], Mental Health [041] and Digital Transformation [042].
- b To ascertain whether LIBF's policies support its mission and strategy and to determine if these policies are coherent and consistently applied as well as being communicated to stakeholders, the team reviewed the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy, [038] the Student Charter [031], the Equality and Diversity

Policy [197] and the Code of Practice for Quality Assurance [Chapters 1-15 015-029], the LIBF website [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/policies-regulations-and-code-of-practice> accessed 19/04/2021], MSc Course Welcome and Induction Activities [371], the student submission [SS], the Document Control Spreadsheet 2020 [181]; Assessment Feedback Policy [182], HE Module Review Policy [183], Teaching Observation Policy [184], Recruitment to Faculty Policy [185], HE Special Consideration Policy [186], HE Reasonable Adjustments Policy [187], Safeguarding Policy [188], Prevent Duty Guidelines [189], Health and Safety Policy [195], IT Acceptable Use Policy [196], Equality and Diversity Policy [197], Values and Competency framework [198], and the Quality, Policy and Regulation Structure Chart [012] to understand how they support and underpin the realisation of the LIBF strategy. To assess if policies are consistently applied, the team looked at the Teaching and Learning Committee minutes [104, 105], ASQC minutes [minutes 096] Code of Practice Chapter 8 External Examining [022] and Code of Practice Chapter 13 Programme Development Approval Monitoring and Review [027].

- c To gauge the extent, clarity and differentiation of function and responsibility at all levels in the organisation in relation to its academic governance structures and arrangements for managing its higher education provision, the review team looked at the Academic Governance Structure [007] By Laws [004], HE Governance 2020 [140] the entire set of Committee and Group Terms of Reference documents [045 ToR Academic Board, 046 ToR Senior Executive Team (SET), 047 ToR Audit Committee AC, 048 ToR Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC), 049 ToR Learning Teaching Committee (LTC), 050 ToR Student Experience Committee (SEC), 051 ToR HE Assessment Boards, 052 ToR Data Returns Group (DRG), 053 ToR OfS Compliance Working Group (OCWG), 054 ToR Complaints and Appeals Review Group (CARG), 055 ToR Malpractice Committee (MALC), 056 ToR HE Concessionary Board (ConBoard), 057 ToR Staff Student Liaison Committee (SSLC), 058 ToR Academic Partnerships Risk Advisory Group (APRAG), 059 ToR Scholarships Bursaries Grants Committee (SBG), 060 ToR Module Review Group (MRG), 061 ToR Research Ethics Group REG, 062 ToR CPL Working Group (CPL), 063 ToR External Examiners appointment group] and associated schedule of work [064].
- d To understand the arrangements for the management and formal review of governance and committee structures, the team reviewed the Academic Governance Chart [007] Executive Team and Senior Leadership structure [009; 010] and the Board of Governors ToR [008], the Higher Education and Quality Policy and Regulation Structure Chart [011; 012]. In addition, the team examined, in more detail, LIBF's claim that the Board of Governors consists of members who have strong academic leadership credentials by scrutinising the associated board composition [494] and members' skills matrix [495].
- e To understand and determine that the function and responsibility of the senior academic authority is clearly articulated and consistently applied and that there is appropriate depth and strength of academic leadership, the team considered the Executive Team structure chart [010], Senior Executive ToR [046], Executive Team on the website [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/governance/executive-team> accessed 19/04/2021], Academic community on the website [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/academic-community>: 19.04.2021], job descriptions [585-588] and CVs [581-583] and Values and Competency Framework [198]. To understand how the Executive Team is supported, the team viewed the Higher Education Structure Chart [011] and the Quality Policy and Regulation structure [012].

- f To assess the effectiveness of LIBF's governance and deliberative committee structure, the team scrutinised minutes from the Board of Governors [070; 071; 072; 073; 074; 075; 076; 077] and those of the Academic Board, [083; 084; 085; 086; 087; 088; 089; 090] and the entire set of Committee and Group Terms of Reference documents [045 ToR Academic Board AB, 046 ToR Senior Executive Team SET, 047 ToR Audit Committee AC, 048 ToR Academic Standards and Quality Committee ASQC, 049 ToR Learning Teaching Committee LTC, 050 ToR Student Experience Committee SEC, 051 ToR HE Assessment Boards, 052 ToR Data Returns Group DRG, 053 ToR OfS Compliance Working Group OCWG, 054 ToR Complaints and Appeals Review Group CARG, 055 ToR Malpractice Committee MALC, 056 ToR HE Concessionary Board, 057 ToR Staff Student Liaison Committee SSLC, 058 ToR Academic Partnerships Risk Advisory Group APRAG, 059 ToR Scholarships Bursaries Grants Committee SBG, 060 ToR Module Review Group MRG, 061 ToR Research Ethics Group REG, 062 ToR CPL Working Group CPL, 063 ToR External Examiners appointment group] and their schedule of work [064], the Academic Governance chart [007] and the Executive Team structure chart [010].
- g To test how LIBF develops, implements and communicates its policies and procedures in collaboration with its staff and students and external stakeholders, the team considered minutes of key committees, including the Board of Governors [070; 071; 072; 073; 074; 075; 076; 077], Academic Board [083; 084; 085; 086; 087; 088; 089; 090], ASCQ [096; 097; 098], LTC [104; 105; 106; 107], and SSLC minutes [113; 112; 113; 114; 115; 116; 117; 118; 119], Student Representative Role description [351], Student Representative Handbook [352] and Student Representative training materials [353].
- h To determine how LIBF will continue to manage successfully the responsibilities vested in it, were it to be granted indefinite degree awarding powers, the team considered the existing track record of LIBF by minutes of meetings, LTC [Minutes 105], Academic Board [Minutes 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90], Board of Governors [minutes 070, 073], the Statement of Primary Responsibilities of the Board of Governors of The London Institute of Banking & Finance [005] and by reviewing the outcomes of its External Review of HE [139] and published QAA review reports [<https://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviewing-higher-education/quality-assurance-reports/The-London-Institute-of-Banking-Finance>] to confirm its external assurance track record.
- i To assure the team of students' individual and collective engagement in the governance and management of their higher education provision, the team considered the mechanisms for student engagement and reviewed the Student Representative Role description [351], Student Representative Handbook [352] and Student Representative training materials [353]. Minutes from the Board of Governors [070-077], Academic Board [083-090], ASCQ [096-098], LTC [104-107], and the SSLC [113-119] were scrutinised by the team to confirm the mechanisms in place for students to collectively engage and have opportunities for them to engage in practice.
- j To test how the organisation works with other organisations in delivering learning opportunities and that the arrangements are based on a strategic approach, supported by defined written legal agreements subject to the same robust oversight and governance as the rest of the organisation's provision, the team reviewed the LIBF's strategic objectives [037], Code of Practice Chapter 14 [028], the Collaborative Provision Strategy [039], Board of Governor meeting minutes [073], Academic Board [ToR 045] and minutes [083], Academic Partnerships Risk Advisory Group terms of reference [058], Collaborative Provision Annual Report

[154], Extracts from Minutes of Client Programme Planning Meeting [381] and Client Programme Day Presentation [398]. The team considered the only partnership arrangements by reviewing a statement in response to evidence request 22 [579], the General Academic Regulations [030] and the Codes of Practice [015-029] and a collaborative contract relating to apprenticeships [497].

How any samples of evidence were constructed

4 The team considered all evidence submitted by LIBF relating to this criterion. This evidence was sufficient to meet the purpose of the assessment and no further sampling was requested.

What the evidence shows

5 The assessment team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

6 In 2015, LIBF developed a new vision and strategy [the Higher Education Strategic Statement 037; <https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/academic-quality/strategies> accessed 19/04/2021] which was formally reviewed by the Board of Governors with external stakeholder involvement [Statement to response to evidence request #1 485; CC report ifs010615 486; Board of Governors (BoG) Minutes extract 230915 Strategy approval 487; BoG Mins extract 25112015 Strategy presentation 488; Evidence ifs member alumni questions 489; Evidence ifs student questions 490]. As part of this new vision, LIBF launched a new identity and brand and became The London Institute of Banking & Finance in September 2016.

7 LIBF's mission is 'to be an internationally recognised organisation delivering outstanding financial education' [SAR]. Underpinning the mission is the Higher Education Strategic Statement [037], which sets out five key strategic objectives. The critical supporting strategies focus on meeting the five key strategic objectives in the areas of Learning Teaching and Assessment [038], Quality Assurance [491], HE Enhancement [043], Thought Leadership [492] and Careers and Employability [040]. In addition, the Collaborative Provision [039]; Mental Health [041], Digital Transformation [042] strategies also underpin LIBF's strategic intent.

8 The team was clear that the LIBF academic policies are supportive of LIBF's mission, aims and objectives because there are direct links between the documents seen, the five strategic objectives and the policies and Code of Practice chapters. For example, The Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy [038] references and links to the Student Charter [031], the Equality and Diversity Policy [197] and the Code of Practice for Quality Assurance [Chapters 1-15, 015-029]. The team considered the policies which underpin the strategic objectives to be comprehensive, clear and coherent in how LIBF wants to deliver its higher education provision. There are various mechanisms for policies to be communicated to staff and students. Staff and student representatives are members of both Board of Governors and Academic Board where policies are developed, reviewed and approved. Regulations and policies and minutes confirming changes can all be found on LIBF's website [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/policies-regulations-and-code-of-practice>]. Students are made aware of the regulations and LIBF policies at induction [MSc Course Welcome and Induction Activities 371] and students confirmed that they can find information and policies on the website [SS].

9 Key strategic documents, including the Learning Teaching and Assessment Strategy [038], Quality Assurance Strategy [491], HE Enhancement Strategy [043], Thought Leadership Strategy [492], Careers and Employability Strategy [040], the Collaborative Provision Strategy [039], Mental Health Strategy [041], Digital Transformation Strategy [042], the Code of Practice [015-029], and other policies: Document Control Spreadsheet 2020

[181]; Assessment Feedback Policy [182]; HE Module Review Policy [183]; Teaching Observation Policy [184]; Recruitment to Faculty Policy [185]; HE Special Consideration Policy [186]; HE Reasonable Adjustments Policy [187]; Safeguarding Policy [188]; Prevent Duty Guidelines [189]; Health and Safety Policy [195]; IT Acceptable Use Policy [196]; Equality and Diversity Policy [197]; and Values and Competency framework [198] are accessible to all stakeholders on the institutions website [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/policies-regulations-and-code-of-practice> accessed 19/04/2021]. Each policy is included in LIBF's aligned Codes of Practice (CoP) documents [015-029] which sets the framework for quality assurance and enhancement and also references the UK Quality Code. For instance, the Teaching Observation Policy [184] can be found in CoP Chapter 12 Staff Development [026].

10 Minutes from committees demonstrate that LIBF's policies are consistently applied in line with the intent of the policies. An example of this is the minutes from the Teaching and Learning Committee, where changes to the curriculum through programme and module specifications are discussed and agreed [104, 105], which clearly show that the Code of Practice (Chapter 13 Programme Development Approval Monitoring and Review) [027] is being followed. Another example is the ASQC minutes [minutes 096], where the committee approved the appointment of external examiners, which show that the Code of Practice Chapter 8 External Examining [022] is being adhered to.

11 It is clear from the Academic Governance Structure and By Laws [007; SAR; 004] that the Board of Governors has ultimate responsibility for academic governance, but that the Academic Board, which reports into the Board of Governors, has delegated responsibility to act as the guardian of the academic standards adhered to and the quality of LIBF's higher education awards [Academic Board Terms of Reference (ToR) 045].

12 The Academic Governance Structure [007] outlines LIBF's committee arrangements, [HE Governance 2020 140] including relevant subcommittees with clear delineated reporting lines identified [045- 063 ToRs; 064 schedule of work]. The Academic Board, the Remuneration and Nominations Committee, and the Audit Committee and Executive team report to the Board of Governors. The Academic Governance Structure [007] highlights the responsibilities of each committee with further details in the committees' terms of references (ToRs) [045- 063 ToRs]. The team also noted how LIBF's By Laws [004] effectively inform the terms of reference for the Board of Governors by including the powers and duty of the Board.

13 The Academic Governance Chart [007] also outlines governance oversight for LIBF. Operationally, the Executive [LIBF Executive Team 009, LIBF Senior Team Structure Chart 010] is responsible for implementing the strategy, which is approved and monitored by the Board of Governors [008]. The structure charts for the Executive Team [009, 010], along with the Higher Education Structure Chart [011] and Quality Policy and Regulation Structure Chart [012] demonstrate that LIBF has appropriate governance structures in place with clear responsibilities defined in the ToRs. An associated board composition [495] and skills matrix [494] detailing individual members of the Board's skills in areas such as strategic leadership, finance, legal and education, confirms that members have rigorously mapped individual skills and abilities to the LIBF's needs (including industry experience), which in turn confirms strong academic leadership at Board level.

14 The Executive Team structure chart [010], and ToRs [046] and information about the responsibilities of the Executive Team are on the LIBF website. [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/governance/executive-team> accessed 19/04/2021] The assessment team felt that this further confirmed that the Executive Team has the requisite skills to carry out its role, has strength and depth in academic leadership and can support LIBF's mission. This is because the team noted that roles for members of the executive team

are clearly defined (for example, in the areas of quality assurance or strategy) and the relevant experience the members of the Executive Team has, relevant to their role, is clearly detailed. The ToRs [046] clearly set out the collective responsibility of the Executive Team such as 'Develop the Institute's strategy for approval by the Board and ensure delivery of key objectives in the strategic plan'. Further, the academic community [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/academic-community>: 19.04.2021] listing the current senior lecturers and the team's scrutiny of examples of job descriptions [585-588] and CVs [581-583] led the assessment team to be content that there is appropriate depth and strength of academic leadership at LIBF. For example, the job description for the Dean confirms that part of the role is responsibility for academic strategic direction and requires a doctoral qualification in finance or finance services as well as a track record of course development and staff management. The Director of Studies who is responsible for the highest level of teaching and learning, requires a minimum postgraduate qualification in an area related to finance or the financial services, and a relevant higher education teaching qualification. A Senior Lecturer CV reflected the requirements of the role of postgraduate degree track record of course development and relevant higher education qualification. Information publicly available on LIBF's website show that members of staff with roles in education leadership are appropriately qualified and experienced, including many who also have teaching qualifications such as PG Certificates in Higher Education or HEA (Advance HE) Fellowship. Among the academic community are staff with an extensive range of professional qualifications and membership of professional bodies, in the UK and internationally, appropriate to programmes delivered. Examples include Certified International Trade Adviser, Institute of Export and International Trade, Associate of Chartered Institute of Bankers, and Fellowship of the Chartered Institute of Personnel Development, as well as experience as consultants and members of advisory boards. LIBF has a well-integrated Values and Competency Framework [198] which is consistently incorporated into all its role descriptions [job descriptions 585-587] and testifies to the increasing levels of responsibility that accompanies staff working at higher levels.

15 The Executive Team is supported by managers identified in the Higher Education Structure chart, [011] such as the Head of Programmes and the Head of Apprenticeships. The Quality Policy and Regulation structure [011; 012] illustrates the operational responsibility of post holders in the support and management of underpinning quality assurance and governance. Here, three managerial roles define areas of quality assurance and regulation: Head of Quality, External Regulatory Compliance; Head of Higher Education Data Quality; and Head of Quality, Internal Assurance who all report to the Registrar, Quality, Policy and Regulation.

16 As part of this assessment, the team looked to determine the effectiveness of LIBF's governance and deliberative committee structure through scrutiny of the Board of Governors minutes [070; 071; 072; 073; 074; 075; 076; 077] and those of the Academic Board [083; 084; 085; 086; 087; 088; 089; 090], which shows receipt of subcommittee minutes. The team also looked to cross-reference how areas of consideration, such as learning and teaching or LIBF's Code of Practice, align with LIBF's ToRs [045; 046; 047; 048; 049; 050; 051; 052; 053; 054; 055; 056; 057; 058; 059; 059; 060; 061; 062; 063] and the associated schedule of work [064]. The team noted that LIBF's schedule of work outlines which areas are to be considered at which committee throughout the year. For example, the Teaching and Learning Strategy is considered in the first quarter of the year at the Learning and Teaching Committee and then considered at the second quarter at Academic Board. This responsibility is also evidence in the committees' terms of reference and confirmed by minutes [ToRs 045, 049, Minutes 107, 087] which demonstrate that the schedule happens in practice. The Academic Governance chart [007], the Executive Team structure chart [010] along with the committees' ToRs and minutes of meetings seen by the team demonstrate that there is clarity and differentiation of function and responsibility at all levels of the organisation because the ToRs clearly detail the responsibilities of each

committee and reflect the structure charts. The minutes of the meetings reflect the areas of responsibility aligned to the ToRs and the arrangements for managing LIBF's higher education provision.

17 The team found the evidence provided to clearly indicate that LIBF develops, implements and effectively communicates its policies and procedures to (and in collaboration with) its staff, students and external stakeholders through various means. This communication also includes the formal committee structure where representatives from each of these groups are present [Board of Governors 070-077; Academic Board 083-090; ASQC 096-098; SSLC 113-119]. The team also noted that this formal communication is complemented by a set of wide-ranging student engagement initiatives noted through evaluation of Student Representative Role description [351], Student Representative Handbook [352] and Student Representative training materials [Student Representative Training 353]. As such, the team considered LIBF to have a comprehensive collaborative platform for engaging students as partners in policy and procedure creation, implementation and review.

18 The team found that, through its governance structures, LIBF has a strong and robust approach to ongoing quality assurance and quality enhancement review. Programme monitoring is discussed at Learning Teaching Committee (LTC) [Minutes 105] and at Academic Board [Minutes 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90] as well as programme review [Minutes 84, 86, 89]. The Board of Governors receive the minutes of Academic Board [Minutes 070, 073]. Further, to support the intent in LIBF's Statement of Primary Responsibilities of the Board of Governors [005] 'To have oversight of and agree the educational and other strategies of The London Institute of Banking & Finance' LIBF carries out external review activity and considers outcomes such as the 18 recommendations presented in its Review of HE Operations 2019. This included suggestions to 'Continue the emphasis on growing the teaching capabilities of LIBF faculty' and 'Introduce a consistent approach to business planning for new programmes' [139; <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviewing-higher-education/quality-assurance-reports/The-London-Institute-of-Banking-Finance>] which was considered at the Board of Governors [Minutes 073]. Because its governance structures and reporting lines demonstrate the ability to monitor its provision, the team was assured that LIBF will continue to manage successfully the responsibilities vested in it.

19 The assessment team found LIBF students, both individually and collectively, to be effectively engaged in the governance and management of the organisation and appropriately supported in undertaking this role. Students are represented on all major committees, such as the Board of Governors, Academic Board, Academic Standards, Quality Learning and Teaching Committee [070-077; 083-090; 096-098; 104-107] and in the Student Staff Liaison Committee [113-119]. The assessment team noted, in the minutes submitted, that students provided insight and appropriate challenge to LIBF's leaders [BoG Minutes 070-077; Academic Board Minutes 083-090; ASQC Minutes 096-098; LTC minutes 04-107; SSLC Minutes 113-119]. In addition, the student representative system is supported with a clear Student Representative Role description [351], Student Representative Handbook [352] and Student Representative training materials [353] which outline the responsibilities and the skills required for the role, to further support productive and focused engagement.

20 LIBF has a clear and robust approach for working with others. One of LIBF's key strategic objectives is to 'build a network of international collaborations and partnerships that will enable our brand to be globally recognised and to place an international dimension at the heart of our staff and student community [Higher Education Strategic Statement 037].' The Code of Practice for Collaborative Provision [028] and Collaborative Provision Strategy [039] lays out the aims of LIBF's collaborations. For example, one of the aims of collaboration in the strategy is to 'Provide internationally recognised financial qualifications of

a high standard within a sound framework of quality assurance and best practice' [039]. It therefore follows that LIBF's strategic objectives [Higher Education Strategic Statement 037] include developing partnerships with external organisations. The Board of Governors has oversight of the strategy in this respect [Collaborative Provision Strategy 039; BoG minutes HE 050320 073] but all partnerships are formally approved, monitored and reviewed by Academic Board [ToR 045, minutes 083], particularly, but not exclusively, regarding partnerships that include franchise or subcontractual arrangements. For example, a partnership in Abu Dhabi was developed in 2018 to deliver professional and financial education which will lead to delivery of higher education qualifications in the future [Academic Board minutes 083]. In addition, smaller partnership accreditation arrangements are considered by the Academic Partnerships Risk Advisory Group [SAR 2.27; 058]. This group, which reports to the Academic Board, provides guidance and support to colleagues and the Executive Team in developing opportunities and maintaining a register of all arrangements. A Collaborative Provision Annual Report [154] is prepared, which identifies partners and reflects on arrangements contributing to higher education awards. The monitoring of these partnership programmes is overseen through the normal academic structures, but with the addition of engagement with clients [Collaborative Provision Annual Report 154, Extracts from Minutes of Client Programme Planning Meeting 381, Client Programme Day Presentation 398]. LIBF has one current partnership arrangement relating to awarding higher education qualifications or credit. This relates to apprentices whose employer has subcontracted LIBF to deliver the higher education element of the apprentices higher education programme [SAR; Statement in response to evidence request 22 579]. The team scrutinised the collaborative contract relating to apprenticeships [497] and found that it had the sufficient detail on responsibilities and quality assurance for the team to be able to confirm that the appropriate agreements are in place for collaborative provision.

Conclusions

21 The assessment team formulated its judgement against this criterion according to the process set out in the Guidance for Providers, in particular Annex 4.

22 LIBF has a comprehensive and effective governance and management structure wherein there are clear lines of responsibility. LIBF has a broad vision and strategy, with a range of supporting substrategies, which the team considers to be coherent, that underpin the strategic intent. These strategies form the basis for the development and implementation of policies, procedures, and associated practice, which the team found to be shared, communicated, and consistently applied. The Board of Governors has ultimate responsibility for academic governance but has delegated responsibility to the Academic Board, which reports into the Board of Governors as the guardian of academic standards and quality for higher education awards. LIBF's structure charts and ToRs demonstrate that there is clarity and differentiation of function and responsibility at all levels in the organisation in relation to its academic governance structures and arrangements for managing its higher education provision. LIBF develops, embeds and communicates its policies and procedures to staff, students and external stakeholders through various means and mechanistically in the formal committee structure where representatives from each of these groups are present. The team considered there to be appropriate depth and strength in academic leadership, in that senior staff with responsibility for governance and regulatory frameworks have relevant academic and industry experience.

23 Student engagement in the governance and management of the higher education provision is strong and well articulated by LIBF. Students are represented in formal committees and provide insight for the institution and managers on the experience of students. Students are supported effectively through training and support materials to enable them to be effective ambassadors for the student body.

24 LIBF's strategic objectives include developing partnerships with external organisations. There is a clear and robust approach for working with others. The relevant Code of Practice clearly defines the types of collaborative partner as a provider or other body or individual with which LIBF enters into an agreement to collaborate. The Board of Governors has oversight of the strategy in this respect with details and implications shared with relevant committees. The Academic Partnerships Risk Advisory Group provides effective guidance and support to colleagues and the Senior Executive Team in developing collaborative opportunities. The Collaborative Provision Annual Report ably identifies partners and reflects on how partnership arrangements contribute to overall outcomes of the institution and the current sole partnership is managed in the same way as LIBF's other higher education provision. The review team concludes, therefore, that the criterion is met.

Criterion B: Academic standards and quality assurance

Criterion B1 - Regulatory frameworks

25 This criterion states that:

B1.1: An organisation granted degree awarding powers has in place transparent and comprehensive academic frameworks and regulations to govern how it awards academic credit and qualifications.

B1.2: A degree awarding organisation maintains a definitive record of each programme and qualification that it approves (and of subsequent changes to it) which constitutes the reference point for delivery and assessment of the programme, its monitoring and review, and for the provision of records of study to students and alumni.

26 The QAA assessment team conducted an assessment of this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment for Variation and Revocation of Degree Awarding Powers (December 2019)*.

The evidence considered, and why and how the team considered this evidence

27 The QAA assessment team assessed this criterion by reference to a range of evidence gathered according to the process described in the Guidance for Providers, in particular the suggested evidence outlined in Annex 5 and the provider's submission.

Specifically, the review team considered or assessed:

- a To verify that LIBF has in place transparent and comprehensive academic frameworks and regulations to govern how it awards academic credit and qualifications, the team reviewed all the evidence submitted relating to its academic frameworks and regulations, including LIBF's regulations General and Academic Regulations [030] and Code of Practice Chapters 1-15 [012-029]. The team also reviewed how the regulations are made available by looking at the LIBF website [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/policies-regulations-and-code-of-practice>] and a student handbook [Full-time undergraduate 404]. The team viewed examples of course documentation, including programme and module specifications and grade classification descriptors to verify how the policies and regulations are operationalised, Undergraduate programmes specifications for BSc Banking and Finance [204] BSc Finance Investment and Risk [205] and a module specification [206].
- b To identify how LIBF seeks to ensure that its academic frameworks and regulations governing its higher education provision are effective and implemented fully and consistently, the team reviewed a range of evidence. This included minutes from the academic committees to assess whether the regulations are implemented consistently and in accordance with LIBF's own framework: Academic Board Minutes [083-090], Minutes of ASQC [096-098], Minutes of LTC [104-107] as well as the General and Academic Regulations [030] and Code of Practice, Chapters 1-15 [012-029]. The team also reviewed the terms of reference for some of its key deliberative committees: ToR Academic Board [045], ToR Academic Standards and Quality Committee [048], ToR Learning and Teaching Committee [049], ToR Student Experience Committee [050], ToR Assessment Boards [051], ToR OfS Compliance Working Group [053], ToR Complaints and Appeals Review Group [054], ToR Academic Partnership Risk Advisory Group [058], ToR Module Review

Group [060] and ToR External Examiner Appointment Group [063] as well as the LIBF Board of Governors [008] and its Governance Structure Chart [007].

- c To evaluate the implementation of policies relating to admissions, the team considered LIBF's Code of Practice Chapter 2 Admissions and Recruitment to HE [016], and Terms and Conditions of Offer [036], access to LIBF's website [[https://www.libf.ac.uk/study/undergraduate/bsc-\(hons\)-in-banking-and-finance](https://www.libf.ac.uk/study/undergraduate/bsc-(hons)-in-banking-and-finance): accessed, 02.05.2021, <https://digital.ucas.com/coursedisplay/courses/0f0c7bba-d445-4ea9-94bd-1e81650f6233?academicYearId=2021#entry-requirements>, accessed 02.05.2021]. To assess how LIBF processes non-traditional applicants from non-traditional backgrounds, the team reviewed its Code of Practice Chapter 3: Accreditation of Prior Learning [017] and the Report on Accreditation of Prior Learning [174].
- d To evaluate the consistency of implementation of policies relating to assessment and progression, the team considered the Code of Practice Chapter 7 Assessment [021], LIBF's Assessment Board Principles and Procedures [051], Module Assessment Board Minutes [499-506], Programme specification BSc Banking and Finance [204], BSc Finance Investment and Risk [205], Statement in response to evidence request 15 [547], Assessment Mapping Documents [536-546] and General and Academic Regulations [030]
- e The team assessed the approach to external examining by reviewing Code of Practice Chapter 8 External Examining [022], External Examiner Annual Report [281] and the External Examiner Nomination Form [283].
- f In order to verify that the information on assessment provided to students was accurate and consistent with LIBF policies and in accordance with the Code of Practice Chapter 7 Assessment, [021] the team reviewed the aspects of programme and module specifications that relate to assessment, notably Programme Specifications [204; 205], and FT UG Student Handbook [404], and marking criteria for assessment at all levels [536-546]. In order to evaluate the consistency, transparency and implementation of policies relating to appeals and complaints, the team considered the Code of Practice Chapter 10 Complaints and Appeals [024], ToR Complaints and Appeals Review Group [054], Complaints and Appeals Review Group Quarterly Report [175], student handbooks [FT UG Student Handbook 404, Higher Apprenticeship Programme Handbook 406, MSc BF Programme Handbook], the LIBF website [https://www.libf.ac.uk/docs/default-source/cpq/cpq-policies/cpq-complaints-policy.pdf?sfvrsn=84c9408d_20 , accessed: 01.05.2021] and the terms and conditions of offers [CoP Chapter 10 Complaints and Appeals 024, terms and conditions of offers 036].
- g To test the consistency of the approach described to maintaining definitive and up-to-date records of each qualification to be awarded and each programme offered, the team reviewed Programme specifications [204, 205], Academic Board minutes [083], Code of Practice Chapter 13 Programme Development, Approval, Monitoring and Review [027], Module specification [206], ToR Data Returns Group [052], Degree Outcomes Statement [032], Annual Monitoring Report [176], UG Student Handbook and student transcripts [513-526].

How any samples of evidence were constructed

28 The team considered all evidence submitted by LIBF relating to this criterion. This evidence was sufficient to meet the purpose of the assessment and no further sampling was requested.

What the evidence shows

29 The assessment team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

30 LIBF has an academic and regulatory framework [030] that the assessment team felt was appropriate to govern how it awards academic credit and qualifications, as detailed in its Code of Practice [012-029]. This is because the regulations set out the principle that higher education qualifications will be awarded according to the appropriate FHEQ level and meet the expectation of the UK Quality Code, taking into account external reference points such as Subject Benchmark Statements. The regulations are transparent because they can be found on the LIBF website [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/policies-regulations-and-code-of-practice>] and are signposted to students. As an example, student handbooks are available on the intranet and specify which set of regulations relate to which intake or cohort of student [FT UG Student Handbook 404]. The regulations are comprehensive because the Code of Practice includes, for example, chapters on admissions, learning and teaching, accreditation of prior learning, assessment, external examining, malpractice, complaints and appeals, and programme approval, monitoring and review [Code of Practice Chapters 1-15 012-029].

31 This Code of Practice is also supported with further guidance. LIBF's General and Academic Regulations [030] provide a framework for all its programmes of study. The credit framework outlined [030: 9-10] is consistent with FHEQ guidance for Levels 4, 5, 6 and 7, for awards of each undergraduate and postgraduate qualification; namely, the master's degree, postgraduate diploma, postgraduate certificate, bachelor's with honours, bachelor's, graduate diploma, graduate certificate, foundation degree, Diploma of Higher Education, Certificate of Higher Education. Its framework in terms of number of credits, credit values at each FHEQ level and notional hours for learning are consistent with the *Higher Education Credit Framework for England*. The notional hours of student learning and credit value for each award (and module) are transparent because they are included in programme specifications [204-205] and on module specifications [206]. The team found that this demonstrates consistency with stated policy. Course documentation demonstrates that programmes and modules are consistent with the credit framework and FHEQ levels [module and programme specifications 204; 205; 206]. Credit weightings are clear and transparent in programme specifications [204; 205] and in the module specification [206].

32 In order to identify how LIBF seeks to ensure that its academic frameworks and regulations governing its higher education provision are effective and implemented fully and consistently, the team reviewed minutes and terms of reference of its key academic and deliberative committees. Terms of reference for the key academic committees [ToR Academic Board, 045; ToR Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC), 048; ToR Learning and Teaching Committee 049; ToR Student Experience Committee, 050] provide evidence of effective reporting structures within the academic frameworks that are consistent with the General and Academic Regulations [030]. The team viewed minutes covering meetings held between 2017 and 2020 which provided convincing evidence of the alignment of policy and practice, and that the rules and regulations are monitored as outlined in the regulatory framework. Examples of the Minutes of the Academic Board [083-090] provides evidence of oversight of monitoring of academic strategies, student satisfaction, assessment and feedback, approval of new programmes and credit frameworks [083], annual monitoring plans, review of programme specifications and approval of the Access and Participation Plans [084]. Examples of the minutes of ASQC [096-098] and LTC [104-107] also demonstrates that the structures and reporting lines are operationalised in accordance with the stated governance structure [Governance Structure Chart, 007] and reporting lines [008].

33 The LIBF Code of Practice includes a Policy on Admissions and Recruitment to HE programmes [016]. Chapter 2 of the Code of Practice Admissions establishes general principles for recruitment, including information on minimum standards of English language,

how entry requirements should be communicated and reviewed, the application process, how to communicate offers and how students can complain or appeal [016]. The evidence demonstrates how this admissions policy operates in practice. Successful applicants are subsequently sent an offer letter which contains further information. The Terms and Conditions of Offer document [036] includes the further information referred to in the Admissions Policy 2.5.1, that is, 'details on the next steps and where to find additional information relating to regulations, tuition support and assessment' [016; 2.5.1]. The claim that this information is transparent can be partially upheld, as this information relating to entry requirements and how to apply is available on the LIBF website as well as the UCAS site and is therefore publicly available. However, transparency in decision-making regarding the actual entry requirements remain rather vague for potential applicants. For example, for the BSc Banking and Finance, the LIBF website [[https://www.libf.ac.uk/study/undergraduate/bsc-\(hons\)-in-banking-and-finance](https://www.libf.ac.uk/study/undergraduate/bsc-(hons)-in-banking-and-finance): accessed, 02.05.2021] states that students require A Levels in the range of ABB-BBB, 'but typically BBB', so potential students might well ask under what circumstances would a student be asked to obtain ABB. This is a result of the 'holistic' approach to applications adopted by LIBF. The team noted that this approach can lead to some uncertainty around what students actually need to achieve in order to be offered a place on a programme. The team also noted that the UCAS website quotes this range as being AAB-BBC for BSc Banking and Finance [<https://digital.ucas.com/coursedisplay/courses/0f0c7bba-d445-4ea9-94bd-1e81650f6233?academicYearId=2021#entry-requirements>: accessed 02.05.2021]. LIBF has a separate policy on accreditation of prior learning [Code of Practice Chapter 3: Accreditation of Prior Learning, 017]. The evidence provided to the assessment team indicated that the application of the Accreditation of Prior Learning policy is very rare [Report on Accreditation of Prior Learning, 174]. But the team was content that this information is transparent and available on LIBF's website.

34 In order to ensure that LIBF's assessment strategies are robust, consistent and implemented fully, the team reviewed policies within the academic framework relating to assessment and considered minutes of Boards of Examiners to check for consistency of decision. The Code of Practice Chapter 7 Assessment [021] sets out the basis on which assessment and grading is carried out and must be transparent to students and staff. This includes that students and staff are provided with information regarding the assessment requirements and the grading criteria along with weightings and the contribution of different assessment criteria that will allow students to make informed decisions regarding allocation of learning effort. The assessment results and awards are approved in line with LIBF's Assessment Board Principles and Procedures [051] because the evidence shows that Module and Programme Board of Examiners are run in accordance with these terms of reference. Module Assessment Board minutes shows that marks are approved by the Programme Assessment Board through delegated authority [Module Assessment Board Minutes, 499-506] and decisions are made which are consistent with LIBF's regulatory frameworks. Programme specifications [BSc Banking and Finance 204; BSc Finance Investment and Risk 205] show that there is a range of assessment tasks on the programme. This is also evidenced in the mapping documents reviewed [536-546]. LIBF is developing a new approach to mapping employability attributes and behaviours progressively across each programme [Statement in response to evidence request 15 547] in order to ensure that cognitive abilities and generic skills (such as independent learning, working with others and critical thinking) as well as learning outcomes are tested progressively.

35 The team noted a small ambiguity in the wording of documentation relating to approval of marks and resubmissions. In the General and Academic Regulations, it is stated that, 'Resubmissions must be submitted within one calendar month of the release of the provisional result for the assessment' [030: 9.3.4]. This means that students have to resubmit work before their marks are finalised formally (which must be at an Assessment

Board). The team found this potentially confusing for students, especially if the marks ratified at the Board of Examiners are not consistent with the provisional mark. However, the team found that practice within LIBF is consistent with its stated policy in this case and the team had no evidence to suggest that this policy has led to any appeals.

36 External examining forms an integral part of the assessment process and the evidence shows there exists a range of appropriate documentation to support the external verification of standards in the assessment process. The Code of Practice Chapter 8 External Examining [022] outlines the key principles to be followed and purpose of external examining, meaning that the standards of all awards should be consistent with FHEQ levels and must be verified by an external examiner. The evidence seen by the team showed that LIBF has a consistent approach to external examining within its academic framework and policies with templates for nominations [External Examiner Nomination Form 283] and external examiner reports [281] (see paragraph 59-60 (B2) for consistency of implementation of external examining processes).

37 The team found that information on assessment is provided to students in accordance with LIBF's Code of Practice Chapter 7 Assessment [021]. Programme specifications [204; 205] outline expectations and explain what learning outcomes and skills are expected at Level 6. Module specifications [206] detail credits awarded and assessment weightings, as well as expectations in terms of the overall type of assignment. Marking descriptors for Level 6 are included in the programme handbooks [e.g. Full-time UG student handbook 404]. Detailed marking criteria and assessment mapping documents are available for each assessment at all levels [536-546]. The team found that this demonstrates a consistent approach to communicating expectations which is in line with current practice in the sector.

38 LIBF has a policy for dealing with appeals and complaints detailed in the Code of Practice Chapter 10 Complaints and Appeals [024] which is implemented by the Complaints and Appeals Review Group (CARG) [054]. LIBF's Complaints and Appeals Policy defines what constitutes a complaint or an appeal, the principles and process, and the timescales for dealing with the whole process. In order to verify the process, the team reviewed the report of higher education and postgraduate complaints and appeals [175], which summarises all complaints and appeals in 2020. The one complaint raised during this period had been dealt with in line with the policy which LIBF asserts draws on guidance from the Office of Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA). There were six appeals raised during the same period, one was upheld and five were not upheld with an early resolution on one. In accordance with that policy, internal investigations were carried out on the others and those investigations found that LIBF's policies and procedures were followed correctly and fairly in reaching the relevant decisions. None of those denied appeals were escalated to CARG [175]. The assessment team considered the Complaints and Appeals Process to be transparent as it is available in programme handbooks as well as on LIBF's website [https://www.libf.ac.uk/docs/default-source/cpq/cpq-policies/cpq-complaints-policy.pdf?sfvrsn=84c9408d_20: accessed: 01.05.2021]. It is also highlighted in the Student Handbooks [404; 406; 407]. The terms and conditions of admissions offers [024, 036] demonstrate how an applicant could access the relevant information to enable them to complain and appeal against a decision made in the application process. As a result of this evidence, the team concluded that LIBF's policies relating to appeals and complaints are transparent and robust with the potential to be applied consistently.

39 The team considered all the evidence relating to LIBF's policies and regulations and concluded that it has in place transparent, comprehensive and effective academic frameworks and regulations that are implemented fully and consistently in order to govern how it awards academic credit and qualifications.

40 In order for the team to verify that definitive and up-to-date records of each qualification and programme are maintained, the team reviewed a range of programme documentation and records of awards. Programme Specifications show that definitive records exist [204; 205] including up-to-date details of each award, and possible exit awards. These are available on LIBF's website [multiple pages, accessed 19th April 2021] as well as being provided to students. The specifications are also monitored and reviewed by Academic Board [minutes 083] in accordance with LIBF's Code of Practice Chapter 13 Programme Development, Approval, Monitoring and Review [027], which details the framework for the annual review of programmes. The quality of data generated by the higher education provision at LIBF is audited by the Data Returns Group [052], and evidence of how programmes and student performance are monitored, incorporating student feedback and actions, is provided in the Annual Monitoring Report [176]. The evidence provided enabled the assessment team to have confidence that LIBF can maintain up-to-date records [Approval, Monitoring and Review 027; Annual Monitoring Report 176].

41 The team also reviewed evidence of student records of awards. Summary data on awards is available in the Degree Outcomes Statement [032] and forms part of the annual monitoring and review process [Annual Monitoring Report, 176]. Boards of Examiners record qualifications awarded and this provides testament to support the assertion that credit awarded is consistent with the UK Quality Code and with LIBF's own regulations. The UG Student Handbook states that students will be awarded a Pass or Fail mark for each component that will appear on their transcripts [404, p.27]. The team saw examples of student transcripts [513-526] which also show that students are provided with numerical percentages of grade and their award classification. The assessment team was therefore satisfied that students are provided with records of study consistent with LIBF's definitive course documentation.

42 The team considered that definitive, up-to-date records are maintained of each programme and qualification approved by LIBF, that these are used as the reference point for the delivery and assessment of programmes, and that they are used for the provision to students and alumni of records of study and conferment of awards.

Conclusions

43 The assessment team formulated its judgement against this criterion according to the process set out in the Guidance for Providers, in particular Annex 4.

44 The evidence shows that LIBF's academic frameworks and regulations used to govern how it awards academic credit and qualifications are appropriate to its current status and are implemented fully and consistently. LIBF's framework for the delivery of its provision covers the full scope of policies, principles and procedures appropriate to its current higher education provision, including the approval, monitoring and review of degree programmes, admissions, use of credit, regulation of assessments and appeals and complaints. All frameworks and regulations are approved by LIBF's senior academic authority, the Academic Board. The team saw evidence of consistent application of the academic regulatory framework and associated policies and procedures. LIBF has a mature set of policies to support its academic objectives which are documented in the 15 chapters of its Code of Practice.

45 LIBF records of course documentation are maintained and used as the reference point for the delivery and assessment of programmes, and for the conferment of awards. Students are provided with accurate and up-to-date information about their programme and modules, and this information is transparent. Processes are in place through annual monitoring and periodic review to ensure that definitive course documentation is maintained and updated.

46 LIBF has in place transparent and comprehensive academic frameworks and regulations to govern how it awards academic credit and qualifications. LIBF maintains a definitive record of each programme and qualification that it approves (and of subsequent changes to it) which constitutes the reference point for delivery and assessment of the programme, its monitoring and review, and for the provision of records of study to students and alumni. The review team concludes, therefore, that the criterion is met.

Criterion B2 - Academic standards

47 This criterion states that:

B2.1 An organisation granted degree awarding powers has clear and consistently applied mechanisms for setting and maintaining the academic standards of its higher education qualifications.

B2.2 Organisations with degree awarding powers are expected to demonstrate that they are able to design and deliver courses and qualifications that meet the threshold academic standards described in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ). Organisations with degree awarding powers are expected to demonstrate that the standards that they set and maintain above the threshold are reliable over time and reasonably comparable to those set and achieved by other UK degree awarding bodies.

48 The QAA assessment team conducted an assessment of this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment for Variation and Revocation of Degree Awarding Powers (December 2019)*.

The evidence considered, and why and how the team considered this evidence

49 The QAA assessment team assessed this criterion by reference to a range of evidence gathered according to the process described in the Guidance for Providers, in particular the suggested evidence outlined in Annex 5 and the provider's submission.

Specifically, the review team considered or assessed:

- a To determine whether LIBF has clear and consistently applied mechanisms for setting and maintaining academic standards that are consistent with the FHEQ, the team considered LIBF's regulatory framework and supporting policies, including its General and Academic Regulations [030] and its Code of Practice Chapters 1-15 [012-029]. It also considered course documentation: UG Programme Specifications [204; 205], MSc Banking and Finance Programme Specification [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/docs/default-source/HE/msc-banking-finance-programme-specification.pdf>, accessed 19th April 2021], module specification [206], course handbooks [404-407], Grade Classification Descriptors [321-322], Annual Review Reports [176] and Assessment Mapping Documents [536-546]. The team also used this information to assess whether academic standards are set at a level that meets the UK threshold standard for the qualification, corresponded to the relevant FHEQ level and are in accordance with LIBF's own academic regulations [030].
- b To assess that LIBF's programme approval, monitoring and review processes are robust and applied consistently, and to ensure academic standards are being maintained, the team reviewed LIBF's evidence relating to programme approval, monitoring and review, including the Code of Practice Chapter 13 Programme Development, Approval, Monitoring and Review [027], HE Validation Schedule [236], Guidelines for Validation and Review Panel Members [237] and examples of validation reports: Validation Report for PG Cert in FinTech, MSc Framework and Revised Certificate in Sustainable Finance [212], Validation Report BSc Financial Services Management [213], Validation Report BSc Banking and Finance [214] and PPR Finance Investment and Risk [244], the Teaching and Assessment Strategy [038], HE Enhancement Strategy [043], Minutes of ASQC [096-098], Minutes of the Academic Board [083-090], Minutes of the LTC [104-107] and Minutes of SSLC [113-119].

- c To confirm that awards are made only when the learning outcomes have been demonstrated through assessment and the UK threshold standards for the qualification have been met, the team reviewed the Code of Practice Chapter 7 Assessment [021], Assessment Boards ToR [51] Minutes of Boards of Examiners [499-506], student transcripts [513-526] and external examiner summary reports [281], degree outcomes statement [032] in addition to LIBF's General and Academic Regulations [030].
- d To determine whether the setting and maintaining of threshold academic standards at LIBF takes into account external points of references and external and independent expertise, the team considered LIBF's external examining policies: the Code of Practice Chapter 8 External Examining. [022] The team considered evidence of external expertise in the approval monitoring and review of programmes, including the Code of Practice Chapter 3 Programme Development Approval Monitoring and Review [027], Validation Report for PG Cert in FinTech, MSc Framework and Revised Certificate in Sustainable Finance [212], Validation Report BSc Financial Services Management [213], Validation Report BSc Banking and Finance [214], Barclays' Relationship Manager (Banking) Apprenticeship programme [217], the Board Effectiveness Review [142], Review of HE Operations in 2019 [139], Validation Action Plan PG Cert FinTech, MSc Finance and PG Cert SF, [230] LIBF's website: Academic Community [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/academic-community> accessed 22.04.2021]. The team also sought to verify how the students contributed to decision-making by considering the Code of Practice Chapter 11 Student Engagement [025] and through Terms of Reference of deliberative committees: ToR Academic Board [045], ToR Student Experience Committee [050], ToR Staff Student Liaison Committee [057], CoP Ch 11 Student Engagement [025], and how the views of students are incorporated into monitoring and review processes through Minutes of Staff Student Liaison Committees [113-119] and Module Survey Semester 1 [265].

How any samples of evidence were constructed

50 The team considered all evidence submitted by LIBF relating to this criterion. This evidence was sufficient to meet the purpose of the assessment and no further sampling was requested.

What the evidence shows

51 The assessment team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

52 LIBF's General and Academic Regulations [030] set out the principle that LIBF's higher education qualifications will be awarded at the appropriate level in line with the sector recognised standards such as the FHEQ and take into account relevant external reference points, including Subject Benchmark Statements. The Code of Practice [012-029] sets out the systems and processes that are designed to ensure that this is the case. The team found that references in the course documentation to the UK Quality Code and FHEQ levels are consistent and this is embedded within course approval documentation [Code of Practice Chapter 13 Programme Development, Approval, Monitoring and Review 027]. While Annual Review Reports [176] do not make direct reference to levels of the FHEQ or require staff to review programme/module learning outcomes, the Code of Practice Chapter 13 [027: 13.1] does require staff to consider all course reviews, taking into consideration sector recognised standards such as the UK Quality Code and FHEQ. After reviewing the evidence relating to this process, the team considered this to be an adequate mechanism to assure academic standards.

53 The team also assessed whether academic standards are set at a level which meets the UK threshold standard for the qualification, correspond to the relevant FHEQ level and are in accordance with LIBF's own academic regulations [030]. Programme specifications [204, 205] demonstrate that the learning outcomes are set at threshold standards appropriate to the FHEQ level of the qualification. The learning outcomes for the Level 6 and Level 7 qualifications are clearly distinguished (BSc Banking and Finance, [204] and MSc Banking and Finance Programme Specification [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/docs/default-source/HE/msc-banking-finance-programme-specification.pdf>, accessed 19 April 2021]) and reflect the different qualification descriptors at FHEQ levels in the UK Quality Code. Undergraduate and postgraduate classification descriptors are the same for all levels [321-322] and there is no distinction between Level 6 and Level 7. On further investigation and analysis of marking criteria for Levels 4, 5, 6 and 7, [536-546] the team was able to establish that there is progression in student learning. For example, the requirement to write more analytical responses as students progress through the programmes, but this is not reflected in the generic award level classification descriptors. The team concluded that the learning outcomes are consistently aligned with the appropriate level within the FHEQ, and that this was reflected in the assessment tasks. The evidence analysed by the team indicate that LIBF's regulatory framework and supporting policies to set and maintain academic standards are consistent with the FHEQ.

54 LIBF's arrangements for maintaining academic standards through monitoring and review are set out in the Code of Practice Chapter 13 Programme Development, Approval, Monitoring and Review [027]. This establishes policy for the validation, approval, periodic review and annual monitoring of programmes. This includes periodic review of programmes every five years as well as annual programme monitoring. There is evidence that LIBF adheres to its own codes of practice relating to programme monitoring and review. LIBF's HE Validation Schedule [236] records when each programme is due for validation and review, and validation reports show that these reviews have taken place when required [212-214]. LIBF's Guidelines for Validation and Review Panel Members [237] make specific reference to ensuring adherence to standards set out in the FHEQ. This is also included in validation reports. For example, in the Validation Self Evaluation Document for the Periodic Review of the BSc Finance Investment and Risk [244] there is specific confirmation that the programme team has reviewed the Subject Benchmark Statements and sought to align the programme's learning outcomes with those standards [244: 6] as well as with the FHEQ descriptors for Levels 4, 5 and 6. The team found that LIBF meet the UK Quality Code's expectations that relevant external reference points, including FHEQ levels and descriptors, are taken into consideration to ensure ongoing adherence to appropriate academic standards.

55 Programme validation and review events lead to approval of a programme for a period of five years. Recommendations regarding programme approvals follow validation events, and formal approval of a programme sits with the Academic Board. The Quality Policy and Regulation (QPR) is responsible for ensuring that the review panel is consistent with LIBF's policy [Code of Practice Chapter 13 Programme Development, Approval, Monitoring and Review 027]. Any action points following approval are monitored by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee and the Learning and Teaching Committee [027]. Outcomes of a review might include commendations, observations, recommendations and/or conditions of approval. Minutes of the Academic Board [083-90] and of the Learning and Teaching Committee [104-107] demonstrate that such a reporting mechanism works efficiently and in accordance with LIBF's policy. The team reviewed documentation relating to two recent validation events: PG Certificate in FinTech and the BSc (Hons) Financial Services Management [212; 213]. The team confirms that the learning outcomes were reviewed and considered to be clearly articulated and assessments designed to measure an appropriate FHEQ level, aligned with LIBF's credit and regulatory framework. There is a consistent approach to holding validation events with standard templates and guidance.

Action plans are monitored at subsequent Learning and Teaching Committee meetings. An example of this is that in the minutes of the Learning and Teaching Committee [104] the plan for the Validation of PG Cert FinTech MSc Framework is monitored and action points updated.

56 Annual monitoring is an ongoing process, but each year a wide range of activities take place to gather qualitative and quantitative data on aspects of programme and module delivery, including module evaluations and performance data, statistics and trends, and external examiner reports, while views of stakeholders such as lecturers, employers and students are also sought. An annual report that covers all these aspects of delivery and performance is prepared and presented to stakeholders, including the SSLC. While the team did not see any examples of annual review documentation being discussed in the minutes of the SSLCs in the evidence base, there was evidence of aspects of module-level evaluations and minor changes to the programme or student experience discussed. Annual monitoring is reported to the Learning and Teaching Committee and the evidence shows that it receives the annual reports and monitors actions [104-107]. Any requests for modifications, major or minor, must be endorsed by the Learning and Teaching Committee before being sent to ASQC for consideration. ASQC may approve changes to modules or, if the impact of change has a cumulative or substantial impact on the programme, recommend that the Academic Board approve the change. Again, minutes of both ASQC [096-098], and Academic Board [083-090] confirm that this practice is consistent.

57 The team found that, overall, the evidence shows that LIBF's programme approval, monitoring and review processes are robust and applied consistently. The team also found evidence that demonstrated how academic standards are being reviewed and maintained.

58 Assessment Boards [ToR 051] are the main mechanism to confirm that LIBF's awards are made only when the learning outcomes have been demonstrated through assessment and that the UK threshold standards for the qualification have been met. Module Assessment Boards ratify the marks at module level while Programme Assessment Boards approve degree classifications and programme-level awards [Code of Practice Chapter 7 Assessment 021].

59 External examiners are involved at both module and programme level and evidence shows that external examiners confirm that provision meets the expected academic standards [External Examiner Annual Report 281]. The team reviewed examples of minutes of Boards of Examiners [499-506], which included a full range of awards. While it is not possible for the team to make a judgement on the basis of the minutes of Programme Assessment Boards whether awards are made only when students have passed the correct number of credits or achieved the learning outcomes of the programme – the minutes do not present the marks for each student – the external examiners confirm this independently, and this is in the minutes of those Boards. Furthermore, and in order to test that qualifications are only awarded when the threshold standards are met, the team reviewed examples of student transcripts [513-526]. The team noted that in the case of the PG Certificate and PG Diploma, there are no learning outcomes associated with the exit award, and the award is based on number of Level 7 credits achieved. The transcripts of study confirmed consistency in this approach [524-526]. Based on this further evidence, the team found that decisions relating to academic standards and meeting of learning outcomes were not explicit in the minutes, especially in cases where students might have failed modules but achieved sufficient credits for an award. However, the evidence confirms that the number of credits passed is appropriate to the level of award. LIBF produces a degree outcomes statement consistent with practice in the sector [032]. The team found that this provides a further summary record of the qualifications awarded. The team concluded that LIBF only makes awards when the learning outcomes of the qualifications have been demonstrated through assessment and the UK threshold standards have been met.

60 LIBF takes account of independent viewpoints and external expertise in setting and maintaining standards. LIBF's policy for the appointment of external examiners [Code of Practice Chapter 8, 022] is designed to assure threshold standards in assessments and awards in an impartial way. LIBF provides guidance for external examiners in their role [Guidelines for External Examiners, 286], and sets out in CoP Chapter 8 External Examining [022] clear expectations of the role. The guidelines are clear because they explain that the main responsibility of the external examiner is to ensure that assessment procedures have been fairly and properly implemented, consistent with LIBF's Code of Practice, and that the standards of awards are, 'comparable with those in other higher education institutions and reflect the principles set down in the Framework for Higher Education Qualification.' [022: 2]. Minutes of Boards of Examiners [499-506] support LIBF's Code of Practice Chapter 8 in that they demonstrate that external examiners have roles at module level and programme level. They attend Boards of Examiners and consider cases with 'exceptional issues.' Evidence provided in the form of a summary of external examiner reports [281] concludes that external examiners are satisfied with the academic standards at LIBF.

61 External verification and comparability of standards is assured through the role of external examiners. LIBF regulations dictate that the role of external examiners should be embedded within the process of approving marks [CoP Chapter 7 Assessment 021; CoP Chapter 8 External Examining 022]. Evidence provided shows that this is the case as all external examiners are reported as confirming that the academic standards are appropriate and comparable with other providers [External Examiner Annual Report 281]. Minutes of the Academic Board [090] confirm that the comments of external examiners are considered, and actions followed up as a result.

62 LIBF ensures that external expertise is required in the development, quality assurance, monitoring and review of academic programmes. External expertise (academic and practitioner/employer) is required from the initial development of a programme, through its approval, validation and periodic programme review [Programme Development, Approval, Monitoring and Review 027]. The team assessed whether these requirements were met consistently. Minutes of review and validation events testify that the policies are operationalised fully. There is evidence of this to assure the team that external views are sought throughout LIBF's key academic functions. Minutes of validation events confirm that external academics, practitioners and students are involved in the process of validation [Validation Report for PG Cert in FinTech, MSc Framework and Revised Certificate in Sustainable Finance 212, Validation Report BSc Financial Services Management 213, Validation Report BSc Banking and Finance 214]. A review of LIBF's Barclays' Relationship Manager (Banking) Apprenticeship programme [217] demonstrated a commitment to benchmarking against other similar programmes at comparable higher education institutions.

63 Furthermore, other reviews of academic provision provide further evidence that LIBF draws on external expertise; for example, the Board Effectiveness Review included external members [142]. LIBF also commissioned a Review of HE Operations in 2019 [139] carried out by an external academic. Many of LIBF's visiting lecturers have current professional expertise in their field [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/academic-community> accessed 22.04.2021]. Students are also represented in the membership of key academic deliberative committees, for example, ToR Academic Board [045]; ToR Student Experience Committee [050]; ToR Staff Student Liaison Committee [057], in accordance with the CoP Ch 11 Student Engagement [025]. They have input into the monitoring and review of programmes [Code of Practice Chapter 3 Programme Development Approval Monitoring and Review 027] and modules through module evaluation, for example, Module Survey Semester 1 [265] and through SSLCs [ToR Staff Student Liaison Committee 057; Minutes of SSLCs 113-119].

Conclusions

64 The assessment team formulated its judgement against this criterion according to the process set out in the Guidance for Providers, in particular Annex 4.

65 LIBF's higher education qualifications are offered at levels that correspond to the relevant levels of *The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree Awarding Bodies* through its regulations and framework of quality assurance. LIBF has demonstrated that it has robust mechanisms for setting and maintaining academic standards, through course approval (validation), monitoring and review, which are carried out in accordance with LIBF's own regulatory framework. These processes are set out in the Code of Practice Chapter 13 Programme Development Approval Monitoring and Review, and require that external references points, independent expertise and student voices are considered during the approval, monitoring and review processes. The evidence reviewed by the team demonstrated that these arrangements are robust, are applied consistently and address whether the UK threshold academic standards are achieved, and do take into consideration the views of external and independent expertise as well as student feedback.

66 There are comprehensive regulations relating to the award of academic credit and qualifications and the Board of Examiners and student transcripts provide evidence that awards are only made when students have achieved the correct amount of credit. The team notes that reference to the achievement of learning outcomes to achieve exit awards could be more explicit in places in the minutes of Boards of Examiners but is satisfied that external examiners are consistent in their agreement that standards are appropriate and comparable with other providers. The team also noted that the generic descriptors for undergraduate and postgraduate degree classifications do not reflect the differentiated learning outcomes of FHEQ Levels 6 and 7, but again is satisfied that learning outcomes are appropriately differentiated, and external examiners are consistent in their agreement that standards are appropriate for the level of each award. The team concludes, therefore, that this criterion is met.

Criterion B3 - Quality of the academic experience

67 This criterion states that:

B3.1 Organisations with degree awarding powers are expected to demonstrate that they are able to design and deliver courses and qualifications that provide a high quality academic experience to all students from all backgrounds, irrespective of their location, mode of study, academic subject, protected characteristics, previous educational background or nationality. Learning opportunities are consistently and rigorously quality assured.

68 The QAA assessment team conducted an assessment of this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment for Variation and Revocation of Degree Awarding Powers (December 2019)*.

The evidence considered, and why and how the team considered this evidence

69 The QAA assessment team assessed this criterion by reference to a range of evidence gathered according to the process described in the Guidance for Providers, in particular the suggested evidence outlined in Annex 5 and the provider's submission.

Specifically, the review team considered or assessed:

Design and approval of programmes

- a To assess whether the organisation operates effective processes for the design, development and approval of programmes, the team considered the Code of Practice Chapter 13: Programme Development Approval Monitoring and Review [027], and the General Academic Regulations for Students [030]. To understand how the process of learning and assessment design is supported, the team considered the Learning Design Development and Production Process [311], TARGET Learning Design Tool [314], Curriculum Design and External Exposure [315] and information about LIBF's academic community on its website [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/academic-community> accessed 20.06.21] The team also scrutinised the Guidelines for Validation and Review Panel Members [237], the ToR of the Academic Board [045], Academic Standards and Quality Committee [048], and Learning and Teaching Committee [049], together with minutes of Academic Board [083-090], Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) [096-098] and Learning Teaching Committee (LTC) [104-107] as well as the Academic Board Annual Report [145;147]. The Committee Schedule of Work was reviewed [064], and a range of undergraduate and postgraduate validation reports [212-216] together with the validation self-evaluation documents [223-224], the Validation Action Plan [230] and the HE Validation Schedule [236] were considered.
- b To check whether relevant staff are informed of and provided with guidance and support on these procedures and their roles and responsibilities in relation to them, the team reviewed the SAR and the Code of Practice Chapter 13: Programme Development, Approval, Monitoring and Review [027], Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy [038] and Enhancement Strategy [043] and the Guidelines for Validation and Review Panels [237], together with the minutes from the Learning and Teaching Committee [104;107]. Staff involvement was considered as part of the initial Learning Design Development and Production Process [311], as part of the academic community [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/academic-community> accessed 20.06.21], and in self-assessment documentation for undergraduate and postgraduate programmes [223 Validation SED MSc Framework Certificate in

Fintech Cert in Sustainable Finance], Validation SED BSc Hons Financial Services Management 224] and Module Reviewed Group meetings [569].

- c To determine whether the responsibility for approving new programme proposals is clearly assigned, including the involvement of external expertise, where appropriate, and subsequent action is carefully monitored, the team reviewed the Code of Practice Chapter 13: Programme Development, Approval, Monitoring and Review [027] and the Guidelines for Validation and Review Panels [237], a range of undergraduate and postgraduate validation reports [212-216] and validation self-evaluation documents [223-224], ASQC ToR [048], Learning and Teaching Committee [049] and Academic Board [045], Academic Partnerships Risk Advisory Group ToR [058] together with minutes of the Academic Board [083-090] and ASQC [096-098] and reports made to the Academic Board [Academic Board Annual Report 2020 145], Academic Board Annual Report 2019 [147] were considered, as were Annual Monitoring Report 1 Aug 2018 to 31 July 2019 [176], Draft Annual Monitoring Report 1 Aug19 31 July20 [552] to identify how actions were monitored. A range of surveys, feedback and views were evaluated: Module survey results [265-272], global feedback from the NSS [263-264] and student academic experience survey [275].
- d To check whether close links are maintained between learning support services and LIBF's programme planning and approval arrangements, the team reviewed examples of programme approval documentation [212-217], ToR and minutes of the Academic Board [045; 083-090], Academic Standards and Quality Committee [048; 096-098] and Learning Teaching Committee [049; 104-107]. Examples of staff interactions that linked planning, design and approval processes to support services were scrutinised, including communication with staff through Executive Team members [046] and organisation-wide update meetings [570]. The Learning Design, Development and Production Process [311], Guidelines for Validation and Review Panel Members [237], and a range of staff planning and briefing meetings [571-574; 312; 328-329] were considered, as were Feedback surveys [277-280] records of Forum meetings [274;276] and workshop student feedback [277-280].

Learning and teaching

- e To verify that the organisation articulates and implements a strategic approach to learning and teaching which is consistent with its stated academic objectives, the team reviewed the Code of Practice, [015-029] in particular Chapter 4: Learning and Teaching [018], the HEA Professional Standards Framework [<https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/guidance/teaching-and-learning/ukpsf> accessed 20.05.21], the Learning, Enhancement Strategy [043], Collaborative Provision Strategy [039], Teaching and Assessment Strategy [038], Equality and Diversity Policy [197] and Student Charter [031]. The Terms of Reference of the Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) [049] and examples of LTC minutes [104-107]. The team also considered a range of Programme Handbooks [404-407] and Programme and Module Specifications [204-207], together with the Student Submission [SS] minutes of the Student Staff Liaison Committee meetings [113-119] and access to the VLE [619] and the LIBF website. [<https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/guidance/teaching-and-learning/ukpsf> accessed 20.05.21]
- f To ascertain that the organisation maintains physical, virtual and social learning environments that are safe, accessible and reliable for every student, promoting dignity, courtesy and respect in their use, the team considered the SAR, Student Submission [SS], VLE [619], Code of Practice Chapter 4 Learning and Teaching [018] and a range of institutional policies relating to Health and Safety [195], IT Acceptable use [196], Equality and Diversity [197], Values and Competency

Framework [198], Safeguarding [188]. Prevent Duty [189], Student Charter [031], Mental Health Strategy [041], HE Brightspace plan [163] and examples of SSLC minutes [113-119].

- g To check that robust arrangements exist for ensuring that the learning opportunities provided to those of its students that may be studying at a distance from the organisation are effective, the team considered the Code of Practice Chapter 4 Learning and Teaching [018], the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy [038], HE Brightspace plan [163], online resources and support through the VLE, [619] including an online study guide [276], feedback and evaluation of online tasks [276-278], online induction webinars [360;371; 236], the Welcome brochure [360] and Study Skills screenshots from Induction [388-389]. Programmes and books were also reviewed [404-407].
- h To ascertain the arrangements so that every student is enabled to monitor their progress and further their academic development, the team considered Assessment Feedback Policy [182], External Examiner Annual Report 2019 [281], Feedback Process [415], Annual Monitoring Report 1 Aug 2018 to 31 July 2019 [176], Draft Annual Monitoring Report 1 Aug19 31 July20 [552], Staff Student Liaison Committee minutes [113-119] LTC ToR and minutes [049;104-107], SSLC meeting minutes [115], the SAR [SAR], PT Module Survey Nov 19 collated results and feedback [271], Extracts from Apprentice Staff Liaison Forum Meeting and Survey [274], Apprentice Feedback via Forum Meeting [276]; Apprentice Workshop Feedback Modules 1 and 2 [280]; Marking Moderation Form [458], early module feedback [266-267] and end of module surveys [268-269].

Assessment

- i To ascertain that LIBF operates valid and reliable processes of assessment, including for the recognition of prior learning, which enable every student to demonstrate the extent to which they have achieved the intended learning outcomes for the credit or qualification being sought, the team scrutinised the Student Submission [SS], Code of Practice Chapter 7: Assessment [021], Chapter 3: Accreditation of Prior Learning [017] and Chapter 8: External Examining [022], the General Academic Regulations [030]; Learning Teaching and Assessment Strategy [038], Terms of Reference for the Learning Teaching Committee [049], Programme or Module Change Request Form [462], HE Module Review Policy [183], Assessment Guidance for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Programmes [Grade Classification Descriptors UG 321, Grade Classification Descriptors PG 322; 335 Types of Assessment, 336 Assessment Mapping Document, 337 Presentation General Guidance, 338 Group Work General Guidance, 339 Online Discussion General, Guidelines, 340 Blog General Guidance, 341 Viva General Guidance, 342 Remote Examination Guide Moodle Quiz], the Process for Writing and Moderating Assessments [416], Programme Handbooks [404-407], Guidelines for External Examiners [286] and the External Examiners Annual Report Form [284] were also reviewed. To evaluate the effectiveness of these processes, the team considered the Report on Accreditation of Prior Learning to Academic Standards and Quality Committee [173-174], the External Examiners Annual Report [281], Faculty and student feedback [413-414], and records of Faculty meetings [132].
- j To establish that staff and students engage in dialogue to promote a shared understanding of the basis on which judgements are made, the team reviewed the Code of Practice Chapter 11: Student Engagement [025], Assessment Feedback Policy [182], the NSS 2016-2020 [263] and Action Plan [264], the Student Submission [SS], ToR of the Student Experience Committee [050] ToR and minutes of the Staff Student Liaison Committee [057; 113-119] together with a range of

Programme Handbooks at both undergraduate and postgraduate level [404-407], examples of surveys and reviews [265-280] and LIBF's website [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/policies-regulations-and-code-of-practice> accessed 20.05.21].

- k To evaluate how students are provided with opportunities to develop an understanding of, and the necessary skills to demonstrate, good academic practice, the team considered the SAR, the Code of Practice Chapter 9: Malpractice [023], together with the Personal Development and Employability Module [207], the VLE [619], and Guide to Referencing [344] which introduce students to academic good practice.
- l To confirm that the organisation operates processes for preventing, identifying, investigating and responding to unacceptable academic practice, the team considered the Code of Practice Chapter 9: Malpractice [023] and Chapter 7, Assessment [021], the Terms of Reference of the Malpractice Committee [055], HE Malpractice Reports for 2018-2020 [255-256], Malpractice Outcome Categories [257] and ToR of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee [048]. Guidance provided to students at induction, including the Personal Development and Employability Module [207], the VLE [619], and Guide to Referencing [344] were also considered which introduce students to academic good practice.
- m To evaluate that the processes for marking assessments and for moderating marks are clearly articulated and consistently operated by those involved in the assessment process, the team reviewed the SAR, Code of Practice Chapter 7: Assessment [021], the Feedback process [561], Marking Moderation Form [458], and General Academic Regulations [030], Programme or Module Change Request Form [462], HE Module Review Policy [183]. Marking Moderation Forms including moderation and external examiner reviews [562-568], CoP Chapter 8 External Examining [022], and minutes of the Learning and Teaching Committee [107], SSLC [117-119] and Faculty meetings [132; 329] were also scrutinised.

External examining

- n To establish that the organisation makes scrupulous use of external examiners, including in the moderation of assessment tasks and student assessed work, the team evaluated the Code of Practice Chapter 8: External Examining [022], the Guidelines for External Examiners [286], the External Examiners Log [285], External Examiner Annual Report Form [284], an Example External Examiner Results Sheet [282] and an External Examiner Nomination Form [283]. The terms of reference of the HE Assessment Boards [051] were also reviewed and the External Examiner Annual Report [281] was also inspected. The programme Annual Monitoring Report [176;552] was also reviewed confirm that external examiner feedback was reported.
- o To confirm that the organisation gives full and serious consideration to the comments and recommendations contained in external examiners reports and provides external examiners with a considered and timely response to their comments and recommendations, the team reviewed the Code of Practice Chapter 8: External Examining [022], ToR of the Learning and Teaching Committee [049] and Academic Board [045], programme Annual Monitoring Report [176;552] and the External Examiner Annual Report [281], together with examples of comments, actions and responses to external examiners at undergraduate, postgraduate and apprenticeship level [553-558; 560-568].

Academic appeals and student complaints

- p To check that the organisation has effective procedures for handling academic appeals and student complaints about the quality of the academic experience and that these procedures are fair, accessible and timely, and enable enhancement, the team evaluated the SAR, the Code of Practice Chapter 10: Complaints and Appeals [024], the terms of reference of the Complaints and Appeals Review Group [054], Academic Standards and Quality Committee [048] and Academic Board [045], together with the quarterly report from CARG [175] and information available through the VLE [619], and the Student Submission [SS].
- q To establish that appropriate action is taken following an appeal or complaint, the team considered the Code of Practice Chapter 10: Complaints and Appeals [024], the terms of reference of the Complaints and Appeals Review Group [054] together with its quarterly report [175] and the VLE [619]

How any samples of evidence were constructed

70 The team considered all evidence submitted by LIBF relating to this criterion. This evidence was sufficient to meet the purpose of the assessment and no further sampling was requested.

What the evidence shows

71 The assessment team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

Design and approval of programmes

72 LIBF has robust processes in place for designing, developing and approving programmes. The General Academic Regulations provide a framework for the operation of all programmes of study [030] and the Code of Practice Chapter 13: Programme Development Approval Monitoring and Review [027] clearly sets out LIBF's expectations, which include alignment with external reference points such as the FHEQ and engagement with students and external stakeholders.

73 The design of new programmes is guided by the HE Advisory Panel which seeks internal and external input during the design process and also advises on the strategy for new programmes and the student experience [SAR]. Academic staff have sector-specific expertise in curriculum design [Curriculum Design and External Exposure 315; <https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/academic-community>: accessed 20.06.21] and LIBF's approach to learning design is captured in the Learning Design, Development, and Production Process document [311] which sets out expectations and ensures stakeholder buy-in, together with the use of the TARGET Learning Design Tool [314] which helps academic staff plan how they teach their modules by considering its delivery type, for example, seminar or flipped lecture.

74 The course approval process includes strategic planning and course development with student engagement and scrutiny by a course approval panel with clear Guidelines for Validation and Review Panel Members [237] and monitoring by ASQC [ToR 048] and the Learning and Teaching Committee [ToR 049], as well as the Academic Board [ToR 045]. Minutes confirm that course approval matters are discussed in these committees [083-090; 096-098; 104-107] and that an annual report is presented to the Academic Board [145;147]. Examples of undergraduate and postgraduate validation reports [212-216], the Committee Schedule of Work [064], self-evaluation documents [223-224], Validation Action Plan [230] and HE Validation Schedule [236] provided evidence of the implementation of these processes in practice.

75 LIBF demonstrates that it develops programmes on an ongoing basis throughout the year through monitoring and review, including the introduction of new curriculum areas based on topical changes in the sector, in particular annual monitoring is reported to the LTC [ToR 049; Minutes 104-107; Annual Monitoring Report 1 Aug 2018 to 31 July 2019 176; HE Module Review Policy 183] before being referred to ASQC for consideration [ToR 048; minutes 096-098].

76 In 2017 there was a full review of the undergraduate full-time programmes which included stakeholder feedback. As a result, new programmes were introduced which have strengthened LIBF's portfolio and includes an increased focus on higher apprenticeships [SAR; Schedule of work 064]. Changes in the postgraduate programmes have also occurred since LIBF was awarded taught degree awarding powers, including the discontinuation of the Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education, the re-validation of MSc in Banking Practice and Management programme to form the updated MSc Banking and Finance, and the introduction of smaller postgraduate certificates focusing on key areas of financial services [Validation report PGCert Fintech MSc framework and PGCert SF 212]. Based on the range of evidence provided, the team found that LIBF was able to demonstrate that the organisation operates effective processes for the design, development and approval of programmes because each stage of the process was clearly documented and evidence supported the implementation of the strategy at an operational level.

77 The Code of Practice Chapter 13 is the major guidance document for staff at LIBF involved in programme development, approval, monitoring and review [027] and sets out the requirements in line with the principles established in the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy [038] and Enhancement Strategy [043]. These documents outline how the Senior Executive Team agree the strategic direction and how the Programme Team takes responsibility for ensuring that programmes are developed prior to any validation event.

78 The Guidelines for Validation and Review Panels [237] provide comprehensive information explaining the role of panel members in ensuring that standards are maintained and quality continues to be enhanced, and how staff are involved in the validation process through providing clarifications arising from the self-evaluation document, including their understanding not only of the programme itself but of the policies and procedures of LIBF during the validation meeting. Staff are engaged at the start through involvement in the initial design and development process [Learning Design Development and Production Process 311] and as part of the academic community [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/academic-community>; accessed 20.06.21]. They are also involved in contributing to the self-assessment documentation prior to validation, as evidenced in the undergraduate and postgraduate programmes reviewed by the team [Validation SED MSc Framework Certificate in Fintech Cert in Sustainable Finance 223, Validation SED BSc Hons Financial Services Management 224]. A member of the Quality, Policy and Regulation team provides guidance to the Programme Team for validation events and offers staff support with programme design and development guidance [SAR; Statement in response to evidence request 19 569]. The team found evidence that staff are also involved in discussions relating to programme design, development and approval at Module Review Group meetings [569] and Learning Teaching Committee meetings [104;107]. The team was therefore able to establish that staff are informed of and provided with guidance and support on these procedures and their roles and responsibilities in relation to them because of the range of documentation that evidenced their involvement from the start of the process to implementation.

79 The processes and responsibilities for approving, monitoring and reviewing programmes is set out in the Code of Practice Chapter 13 [027] and describes the range of sources which feed into the design stage of the programme. This includes the internal HE

Advisory Panel and students, and external sources such as subject matter experts, industry experts and employers [027]. The Guidelines for Validation and Review Panels [237] further clarifies the involvement of external expertise to reflect a balance of direct experience of delivering education in the UK or practitioner experience in the sector to ensure that programmes are delivered at an appropriate standard and quality. The outcomes of both undergraduate and postgraduate validation panels are captured in the Validation Reports [212-216;223-224] and any actions required by the validation panel are monitored by the ASQC [ToR 048] and the Learning and Teaching Committee [ToR 049], and are reported to the Academic Board [ToR 045]. Minutes of these academic committees [083-090; 096-098] show that actions are monitored carefully, and a report is made to the Academic Board [145;147] annually.

80 Monitoring of the programmes as a whole takes place each year to review aspects of programme and module delivery, taking into account surveys and feedback and the views of stakeholders such as academic staff, external clients and students [Annual Monitoring Report 1 Aug 2018 to 31 July 2019 176; Module survey results 265-272; Draft Annual Monitoring Report 1 Aug19 31 July20 552], as well as global feedback from the National Student Survey (NSS) [263-264] and the Student Academic Experience Survey [275]. The team therefore considered that LIBF was able to demonstrate that the responsibility for approving new programme proposals was clearly assigned and that external expertise was used in the design and monitoring process.

81 Academic Board also has oversight of programme development through its approval and monitoring of partnerships [ToR 045, minutes 083-90]. All partnerships are formally approved, monitored and reviewed by the Academic Board [ToR 045; minutes 083-090] or the Academic Partnerships Risk Advisory Group [058] for smaller accreditation arrangements. While this is a new area that has yet to be expanded, an example is provided of the Abu Dhabi Global Market Academy which was developed in 2018 to deliver professional and financial education and which will lead to delivery of higher education qualifications in the future, having been discussed at the Academic Board [083] which recommended approval to the Board of Governors.

82 Linkage between learning support services and programme planning and approval arrangements is managed by LIBF through its various academic committees [ToRs 045;048;049] and communications with staff through Executive Team members [ToR 046] and organisation-wide update meetings [Statement in response to evidence request 20 570]. Representatives from the learning provision team are included in the initial design meetings as outlined in the Learning Design, Development and Production Process [311] which documents the different stages of the process, including any requirements for specific resources and learning support.

83 The Guidelines for Validation and Review Panel Members highlight the importance of identifying appropriate student support prior to validation [237] and this support is monitored and reviewed through the Learning Teaching Committee [Tor 049], ASQC [ToR 048] and Academic Board [ToR 045]. Staff-to-staff communication takes place at a local level in several ways, including during design meetings [311], representation from the Learning Provision Team who collaborate in project planning and briefing meetings [571-574] and from Year Tutors [312] and Faculty meetings [328-329]. An example is provided in the apprenticeship programme where the Learning Provision Project Manager acts as a conduit between the programme team and the learning provision team to ensure that feedback and prior experience is considered in the design or revision of the learning materials process [Statement in response to evidence request 20 570].

84 Feedback surveys also take place early in the module and at the end of each module [265-272] as well as through Forum meetings [274;276] and workshops on individual

student feedback [277-280] and this is fed back to the learning provision team. Based on a review of the information provided, the team considered that close links are maintained between learning support services and LIBF's programme planning and approval arrangements as evidence was seen of relevant and meaningful discussions taking place at a local level which are then overseen and monitored through established academic procedures.

Learning and Teaching

85 LIBF articulates and implements a strategic approach to learning and teaching through its Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy, developed over a number of years as LIBF has developed, which sets out its principles, strategic objectives, quality standards, academic development and scholarship arrangements [038]. Its approach to innovation and enhancement, focusing on development of the quality of the students' learning experience and outcomes is set out, including encouraging all students to be independent, creative learners who are able to achieve their full potential. It aims to support a flexible learning experience to allow students to progress while developing themselves personally and professionally with a view to future employment. Developed with reference to the Code of Practice [015-029], Enhancement Strategy [043] and Collaborative Provision Strategy [039], a commitment to Equality and Diversity is embedded in the strategy and developed further in the Equality and Diversity Policy and Student Charter [197; 031]. The Learning Teaching and Assessment Strategy [038] is informed by the UK Quality Code and the HEA Professional Standards Framework. [<https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/guidance/teaching-and-learning/ukpsf> accessed 20.05.21] Drawing from this overarching strategy, the Code of Practice Chapter 4: Learning and Teaching [018] sets out the standards expected for all its higher education programmes and the Learning and Teaching Committee is responsible for the quality of the student learning opportunities and facilitates their ongoing enhancement [ToR 049; minutes 104-107]. The Programme and Module Specifications [204-207] and Programme Handbooks [404-407] provide pertinent information to students about their learning, teaching and assessment and demonstrates that LIBF's strategic approach is cascaded down to students at a programme level. In their submission, [SS] students confirmed that they are aware of LIBF's policies, regulations and Code of Practice and that they have an opportunity to engage with this through SSLC meetings [113-119]. The team was able to corroborate that LIBF articulates and implements a strategic approach to learning and teaching consistent with the stated academic objectives as LIBF's strategy is clearly articulated and readily available to all stakeholders and implemented through the relevant academic committees through to staff and students.

86 LIBF is committed to supporting students through learning experiences that deliver learning materials, resources and support to enable all students, regardless of background, with comparable learning opportunities to meet the intended learning outcomes of their programme of study, and the minimum standards to deliver this are articulated through its Code of Practice Chapter 4: Learning and Teaching [018]. The Code of Practice further sets out the requirement for all students to receive access to the virtual learning environment (VLE) [619], as well as the online library and information service, KnowledgeBank, available through the web portal, which provides access to a wide range of learning materials and activities including discussion forums and the Programme Handbooks [mylibf], as well as on-campus access to the library [SAR]. Students confirm that the virtual environment is 'engaging and interactive' [SS].

87 LIBF states [SAR] that it has recently made changes to enhance its campus, taking advantage of technological enhancements, including increasing the resilience of the VLE platform to support high-volume concurrent usage adaptations and investment in the Brightspace D2L platform [HE Brightspace plan Subitems of Migration timeline 163], VLE [619 accessed 23.05.2021].

88 The Student Charter [031] establishes the expectations for staff and students to treat each other respectfully and LIBF is committed to sound equality and diversity principles within the educational experience under its Equality and Diversity Policy [197], Mental Health Strategy [041] and Values and Competency Framework [198] to ensure that all students, regardless of background, are able to engage with comparable learning opportunities.

89 Relevant policies are in place to ensure a safe, accessible, and reliable learning environment for students in both the physical and virtual space, for example the Health and Safety Policy [195] lays out the requirements for keeping all individuals safe on campus, the IT Acceptable Use Policy [196] sets out guidance for the use of the virtual environment and the Safeguarding Policy and Prevent Duty Guidelines articulate the duty of care requirements for a safe learning environment [188-189]. The Health and Safety Committee provides oversight and maintenance of the policies and ensures the compliance of their aims [195]. The team found that LIBF had the policies in place in order to maintain physical, virtual and social learning environments that are safe, accessible and reliable for every student, promoting dignity, courtesy and respect in their use because of the clearly articulated policy documents provided alongside evidence of their implementation.

90 In line with the Code of Practice [018] and Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy [038], LIBF ensures that blended and online learners are provided at induction with an online orientation so they can become familiar with the website and online library. This includes a number of focused and relevant tasks, including how to log on and access modules, core texts and academic journals, how to use discussion forums, how their programme will be delivered and key contacts to support them in their learning [Study Skills screenshots from Induction 388-389]. An online study guide is also available [276] together with online academic tasks and library study skills programmes so that students can build on their skills at a distance. Feedback and evaluation on the usefulness of these online tasks are sought [277 Academic Task Writing Submission for Library Feedback, 278 Evaluating Library Study Skills Programmes], and although not systematically gathered, feedback from an apprentice forum suggests that new student feedback is listened to and, as a result, the online study guide was moved to a more intuitive place on the VLE [Apprentice Feedback through Forum Meeting 276].

91 Live webinars introduce first module lecturers during welcome and induction activities [360; 371] and all webinars are recorded, with attendance and recordings appearing in logs on the VLE [236; 619]. Programme handbooks provided to online learners provide comprehensive information, including guidance on study skills, preparing for assessments, policies, regulation and support [404-407]. In addition, the online library [619] and a specialised financial Bloomberg database allows access for students studying at a distance [HE Brightspace plan Subitems of Migration timeline 163].

92 LIBF is currently in the process of migrating its programmes to an online learning platform, Brightspace D2L, with Level 7 programmes and apprenticeship modules already in process and delivered entirely through distance learning [HE Brightspace plan Subitems of Migration timeline 163]. The team was able to ascertain that robust arrangements exist for ensuring that learning opportunities provided to students studying at a distance are effective because the remote access afforded to the team allowed it to mimic the experience of students on site.

93 In considering the way in which students are able to monitor their progress, LIBF has a Policy on Assessment Feedback which is overseen by the Dean and the Faculty Lead for Assessment and Feedback [Assessment Feedback Policy 182] with a clear feedback process, including grade classification descriptors, to assist with improving assessment performance. External examiners have also commented on the quality of feedback [External Examiner Annual Report 2019 281; Feedback Process 415] and this is kept under review

through the annual monitoring process [Annual Monitoring Report 1 Aug 2018 to 31 July 2019 176, Draft Annual Monitoring Report 1 Aug19 31 July20 552], engagement at the Staff Student Liaison Committee [113-119] and reported to the Learning and Teaching Committee [049;104-107]. For example, 1:1 exam feedback was implemented in 2018 for the year 1 full-time undergraduate programme as a pilot and this has now been rolled out to other years after discussion at an SSLC meeting [115], and assessment feedback times have been shortened to under four weeks [176]. To monitor student progression and performance accurately, LIBF uses an in-house bespoke student information system [SAR].

94 The team found that LIBF provided feedback to students in line with the Assessment Feedback Policy [182] through a variety of written and face-to-face opportunities both individually and as a group to allow students to benchmark themselves against their cohort [PT Module Survey Nov 19 collated results and feedback 271, Extracts from Apprentice Staff Liaison Forum Meeting and Survey 274, Apprentice Feedback via Forum Meeting 276, Apprentice Workshop Feedback Modules 1 and 2 280, Marking Moderation Form 458] and therefore monitor their development. Students are able to respond to the quality of their feedback through module feedback surveys about early module feedback [266-267] and end of module surveys [268-269] and demonstrated that students were able to engage with their studies.

Assessment

95 The Code of Practice Chapter 7 Assessment [021] and Chapter 3 Accreditation of Prior Learning [017] and the General Academic Regulations [030] define the processes of assessment, recognition of prior learning and the accreditation of in-house corporate education programmes by setting down policy parameters, guidelines and procedures to be awarded credits, the types of credit awarded, and how credit claims are assessed in line with the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

96 The Learning and Teaching Committee [049] reviews the breadth of assessment across each year and level of the programmes, and modules are reviewed on a biannual basis [462] under LIBF's HE Module Review Policy [183]. The teaching and assessment process has recently been reviewed following faculty and student feedback [413-414], and the process for writing and moderating assessments [416] together with a variety of assessment guidance for both undergraduate and postgraduate programmes [321-322;335-342] provides assurance that this process is followed. Ongoing review of the assessment experience by staff following student feedback is provided through faculty meetings [132].

97 Students are provided with clear and detailed assessment information and guidance through their handbooks [404-407]. LIBF's approach to the accreditation of prior learning (APL) is set out in the Code of Practice Chapter 3 [017] which sets out the process for reviewing and approving previous certificated or experiential learning under the General Academic Regulations [030]. Claims must be made in writing and supported by relevant evidence and all claims are received, recorded and processed through the programme teams. A high-level report on APL granted across all programmes and at all levels together with any information on relative student performance by those in receipt of APL is reviewed annually by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee [173-174].

98 Consideration of the Guidelines for External Examiners [286] together with the External Examiners Annual Report Form [284] and summary of the External Examiners Annual Report [281] provided confirmation by the external examiners that the processes of assessment were valid and reliable [281]. Students also confirmed that the assessment of work and grades awarded were 'fair and consistent across the board' [SS].

99 All students are enabled to have an understanding of the basis on which academic judgements are made through information contained in their Programme Handbooks [404-

407]. These include comprehensive information on assessment, assessment practices including arrangements for marking and feedback, the role of the external examiner, the marking criteria and also signposts students to academic regulations for further details.

100 The team found that it is clear that the student voice is important to LIBF as students are represented on a wide range of committees [Code of Practice Chapter 11: Student Engagement 025], feedback is sought and listened to and that dialogue takes place through the Student Experience Committee [ToR 050], SSLC [ToR 057; minutes 113-119] and periodic surveys and reviews [263-280], and students are able to access policies, regulations and the Code of Practice, including areas such as assessment feedback policy [182] on the website [SS; <https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/policies-regulations-and-code-of-practice> accessed 20.05.21]. The team was able to establish that staff and students engaged in meaningful dialogue to promote a shared understanding of the basis on which judgements are made because of the clear and comprehensive information provided to students underpinned by minutes of relevant meetings and the student submission.

101 Under the Code of Practice Chapter 9: Malpractice, [023] LIBF is responsible for ensuring that students and others involved in the delivery of a programme have access to the rules and regulations regarding malpractice. The principles have been aligned to the UK Quality Code and it is compulsory for any stakeholder aware of a suspected case of malpractice to bring it to LIBF's attention in line with the Code of Practice Chapter 7, Assessment [021]. The Code further states that it is the students' responsibility to ensure that they understand the rules and seek advice and guidance as necessary to avoid committing malpractice. LIBF ensures that students are provided with guidance on what is expected of them at the start of the programme. At induction, this includes study skills with the Guide to Referencing [344], through information provided on the VLE, including the use of Turnitin UK, [619] and specifically the Personal Development and Employability module [207]. Students may also be interviewed if a marker flags a concern and suspects contract cheating [SAR]. Evaluation of the range of evidence and materials seen by the team confirms that LIBF has in place clear guidance to ensure that students can develop an understanding of, and the necessary skills to demonstrate, good academic practice.

102 Cases identified are investigated and considered by the Malpractice Committee [055] which may range from no case to answer through academic misconduct to serious malpractice, with an associated range of outcomes from case dismissed, feedback, warning, capped or reduced mark and ultimately termination of studies so that the outcome fairly reflects, and is proportionate to, the level of malpractice [Malpractice Outcome Categories 257]. The prevalence of malpractice is regularly reviewed and evaluated at the Academic Standards and Quality Committee [ToR 048] through an annual report which documents and analyses the number and type of malpractice cases by level and mode of study, including any recommendations for referral to the Head of Faculty [Report 2020 255 and report 2019 256]. Reports to the committee seen by the team confirm that malpractice is reviewed and evaluated.

103 In 2016-17, LIBF sought to develop its marking practices and moved away from professional body practices to bring it more in line with practice in the sector [SAR]. These processes for marking assessments and for moderating marks now reflect the UK Quality Code and are set out in the Code of Practice Chapter 7: Assessment [021] and in the General Academic Regulations [030]. The marking and moderation process is standardised and operated by the HE Programme team (HEP) using approved marking moderation forms [458] to maintain the consistency and integrity of the marking and feedback process. The process [Feedback process 561] of marking starts with one lecturer marking the whole cohort to ensure the consistency of marking and by completing the first part of the Marking Moderation form [458] for each cohort if there has been collective feedback of five or more students. The form is then sent to the moderator with a sample of 10% or at least six

examples of marked work and the form includes standardised questions such as 'Is the marking fair?' and 'Is the feedback clear?', which the moderator then completes [example of moderation form with no issues 563, example moderation form with issues 564]. The form is returned to the lecturer who agrees the marks with the Moderator, with the Dean mediating if there is no agreement. The marked work is then returned to the student within 15 working days of submission. This process is monitored by HEP and overseen by the Dean [Feedback process 561]. External examiners are sent a sample of the dissertations to moderate CoP Chapter 8 External Examining [022]. Adherence to the marking and feedback processes has been commended by external examiners [EE Review MCA Results sheet 568].

104 Assessment methodologies are reviewed twice a year by faculty using the Programme or Module Change Request Form [462] under the HE Module Review Policy [183]. There is clear evidence of engagement with students over assessment practices, and of internal processes for reviewing change. For example, changes to assessment are discussed at Staff Student Liaison Committee meetings where student input on types of assessment and guidelines were noted as well received [117-119]. In November 2018, however, students showed some dissatisfaction with group work and clearer guidelines were produced as a result [SSLC Minutes 221118 118]. The matter was discussed further at Learning and Teaching Committee [Minutes 107] and followed up at a subsequent faculty meeting [Minutes 132, 329]. Based on the documentation provided for marking assessments and for moderating marks, the team is able to conclude that LIBF has a clearly articulated and consistently operated assessment process.

105 The team found that LIBF had demonstrated robust arrangements for the valid and reliable processes of assessment, including for the recognition of prior learning, to enable every student to demonstrate the extent to which they have achieved the intended learning outcomes because of the clear documentation provided, evidencing the implementation of the Code of Practice and confirmed by external examiners and students.

External examining

106 LIBF recognises the importance of scrupulous use of external examiners to help ensure independent external participation in the management of academic standards through its Code of Practice Chapter 8: External Examining [022] which details the use of external examiners and, after nomination and approval [283], provides them with clear guidelines on their roles [Guidelines for External Examiners 286]. A register of external examiners [285] is kept which is reported to the ASQC. External examiners attend assessment boards and through a standing agenda item are expected to provide feedback on assessments [051] which is incorporated into the programme Annual Monitoring Report [176;552]. The External Examiner Annual Report, using a standard report form [284], is consolidated into an overarching report compiled by the Quality Policy and Regulation Team for annual presentation to the Academic Board [281]. External examiners are asked to comment on assessment, for example, whether the assessment provides suitable coverage of the learning outcomes [External Examiners Annual Report 281]. External examiners are sent a sample of the dissertations to moderate [CoP Chapter 8 External Examining 022]. Through the consolidated External Examiner Annual Report [281], external examiners have confirmed that the assessed work sampled is comparable with other UK degree-awarding bodies.

107 The Code of Practice Chapter 8: External Examining sets out the importance of independent, objective feedback from each external examiner and the process for full and serious consideration of their reports [022]. External examiners' consolidated report is considered by Learning and Teaching Committee [049] and Academic Board [External examiner Report 281].

108 The programme Annual Monitoring Report with summaries of examiners reports and action taken in response are also made available to student representatives as part of the annual monitoring process [176;552]. External examiners may also request formal meetings with students [022]. Three examples were provided in additional evidence to demonstrate that LIBF responds in a timely manner to external examiners with observations and action plans at undergraduate, postgraduate and apprenticeship level, demonstrating full consideration of their comments and recommendations [553-558]. In one of these examples an external examiner comment concerning using the full range of marks was fed back to faculty to improve the quality of the academic experience for students [555]. The team was able to ascertain through the evidence provided that LIBF could demonstrate that it makes scrupulous use of external examiners and gives full and serious consideration to the comments and recommendations contained in external examiners' reports and responds in a timely and considered manner.

Academic appeals and student complaints

109 The processes detailing complaints and appeals are evident in the Code of Practice Chapter 10: Student Complaints and Appeals [024], which lays out the distinct processes for complaints and appeals, the process for submitting a complaint, and how the complaint is handled. This includes informal resolution, escalation to the Complaints Officer, and to the Complaints and Appeals Review Group (CARG) which provides formal consideration of escalated complaints and appeals and the monitoring of any developing trends in service delivery [ToR Complaints and Appeals Review Group 054], and ultimately escalation to the Academic Board [ToR Academic Board 045].

110 Guidance is provided to students from the Programme Team to confirm the correct procedure to follow, and if the complaint falls into both the complaint and appeals procedures, the case is directed to a Designated Complaints Officer [Code of Practice Chapter 10 024]. Information and guidance are available to students on the VLE [619], including how to query a result or appeal a decision or make a complaint and the timescales for doing so. Students confirm in the student submission that the policies and procedures are available to them from LIBF's website [SS].

111 Drawing on guidance from the UK Quality Code, the Office of the Independent Adjudicator, the Competition and Marketing Authority and the Equality Act 2010, the complaints policy applies to registered, enrolled and recent former students of LIBF, together with apprenticeships, where appropriate [Code of Practice Chapter 10 024]. LIBF states in its Code of Practice [Chapter 10 024] that it would normally deal with all complaints as promptly as possible and would aim to resolve a complaint informally in the first instance, with a resolution to satisfy both parties. If escalated, the Complaints Officer will acknowledge receipt of the complaint within five working days and keep the student informed of time scales and progress. If escalated further to CARG, the complaint would normally be considered within 20 working days of the case being referred and if resolution is still not achieved then the student has 10 working days from notification of the outcome to request escalation to the Academic Board review panel on the grounds of defective procedure, unreasonable outcome or new evidence [Code of Practice Chapter 10 024].

112 The Code of Practice chapter 10 [024] outlines the various stages of an appeal and details the type of appeal which can be made, including a malpractice outcome or an admissions decision. The Code confirms that an academic appeal can only be made against a final decision at a module or programme board and not against a provisional grade result. Students should make their appeal in writing to their Programme Team within 15 working days of the result being communicated to them and LIBF refuse the right to appeal after this deadline. LIBF will acknowledge receipt of an appeal within five working days. The Programme Team Manager confirms in the first instance whether the appeal has been

upheld or not, and if upheld, it proceeds to CARG and can be escalated to Academic Board if the student requests this.

113 CARG [ToR 054] reports to the Operating Committee on a quarterly basis and submits an annual report [175] to it with an extract relevant to higher education complaints and appeals provided to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee [048], signed off by the Academic Board [045]. From a review of the quarterly report from CARG in 2020 [175] very few complaints and appeals are received and all are resolved according to the published procedures. The team was able to establish that LIBF demonstrated that effective procedures are in place for handling academic appeals and student complaints about the quality of the academic experience, and that, although the level of complaints and appeal was low, the procedures were handled in a fair, accessible and timely fashion.

Conclusions

114 The assessment team formulated its judgement against this criterion according to the process set out in the Guidance for Providers, in particular Annex 4.

115 LIBF operates effective processes for the design, development and approval of programmes and has demonstrated that it operates them through the validation of its own programmes which are strategically planned. The Code of Practice is the guidance document for LIBF staff, students and external advisers involved in the development and approval of programmes with details about the different stages of the process and their roles and responsibilities in relation to them. Responsibility for approving new programme proposals is clearly assigned through the deliberative committee structure following a validation or periodic review process involving student, external academics and employers and any outcomes from the process are monitored through committee deliberation. Engagement and close links are maintained with the learning and support services to ensure that programmes are appropriately resourced through the planning, design and approval processes and planning and briefing meetings.

116 LIBF demonstrates a strategic approach to learning and teaching through its Learning Teaching and Assessment Strategy which sets out its principal, strategic objectives, quality standards, academic development and scholarship arrangements and is supported by a range of policies and strategies setting out the standards for its programmes and the quality of the student learning opportunities. The strategy is monitored through its governance and committee structure and communicated to staff and students.

117 LIBF has clearly articulated policies which the team considers as appropriate to maintain a physical, virtual and social learning environment that is safe, accessible and reliable for every student and promotes dignity, courtesy and respect in their use. These documents are overseen by the Health and Safety Committee who ensures compliance of the aims of the policies. Robust arrangements exist for ensuring learning opportunities provided of its students that may be studying at a distance from the organisation are effective. This is done through a comprehensive online induction and orientation including access to an online library, and supported with an online study guide, with programme handbooks providing guidance and information on study skills, assessments and support. Every student is enabled to monitor their progress and further their academic development through the main mechanism of assessment feedback.

118 The Code of Practice on assessment and accreditation of prior learning as well as the general academic regulation define the processes of assessment and set down the procedures for the awarding of credit and how credit claims are assessed. These procedures are overseen through the deliberative committee structure where the breadth of assessment and the levels of programmes and modules are bi-annually reviewed. Students are provided

with detailed information about assessment and marking criteria in their handbooks to enable an understanding of the basis on which academic judgements are made. All students are given opportunities to develop an understanding of, and the necessary skills to demonstrate, good academic practice by introducing them to study skills, referencing and a professional development module at induction. They are also made aware of the rules and regulations regarding malpractice which are contained within the Code of Practice and outlines the process LIBF operates for preventing, identifying, investigating and responding to unacceptable academic practice. LIBF has a standardised process for marking and moderation which is set out in the Code of Practice. The process involves a separate moderator and external examiners and is overseen by the HE Programme Team who ensures that the process for marking assessments and moderating marks is clearly articulated and consistently operated by those involved in the assessment process.

119 External examiners are appointed for all programmes through a robust appointment and approval process, and LIBF makes scrupulous use of them to ensure independent external participation in the management of academic standards. External examiners attend assessment boards and are also used in the development of assessment and student assessed work. The external examiners provide annual reports which are considered at the Learning and Teaching Committee and at Academic Board and an annual monitoring report captures summaries and actions in the response to the external examiners' comments and recommendations. This report is also shared with students. The process demonstrates that LIBF gives full and serious consideration to the comments and recommendations contained in the external examiner's reports.

120 LIBF has effective procedures for handling academic appeals and student complaints and these are clearly detailed in the Code of Practice, which is available to students via the VLE, and students confirmed that the process can also be found on the LIBF website. The processes are fair, accessible and detailed, outlining each stage with timescales. Any complaints and appeals made are monitored and reported to the Operating Committee, although there was evidence that very few complaints or appeals had been recently received. Those that the team had seen noted that appropriate action had been taken and dealt with in accordance with the policy. The team therefore concludes that the criterion is met.

Criterion C: Scholarship and the pedagogical effectiveness of staff

Criterion C1 - The role of academic and professional staff

121 This criterion states that:

C1.1 An organisation granted powers to award degrees assures itself that it has appropriate numbers of staff to teach its students. Everyone involved in teaching or supporting student learning, and in the assessment of student work, is appropriately qualified, supported and developed to the level(s) and subject(s) of the qualifications being awarded.

122 The QAA assessment team conducted an assessment of this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment for Variation and Revocation of Degree Awarding Powers (December 2019)*.

The evidence considered, and why and how the team considered this evidence

123 The QAA assessment team assessed this criterion by reference to a range of evidence gathered according to the process described in the Guidance for Providers, in particular the suggested evidence outlined in Annex 5 and the provider's submission.

Specifically, the review team considered or assessed:

- a To evaluate LIBF's approach to ensuring it has appropriate numbers of staff to deliver its programmes, the team considered: LIBF's Staff Student Ratios [613] and evidence of staff policies relating to faculty sufficiency: LIBF's HE Strategic Statement [037]; Recruitment to Faculty Policy [185] and the Self Assessment Report [SAR].
- b To evaluate LIBF's approach to ensuring that its programmes have appropriately qualified staff with relevant academic and professional expertise to deliver its programmes, the team considered: Staff CVs [581-583] and information available on LIBF's website [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/academic-community>: 19.04.2021], job descriptions for a range of roles [585-587], documentation relating to staff recruitment processes, including the Recruitment to Faculty Policy [185], Recruitment Procedure [590], Shortlisting Form [591] and Interview Questions [589]. It also reviewed LIBF's Values and Competency Framework [198] and HE Strategic Statement [037].
- c To verify that LIBF's staff are appropriately supported and developed to maintain the level and subject of the qualification awarded, the team reviewed information provided during their induction: the Code of Practice Chapter 12 Staff Development [026], Recruitment to Faculty Policy [185], Staff conference presentations and Thought Leadership sessions [302], Faculty Meeting: Assessment Feedback and Support Presentation [329], Response to further information on staff induction [593], Induction checklist [594], Induction Day Timetable [595], Staff Handbook [596], Overview of Faculty Induction [597] and the Lecturer Handbook [598]. The team also considered the evidence relating to ongoing professional development that might support LIBF's stated commitment to supporting staff reflection and development. In particular, the team sought examples of how staff had undertaken professional development both in pedagogical or scholarly activity or in professional expertise in their specialism, including: LIBF Talks 2019 [300], Examples of Staff Conference Presentations and Thought Leadership [302], Values and Competency Framework [198], Response to request for information on induction [593], External

Activities [305], Curriculum Design and External Expertise [315], Faculty CPD Entries Example [299], Development Request Form [465], HR Report [601], Organisational and individual Memberships [304], Response to request for information on PDRs [599], and Response to request for information on CPD [600].

- d To verify how staff are kept up to date with current developments in the academic and professional communities and LIBF's methods to disseminate good practice, the team considered LIBF Talks 2019 [300], Examples of Staff Conference Presentations and Thought Leadership [302], Did you know... Assessments [303], and Academic Community Expertise [313]. The team also considered evidence of the new Head of Academic Development job description [301], Faculty Meeting Agenda 180121 [132] and the TARGET Learning Design Tool [314] to determine LIBF's commitment to continuing pedagogical development.
- e To confirm staff qualifications and professional development that contribute to aspects of the student experience and student support other than learning and teaching, the team considered Mental Health First Aid Training Certificate [433], MH Awareness Workshop [434], Prevent eLearning Certificate [423] and BACP Registration Certificate [439].
- f To assess LIBF's approach to ongoing staff development in learning and teaching and opportunities for staff to reflect on their own practice, the team considered the Teaching Observation Policy [184], Response to query regarding Peer Observation [611], Teaching Observation Form [612], Lecturer Feedback Form [466], Annual Monitoring Report 2018 [176], Example of Year Tutor Sharing Feedback [273], LTC Minutes [104], SSLC Minutes [113], Assessment Feedback Audit Report 2018 [170] and Faculty Meeting: Assessment Feedback and Support Presentation [329]. The team reviewed mechanisms in LIBF to encourage reflection and good practice on assessment and feedback, including the Teaching Observation Policy [184], Faculty Meeting: Assessment Feedback and Support Presentation [329], and the Assessment Feedback Audit Report 2018 [170].

How any samples of evidence were constructed

124 The team considered all evidence submitted by LIBF relating to this criterion. This evidence was sufficient to meet the purpose of the assessment and no further sampling was requested.

What the evidence shows

125 The assessment team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

126 LIBF has sufficient staff to enable it to deliver its current portfolio of programmes with a student:staff ratio of 40.8:1, [613] which LIBF asserts is within the norm in higher education. Furthermore, LIBF calculates its staff:student ratio based on full-time and fractional staff, and this is supplemented by visiting lecturers. A recent review and change of approach in staffing to move away from a heavy reliance on visiting lecturers is evidence of a commitment to ensuring faculty sufficiency [SAR; LIBF's HE Strategic Statement 037]. As student numbers grow, LIBF is putting in place systems which will ensure the continued monitoring of LIBF's Higher Education Strategic Statement, including a review of the Recruitment to Faculty Policy every 12-18 months [185]. The team considered this to demonstrate that LIBF will continue to ensure it has appropriate numbers of staff to deliver its programmes.

127 An analysis of staff CVs, job descriptions and documentation relating to the recruitment process provides evidence of an academic community that has appropriate

professional and academic qualifications, including expertise in the subject areas of banking and finance. Staff CVs [581-583] and information publicly available on LIBF's website [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/academic-community>: 19.04.2021] provides evidence that supports LIBF's stated commitment [Higher Education Strategic Statement 037] to providing an academic portfolio rooted in professional practice with a strong focus on employability. There is robust evidence within the website information and CVs of professional practice and experience within LIBF's academic community, both visiting and among LIBF staff. At the same time, there is evidence of academic qualifications and experience at all levels. Staff members have appropriate academic qualifications, including many who also have teaching qualifications such as PG Certificates in Higher Education or HEA (Advance HE) Fellowship. Among the academic community are staff with an extensive range of professional qualifications and membership of professional bodies, in the UK and internationally, appropriate to the programmes delivered. Examples include Certified International Trade Adviser, Institute of Export and International Trade, Associate of Chartered Institute of Bankers, and Fellowship of the Chartered Institute of Personnel Development, as well as experience as consultants and members of advisory boards. LIBF has a well-integrated Values and Competency Framework [198], which is consistently incorporated into all its role descriptions [585-587] and testifies to the increasing levels of responsibility that accompanies staff working at higher levels. Members of staff with roles in education leadership are appropriately qualified and experienced [LIBF website, <https://www.libf.ac.uk/about-us/academic-community>: 19.04.2021] because they have academic qualifications commensurate with the level of study and subject taught, as well as having teaching qualifications and industry experience.

128 LIBF's policy on the recruitment of staff is set out in its Recruitment to Faculty Policy [185] and Recruitment Procedure [590]. The shortlisting [591] and interview processes [589] are formalised and fair because standardised templates are used to encourage equal treatment of all candidates. The Dean has significant decision-making power in the application process and is responsible for an initial sift and shortlisting of candidates [185: 1]. The application process consists of an initial application (cover letter and CV, plus references), an interview and then a presentation if successful at interview. Recruitment to academic posts is consistent with the principles outlined in LIBF's Recruitment to Faculty Policy [185] because the evidence shows that most members of staff have both postgraduate qualifications and relevant industry experience, as outlined in its principles [185: 1]. The team requested further evidence of CVs [581-583] and role descriptors [585-588] and was satisfied that staff with leadership roles in learning and teaching are appropriately qualified. The team found that LIBF's recruitment processes are robust because these ensure that only staff with the relevant academic and professional expertise to deliver its programmes are appointed.

129 The team reviewed evidence to verify that LIBF's staff are also supported and developed on an ongoing basis. LIBF policy states that newly recruited staff should have a formal induction [026]. The evidence confirms that staff are inducted on arrival and over the early stages of their appointment [SAR; 185]. The induction checklist [594] and Staff Handbook [596] ensure that staff are aware of administrative support, HR processes and introductory company knowledge, while the Induction Day Timetable [595] provides an introduction to learning and teaching and the educational provision of LIBF. The Lecturer Handbook [598] and Overview of Faculty Induction [597] provide basic introductions to responsibilities relating to learning and teaching on LIBF programmes.

130 The team could not find an introduction to LIBF's regulations and policies during induction. The focus of the Lecturer Handbook is on assessment rather than academic standards or regulations. Furthermore, visiting lecturers do not receive any formal induction, though they are briefed locally and are invited to attend LIBF's annual HE conference [Statement in response to Request 27 593]. The team found it hard to ascertain how newly

recruited staff are introduced to the key regulations and policies designed to assure academic standards in LIBF. However, given that there is strong oversight and coordination between LIBF staff and visiting lecturers, no evidence of misapplication of policies, and no complaints or appeals on these grounds from students, the evidence suggests that LIBF's induction processes are adequate. LIBF's communication of LIBF policy and of learning and teaching initiatives takes place in fora other than in induction. Staff conference presentations and Thought Leadership sessions [302] provide opportunities for staff to share their experiences and for LIBF to disseminate good practice. Faculty meetings also provide opportunities for this purpose, such as the Faculty Meeting: Assessment Feedback and Support Presentation [329]. These are forms of ongoing induction and provide a mechanism for maintaining currency for established members of staff. The team found that LIBF's staff are supported on arrival and through ongoing induction in a way that ensures they are able to maintain the level and subject of the qualification they deliver.

131 LIBF's Code of Practice dedicates Chapter 12 to Staff Development [026]. It references the UK Quality Code and specifically to following the advice and guidance on learning and teaching. This Code of Practice outlines LIBF's commitment to continued and ongoing staff development. The team examined evidence to support this stated commitment to staff reflection and development. While staff are encouraged to discuss opportunities for continuing professional development (CPD) with their line manager, it is a requirement of their contract [026] to attend at least one CPD session relating to their subject expertise or pedagogy, and there is clear evidence of this in action (see paragraph 132).

132 LIBF has no formalised annual professional development review (PDR) process in which staff systematically and formally discuss their developmental needs [Statement in response to Request 28 599]. The team considered that this is unusual in a higher education institution, but manageable in an organisation of the size of LIBF. The Code of Practice Chapter 12 on Staff Development [026] claims that staff have performance reviews regularly with the Dean during the year to discuss their development requirements, but this is not clear in the evidence. Nevertheless, the evidence shows that even without a formalised PDR system, staff are supported and engage in a wide range of professional and pedagogical CPD activities. The evidence submitted by LIBF provided some examples of faculty CPD activities [299] and of staff conference presentations [302]. The team requested additional evidence to gain a better understanding of the extent to which CPD activities were supported by LIBF. The response included information regarding support for staff development: for faculty to maintain currency in their area of subject expertise, acquire new professional or teaching qualification or to undertake other CPD activities that relate to LIBF's core business [Statement in response to Request 29 600]. LIBF have supported 179 training courses for its staff in the last three years [Statement in response to Request 29 600] and made funds available to support its staff in relevant CPD activities [600].

133 Each member of staff has a job description that aligns to LIBF's Values and Competency Framework [198], and the documentation confirms that requests for support for CPD activities are considered through discussions with line managers and completion of a Development Request Form [465] within the context of this framework.

134 LIBF's Code of Practice [026] states a commitment to providing opportunities for staff to engage in professional development and there is strong evidence that it delivers this. Professional development for academic staff falls mainly in two areas: pedagogical development/maintaining currency in higher education practices and development of professional industry expertise in a relevant subject area. There is evidence of using in-house Faculty meetings, LIBF Talks 2019 [300] and Programme Days to engage staff in the development of learning and teaching and to reflect on their professional practice in pedagogy. An Annual HE Conference, referred to in the LIBF Code of Practice [026], provides an opportunity for staff to engage in reflection and evaluation of their practice. The

evidence provides examples of staff conference presentations and Thought Leadership [302] where staff disseminate their knowledge to colleagues in LIBF and visiting lecturers. There are staff information sessions where LIBF informs its staff of new developments in its learning and teaching infrastructure, such as the 'Did you know... assessments' [303] which gives further credence to claims of ongoing induction, engagement, reflection and evaluation of pedagogical practice within the institution.

135 The team reviewed evidence of continued staff development in their professional field of expertise and in scholarship. Examples of continuing development activities in CVs, and examples of staff conference presentations and Thought Leadership [302], provide evidence of professional networking and understanding of current trends in the field of banking and finance as well as in scholarship, and the dissemination of such knowledge and understanding [302] is used to inform and enhance teaching across LIBF [302]. Faculty CPD Entries [299] provide evidence of the opportunities staff have to develop their pedagogic and professional practice, and evidence that staff engage with a range of scholarly and practitioner-based CPD, including conferences, research days and seminars.

136 In 2020, LIBF recognised that further support was required in the pedagogy of digital learning and so appointed a Head of Academic Development [301 Job Description]. The role is to assist LIBF in developing teaching expertise in this area and provide tools and guidance for academic staff [132 Faculty Meeting Agenda 180121, 314 TARGET Learning Design Tool]. The team considered that this appointment demonstrated LIBF's commitment to supporting pedagogical development.

137 Staff engage with activities of other providers and organisations, both in higher education and industry, related to their subject area. Evidence of staff memberships [304] demonstrate that staff have strong corporate connections through membership of external organisations. This is supported by evidence of external activities [305] and academic community expertise [313] that further reflect faculty engagement and expertise. More specifically, the Curriculum Design and External Expertise [315] document provides evidence of external engagement within higher education, including staff who hold roles in and have experience of working in quality assurance, as validation panel members and as external examiners.

138 Professional services staff are included within staff development policies and are also supported. There is evidence of professional development, for example in mental health [433; 434], Prevent [423], counselling [439], software and managerial training. This information is recorded by LIBF on a spreadsheet [601] and provides evidence of engagement in developmental opportunities by professional services staff with the appropriate skills and expertise to support students.

139 The evidence submitted indicates that academic staff are required to engage in the reflection and evaluation of learning, teaching and assessment because staff not only respond to student evaluations of their teaching on each module in a critical and reflective manner [Annual Monitoring Report 1 Aug 2018 to 31 July 2019 176], but they also complete a lecturer feedback form [466]. This explicitly compels a reflection on their own performance, as does the annual peer observation process [184; 611; 612]. Similarly, there is evidence that year tutors share feedback with lecturers, which again prompts reflection and actions if appropriate [273].

140 The Teaching Observation and Peer Review Policy [184] forms the basis of a framework for the peer review of teaching and also for the role of teaching observation within staff appraisal. As it is not clear how the two processes are distinguished in the policy, the team requested some clarification from LIBF and further evidence to explain the distinction. LIBF's response confirmed that there is still some work to do in developing this policy and

differentiating the two aspects of informal and developmental teaching observation, as opposed to peer review of teaching, as part of a formal appraisal. The current approach to the process is informal and LIBF reported that there is no form to record feedback and that observation outcomes are verbal [611]. As a result, the team found it hard to identify the impact of teaching observations. These mechanisms, however, do encourage staff to reflect on performance, and a teaching observation form has been developed for that purpose [612]. The team concluded that, notwithstanding the informality in some areas, LIBF staff have ongoing staff development in learning and teaching and opportunities to reflect on their own practice.

141 According to LIBF's Self-Assessment Report [SAR], there has been a particular focus in the last two years on assuring the quality of assessment and feedback, following an internal Assessment Feedback Audit Report 2018 [170]. This claim is supported by the evidence which shows, for example, a Faculty Meeting: Assessment Feedback and Support Presentation [329] to disseminate a common understanding and good practice in this area, and that staff have expertise in providing feedback on assessment that is timely, constructive and developmental. Assuring the quality of assessment and feedback is also a constant theme in minutes of LTCs [for example, 104] and SSLCs [113].

Conclusions

142 The assessment team formulated its judgement against this criterion according to the process set out in the Guidance for Providers, in particular Annex 4.

143 LIBF staff involved in teaching or supporting student learning, and in the assessment of student work, are appropriately qualified, supported and developed to the level and subject of the qualifications being awarded. This is because the evidence demonstrates that LIBF is following its own regulations and criteria in recruiting appropriately qualified staff, CVs seen by the team show that academic staff are appropriately qualified and LIBF has demonstrated a commitment to staff development for both academic and support staff.

144 LIBF's staff recruitment processes are robust, consistent with its policies and ensure that only staff with the relevant academic and professional expertise to teach their programmes are appointed. It has an appropriate number of staff to teach its students. Although LIBF has recently increased the number of full-time staff, the relatively high student to staff ratio does not reflect LIBF's use of visiting lecturers to support full-time staff. LIBF is committed to reviewing the staffing policy every 12-18 months which allows it to plan for the continued sustainability of its programmes and manageable workloads for its staff to enable them to continue to engage in professional development, especially if numbers of students increase. New members of staff undertake induction activities and the creation of the new role of Head of Academic Development is a positive step towards formalising stronger oversight of approaches to induction and staff development.

145 Staff are provided with opportunities to participate in internal and external development activities, such as teaching observations, research days, external membership of industry organisations and attending conferences, that ensure ongoing engagement with pedagogic development in their professional practice, and subject-specific and educational scholarship. The team reviewed strong and consistent evidence that academic staff are appropriately qualified to teach at the levels of qualification they deliver and that they engage in a wide range of professional development opportunities to ensure active engagement with pedagogical practice and development of their subject expertise. Staff are well-connected professionally as well as pedagogically informed. There is strong evidence to demonstrate that staff are engaged in reflection and evaluation of their learning, teaching and assessment practice as well as personal and community practice. Learning and teaching-related

presentations and conferences demonstrate how LIBF disseminate good practice to colleagues.

146 The evidence shows that despite no formalised PDR system, staff are supported and engage in a wide range of professional and pedagogical development activities and opportunities. Members of the academic community actively engage with the pedagogic development of their discipline knowledge as well as in their area of professional expertise, enabling them to enhance their practice and scholarship. Professional services are well supported and maintain currency in up-to-date practice to support the academic community and student experience. The team concludes, therefore, that the criterion is met.

Criterion D: Environment for supporting students

Criterion D1 - Enabling student development and achievement

147 This criterion states that:

D1.1 Higher education providers have in place, monitor and evaluate arrangements and resources which enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential.

148 The QAA assessment team conducted an assessment of this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment for Variation and Revocation of Degree Awarding Powers (December 2019)*.

The evidence considered, and why and how the team considered this evidence

149 The QAA assessment team assessed this criterion by reference to a range of evidence gathered according to the process described in the Guidance for Providers, in particular the suggested evidence outlined in Annex 5 and the provider's submission.

Specifically, the review team considered or assessed:

- a To establish whether LIBF takes a comprehensive strategic and operational approach to determine and evaluate how it enables student development and achievement for its diverse body of students, the team considered the Learning Teaching and Assessment Strategy [038], Careers and Employability Strategy [040], Collaborative Provision Strategy [039], HE Enhancement Strategy [037] and the LIBF Code of Practice, specifically Chapter 6: Student Support and Guidance [020], Chapter 4: Learning and Teaching [018], Chapter 7: Assessment [021] and Chapter 11: Student Engagement, [025] the HE Special Consideration Policy [186], HE Reasonable Adjustments Policy [187], Equality and Diversity Policy [197], Values and Competency Framework [198]. The team also considered the operational arrangements for delivering the strategies across the student body by reviewing the Student Charter [031], Safeguarding Policy [188] and Prevent Duty Guidelines [189] together with examples of other development opportunities, including guest speakers and feedback opportunities [Early Module Feedback Semester 1 2020-21 267; Apprentice Workshop Feedback Modules 1 and 2 280, Guest Speakers 2019 20 364; Feedback Process 415; UG Feedback Form 461].
- b To assess the effectiveness of the monitoring of student and staff advisory, support and counselling services, and how any resource needs arising are considered, the team evaluated a range of evidence, including LIBF's Learning Teaching and Assessment Strategy [038] and Mental Health Strategy 2020 [041], Counselling and Mental Health Services, namely Counselling Support Services Information [431]; Mental Health Awareness Guide [432]; Mental Health First Aid Training Refresher Certificate of Attendance [433]; half day MH awareness workshop HE 22 January 2019 [434]; Counsellor-Client Agreement [435]; Counselling Initial Assessment Form [436]; Counselling Client Feedback Form [437]; Counselling Qualification [438]; BACP Registration Certificate [439]; BACP Membership Confirmation Letter [440]; Telephone Counselling Certificate of Attendance [441]; and Certificate in Online and Telephone Counselling [442]. The team also reviewed Annual Monitoring [176; 552], Student Handbooks [404-407], Learning and Teaching Committee Terms of Reference [049], and the minutes of the Learning and Teaching Committee [104-107] and SSLC [113-119] as well as the Student Submission [SS] and SAR, and considered examples of survey and feedback

mechanisms from a range of sources, namely the NSS [263-264], the Student Academic Experience Survey [275], module surveys [265-272] and Forum meetings [274;276] together with the Student Report to the Board of Governors [143] and the Report to the Board of Governors on the National Student Survey [144].

- c To determine that students are advised about, and inducted into, their study programmes in an effective way and account is taken of different students' choices and needs, the team considered the LIBF website [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/study/professional-qualifications>, accessed 19.05.21], the induction programme and early start materials [Apprentice Feedback via Forum Meeting 276, Academic Task Writing Submission for Library Feedback 277, Evaluating Library Study Skills Programmes 278; MSc Course Welcome and Induction Activities 371, Study Skills Screen Shot 1 388, Study Skills Screen Shot 2 389; Screenshot of VLE webinar attendance and recordings 401], the VLE to access the online library and online study guide [619], the Programme Handbooks [404-407] and the SAR.
- d To determine how LIBF's administrative support systems enable it to monitor student progression and performance accurately and provide timely, secure and accurate information to satisfy academic and non-academic management information needs, the team reviewed the role of the Operating Committee [SAR; 007] and the Terms of Reference of the Data Returns Group [052], Audit Committee [047] and Terms of Reference and minutes of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee [048] and Academic Board [045], the Access and Participation Plan [033-034], Annual Monitoring processes [Annual Monitoring Report 1 Aug 2018 to 31 July 2019 176, Screenshot of apprentice cohort online progression log 402; Draft Annual Monitoring Report 1 Aug19 31 July20 552] and an update report to the Board of Governors [150]. To determine the approach to analysing student cohorts in terms of access, success and progression, the team reviewed LIBF's Access and Participation Plans [033; 034], LIBF's website for its HE Scholarship Prizes and Bursaries Policy, [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/docs/default-source/HE/HE-Policies/he-scholarships-bursaries-and-prizes-policy.pdf?sfvrsn=26>, accessed 19.04.2021] and Outreach Ambassador Training [350].
- e To assess how LIBF provides opportunities for all students to develop skills that enable their academic, personal and professional progression, the team reviewed the SAR and evaluated the Careers and Employability Strategy [040], Audit Report HE Career Education Information Advice Guidance June 2015, [470], Head of Careers and Employability Job Description [471], Careers and Employability event calendars [472-474], Learning and Teaching Committee ToR [049] Careers Corporate Brochure 2017 [475], Careers in Fintech Conference [476], Guest Speakers 2019 [364], Careers and Employability Guidance Handbook [477]; Career Resources 'Telling your story' [478-479], Registrants on my career – users [480], Careers Events [481], Job Ads [482], the Career-employee timetable 2020 [483], and the DLHE 16-17 analysis information [484; <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/data-and-analysis/graduates/activities> accessed 19.05.21]. Specific modules relevant to skills development, namely the Level 4 PDE Personal Development Employability Module Specification [207] and the Level 6 FSP Retail Pathway Module Outline [380] with an extract from minutes of Client Programme Planning Meeting, [381] were considered, as were Evaluating the Quality of Training and Outcome in Apprenticeships [385], NSS scores for Library services [263], NSS Action Plan 264, External Examiners Annual Report, [281] the VLE [619], the Student Submission [SS] and the LIBF website [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/news-and-insights/our-events/wcbi-2019> accessed 20.05.21].

- f To assess how LIBF provides for safe and effective use of specialist facilities, and the use of digital and virtual learning environments, the team reviewed the Health and Safety Policy [195] and the IT Acceptable Policy [196].
- g To evaluate whether LIBF's approach is guided by a commitment to equity, the team considered the SAR, Learning Teaching and Assessment Strategy [038], the Student Charter [031], Equality and Diversity Strategy [197], Ethnicity data [365], Access and Participation Plans [033-034], HE Special Consideration Policy [186] and HE Reasonable Adjustments Policy, [187] together with a review of its Admissions Guidelines [414].

How any samples of evidence were constructed

150 The team considered all evidence submitted by LIBF relating to this criterion. This evidence was sufficient to meet the purpose of the assessment and no further sampling was requested.

What the evidence shows

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

152 LIBF sets out in four strategies its commitment to developing students' academic, personal and professional potential: the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy [038] which defines its strategic approach to innovation and enhancement and focuses on the development of the students learning experience and outcomes; the Careers and Employability Strategy [040] which supports the development of students personal and professional potential; the Collaborative Provision Strategy [039] which ensures partnership arrangements align with the delivery of higher education; and the HE Enhancement Strategy [037] which seeks to embed the ongoing enhancement of learning opportunities and teaching excellence in service provision.

153 The overarching principles for supporting students with their development and achievement are set out in the Code of Practice Chapter 6 Student Support and Guidance [020] and developed in Chapter 4 Learning and Teaching [018], Chapter 7 Assessment [021] and Chapter 11 Student Engagement [025] which have been mapped to the UK Quality Code to provide a solid basis for the implementation of those strategies. LIBF's Code of Practice Chapter 6 [020] sets out LIBF's approach to, and mechanisms for, student academic, personal and professional development. This aligns with the UK Quality Code, in particular the section relating to enabling student achievement, for both undergraduate and postgraduate programmes.

154 The LIBF Code of Practice makes clear that the opportunities for student development and achievement should enable students to take responsibility for their own learning, and LIBF commits to providing students with an enabling environment for academic, personal and professional development without barriers, recognising the diverse nature of the provision and that the opportunities for student development and achievement should take into consideration the needs of a diverse student body. The team found this further reflected in the Equality and Diversity Policy and Values and Competency Framework to ensure that individuals are not discriminated against and are treated fairly [197-198] and the HE Special Consideration Policy [186] and HE Reasonable Adjustments Policy [187]. Evidence from feedback processes demonstrate that LIBF enables students with different backgrounds, experiences and learning styles to benefit and develop using a range of inclusive and active teaching and learning practices to encourage and inspire students and provide them with feedback and other development opportunities [Early Module Feedback Semester 1 2020-21 267; Apprentice Workshop Feedback Modules 1 and 2 280, Guest Speakers 2019 20 364; Feedback Process 415; UG Feedback Form 461, Ethnicity Data

365, Early Module Feedback Semester 1 2020-21 267, Apprentice Workshop Feedback Modules 1 and 2 280] and that these take account of any special needs of the student body [Student Charter 031, HE Special Consideration Policy [186], HE Reasonable Adjustments Policy 187, Safeguarding Policy 188, Prevent Duty Guidelines 189].

155 LIBF's Learning Teaching and Assessment Strategy [038] and Mental Health Strategy 2020 [041] recognise the diversity of its student body and sets out the vision and strategic aims of LIBF to deliver a learning experience that supports students through induction, learning resources, and learning opportunities regardless of mode or location of study to ensure equality. These strategies are operationalised through a range of counselling and mental health services coordinated through the Student Support Centre which houses the HE Programmes Team, Support Helpdesk, Professional Counsellor and rooms for private consultations and which are signposted in Student Handbooks [404-407]. The team viewed evidence which supported these services and considered that, collectively, these provide a good foundation for support [Counselling Support Services Information 431; Mental Health Awareness Guide 432; Mental Health First Aid Training Refresher Certificate of Attendance 433; half day MH awareness workshop HE 22 January 2019 434; Counsellor-Client Agreement 435; Counselling Initial Assessment Form 436; Counselling Client Feedback Form 437; Counselling Qualification 438; BACP Registration Certificate 439; BACP Membership Confirmation Letter 440; Telephone Counselling Certificate of Attendance 441; and Certificate in Online and Telephone Counselling 442].

156 Terms of reference [049] confirm that the monitoring of advisory, support and counselling services is the responsibility of the Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) and SSLC. Minutes of LTC [104-107] and SSLC meetings [113-119] demonstrate that the advisory, support and counselling services are monitored carefully and reviewed at least twice each year, through a range of surveys and feedback mechanisms, including the National Student Survey (NSS) [263-264], the Student Academic Experience Survey [275], module surveys [265-272] and Forum meetings [274;276]. Any issues identified are discussed and actioned at the meetings. For example, it was recognised that in order to encourage feedback from students about the Mental Health Online Forum, LIBF took action to ensure it had a confidential mechanism in place so that students could comfortably engage [SSLC Minutes 113]. Student feedback in the student submission [SS] indicates broad understanding of the processes in place and satisfaction with LIBF's support for their 'studies, mental health and physical wellbeing'. The effectiveness of these processes is confirmed by the student submission [SS], and reports made to the Board of Governors which describes student support as 'at a high level' and 'outstanding' [143; 144].

157 Students are advised about and inducted into their study programmes in a variety of ways, including initially through the LIBF website [<https://www.libf.ac.uk/study/professional-qualifications> accessed 19.05.21] and VLE [619] which both provide a range of information on support services for prospective and current students. Details of the student induction programme indicate that this information is comprehensive because it includes an introduction to all relevant services and facilities and is tailored to the specifics of the individual programme and student cohort [Apprentice Feedback via Forum Meeting 276, Academic Task Writing Submission for Library Feedback 277, Evaluating Library Study Skills Programmes 278; MSc Course Welcome and Induction Activities 371, Study Skills Screen Shot 1 388, Study Skills Screen Shot 2 389; Screenshot of VLE webinar attendance and recordings 401]. All students receive a copy of the relevant student handbook [404-407], which contains detail about what can be expected during induction, available support and counselling services, course resources and information regarding teaching, learning and assessment. Online learners are provided with an online induction and orientation of the website and online library and a guide including how to access core texts and how to use discussion forums [Study Skills Screen Shot 1 388, Study Skills Screen Shot 2 389]. The team found that students are advised about and inducted into their courses in an effective

way, taking into account different students' choices and needs because of the clear information presented to different student groups and the evidence of feedback and review by the programme team.

158 The SAR describes the library team and support services together with a dedicated student enquiries service which has been in increasing use over the last year due to the COVID-19 pandemic [SAR]. This confirms a strategically led approach where support is embedded within the student experience induction and during their studies. One-to-one training sessions, including those for study skills, research, academic writing and referencing, are offered through webinars and workshops by the library team. The VLE [619] contains a dedicated study skills area with help guides and video and learning approaches as well as support for understanding assessments, which is reported as being well received by students [SAR].

159 To monitor student progression and performance accurately LIBF uses an in-house bespoke student information system to accommodate higher education, professional education and financial education business areas [SAR]. This database application holds the student record and contact details, but also information about students' programme of study and assessment details to enable the production of reports for use at assessment boards. Transition to a new third-party system that is specifically designed for the higher education sector is underway. This is to facilitate internal reporting, including student attainment and progression and the tracking and analysis of student admissions to support recording and monitoring of targets and integrate with external systems to facilitate interaction with bodies such as HESA, UCAS and Student Finance England [SAR].

160 The Data Returns Group (DRG) [ToR 052], which reports into the Operating Committee [ToR 007] and the Academic Standards and Quality Committee [ToR 048], is responsible for ensuring data quality and the collection and submission of data for external data returns. The Audit Committee is responsible for monitoring the governance process in relation to data quality and annual reports of achievement and significant risk are produced [ToR 047]. Data review and analysis is clearly evident: student progression and performance data is reported on at a programme and provider level through the Data Returns Group; annual Monitoring Reports [176, 552] are used to identify actions for quality improvement; and the Access and Participation Plan [033-034] is regularly reviewed at the Academic Board and Academic Standards and Quality Committee [045; 048]. Regulatory updates to the Board of Governors confirm that data matters, such as data returns, are considered at the highest levels of the governance structure [150]. The team found that LIBF's administrative systems enables it to monitor student progression and performance at a programme and institutional level and to make use of this data, which it does regularly through its reporting structures.

161 LIBF's Access and Participation Plans [033; 034] demonstrate a developed and increasingly rigorous approach to the analysis of the student cohort in terms of access, success and progression. The Access and Participation Plan [034] shows a robust analysis of the progression and performance of students from each cohort category and identifies where action is required to address underrepresented groups and under-achieving cohorts [034]. For example, to address the gender gap in applications and admissions to programmes, LIBF established Women into Finance Scholarships [034; HE Scholarship Prizes and Bursaries Policy: <https://www.libf.ac.uk/docs/default-source/HE/HE-Policies/he-scholarships-bursaries-and-prizes-policy.pdf?sfvrsn=26>, accessed 19.04.2021], which led to a modest increase in female applications of 6% [034]. Participation of Local Areas (POLAR) classification is a UK-wide measure of educational disadvantage based on young participation rates in higher education and it estimates how likely they are to go into higher education based on where they live and assigns local areas into five quintiles (Q1, Q2 etc), where quintile 1 areas have the lowest rates of participation to quintile 5 that has the highest.

To encourage applications from POLAR4 (latest release of classification) Q1 and Q2, LIBF enhanced its REACH (Routes to Enhancing ACHievement) programme and provided training on widening participation groups to its student ambassadors [Outreach Ambassador Training, 350]. LIBF also demonstrates its commitment to supporting its Access and Participation Plan through the increase in funding dedicated to supporting student success targets [033].

162 As a specialist provider within the financial services sector, LIBF's Careers and Employability Strategy sets out how LIBF aims to embed employability into the higher education curriculum and increase student achievement in obtaining employment [040]. LIBF undertook an Audit of Career Education Information provision in 2015 [470] and as a result recruited a Head of Careers and Employability [471] charged with developing a Careers and Employability Service [event calendars 472-474] which works with faculty to embed employability into the curriculum through the LTC [049] and in collaboration with recruiters from the financial services sector [475]. As a result, the employability provision is manifestly focused on future career opportunities in the sector, which includes: a Level 4 Personal Development and Employability module which was developed in 2018 and provides an early focus on study, personal and professional skills development [207]; careers support through sector-relevant conferences [476]; free professional events using invited guest speakers which provides exposure to current developments in the industry [Guest Speakers 2019 364]; a Careers and Employability Guidance Handbook [477]; supporting students through the application and selection process [478-479], and an online career centre, careers events and job opportunities [480-482].

163 In the student submission, students confirm that they are able to apply their learning to their job role in real life scenarios which has increased their confidence and allowed them to appreciate their current learning on their future job role [SS]. External examiners also comment positively on industry-relevant experiences in the curriculum [281]. For apprentices in particular, their professional needs are developed through bespoke modules which focus on business areas relevant to their future work [380-381]. The Destination of Leavers in Higher Education survey confirmed that all full and part-time students who participated were in employment or full-time study within six months of graduating [484], and a more recent HESA Graduate Outcomes Survey corroborated that LIBF was ranked third in the UK for full-time employment for undergraduate students [<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/data-and-analysis/graduates/activities>, accessed 19.05.21].

164 The Health and Safety Policy [195] and the IT Acceptable Policy [196] details the approach for ensuring a safe learning environment and effective use of facilities. For example, the Health and Safety Policy includes six objectives, including setting and maintaining high standards for health and safety throughout the organisation and identifying and removing risks. It outlines how it will do this through describing the responsibilities of the Health and Safety Committee and leadership responsibilities. The IT Acceptable Policy [195] outlines its approach towards unacceptable use of access of systems, legal responsibilities and penalties if users fail to abide by the rules.

165 LIBF has a strong commitment to fairness and impartiality, and the removal of barriers to learning in its approach to enabling student development and achievement. The team considers this commitment to be evident in LIBF's Equality and Diversity Policy [197] and Learning Teaching and Assessment Strategy [038] which set out the expectations for mutual respect between staff and students with a recognition that diversity is an asset to the learning community. It is also embedded in the Student Charter [031] which was developed jointly with students to establish individual rights and responsibilities and the requirement to treat all with dignity and fairness, and in keeping with sound equality and diversity principles. The team reviewed evidence of LIBF's responsiveness to the needs of students as demonstrated, for example, through the HE Special Consideration Policy [186] and HE

Reasonable Adjustments Policy [187] which set out the accommodations that can be made for students in unexpected circumstances or with temporary or permanent health and mental illness needs. LIBF takes active steps to monitor the recruitment, progression and achievement of students with regard to ethnicity, gender, age, disability and socioeconomic background to ensure that it supports the development and achievement of all students. As part of its Access and Participation Plan which commits to tracking the performance of underrepresented groups [033-034], in February 2018 the REACH initiative, which targets Black, Asian, minority ethnic (BAME), mature and female learners, was launched to encourage recruitment of a more diverse student body [SAR]. Ethnicity Data extracted from UCAS shows the increase in BAME students [365]. The Student Admissions Guidelines [414] provide consistent and fair processes for admissions, and the Admission Review Panel considers borderline applications to ensure consistency, transparency and removal of the risk of individual bias. There is a widening participation agenda [033-034], and the performance of three cohorts who entered with a lower tariff and were tracked over a five-year period were shown to succeed in completing their programme of study. The team confirmed that LIBF's approach is guided by a strong commitment to equity because of the evidence provided in its strategies which is then embedded operationally and demonstrated in data outcomes.

Conclusions

166 The assessment team formulated its judgement against this criterion according to the process set out in the Guidance for Providers, in particular Annex 4.

167 LIBF has a strategic, coherent and integrated approach to the provision of a learning environment to support all students which is set out through four strategies that embed the ongoing enhancement of learning opportunities for its diverse body of students. The approach is underpinned by overarching principles set out in its Code of Practice and supported by policies which take into consideration the needs of students with varied backgrounds and experiences. Students are effectively inducted into their study programmes, both in person and online, through an induction programme which is comprehensive in that it includes information and guidance relating to their programmes, support services and resources. Effective monitoring and evaluation of support services is undertaken through the management and committee structure where annual monitoring and survey results are considered and where student and resource needs are identified. LIBF has effective administrative support systems in place to monitor student progression and performance through a specific data-focused forum and is monitored regularly.

168 LIBF provides opportunities for all students to develop skills that enable their academic, personal and professional achievement through a strong focus on work-related learning and a range of transferable skills related to employability, personal and professional skills and where career management skills are embedded in the curriculum. LIBF provides opportunities for all students to make effective use of the learning resources provided to ensure a safe, accessible and reliable environment is in place for physical and online learners. The team found evidence of a strong commitment to fairness and impartiality and the removal of barriers to learning, demonstrated in the provision of a comprehensive and responsive range of services to support students which takes into account the needs of a diverse student body. The team concludes therefore that this criterion is met.

Criterion E: Evaluation of performance

Criterion E1 - Evaluation of performance

E1: An organisation granted degree awarding powers takes effective action to assess its own performance, respond to identified weaknesses and develop further its strengths.

169 The QAA assessment team conducted an assessment of this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment for Variation and Revocation of Degree Awarding Powers (December 2019)*.

The evidence considered, and why and how the team considered this evidence

170 The QAA assessment team assessed this criterion by reference to a range of evidence gathered according to the process described in the Guidance for Providers, in particular the suggested evidence outlined in Annex 5 and the provider's submission.

Specifically, the review team considered or assessed:

- a To determine how critical self-assessment is integral to the operation of its higher education provision and that action is taken in response to matters raised through internal or external monitoring, the team considered LIBF's Code of Practice for Quality Assurance document [015], HE Quality and Enhancement Policy [075], the Course Approval and Review Procedures [054] and Services Standards annual report [221]. To determine how the annual monitoring process works and how relevant committees, including input from external parties, critically review its content and associated actions through to completion, the team explored the Annual Monitoring Report [176] and Academic Board Minutes [083-090] and LTC minutes [104-107].
- b To understand and evaluate the mechanisms that exist for assigning and discharging action in relation to the scrutiny and monitoring of LIBF's academic provision, the team scrutinised Academic Board minutes [083-090] and external examiner reports [281-284]. The team also examined the processes for programme development, approval, and monitoring to ascertain how these are implemented in line with the principles established within LIBF's key strategies by reviewing the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy [038] and the HE Enhancement Strategy [043]. The team also considered how this activity is supported by a set of guidelines for panel members [237] in the task of scrutiny and approval and validation of programmes [validation reports 216; 215; 217].
- c To assess how the periodic review process contributes to LIBF's review activity, the team considered the Code of Practice Chapter 13 Programme Development Approval Monitoring and Review [027], ASQC minutes [097], LTC minutes [104-107], Academic Board minutes [083-090] and the BSc (Hons) Finance, Investment and Risk validation document [244], Learning Teaching Committee ToR [049] and LTC Minutes [104; 105; 106; 107]
- d To understand how LIBF draws lessons from practice elsewhere in the sector regarding the quality and sustainability of higher education operation, the team examined the External Review of HE Operations report [139], the SAR and Board of Governors meeting minutes 281119 [074]. In addition, the team looked at the other mechanisms for external and internal evaluation such as academic-related audits [171], Audit Report HE Career Education Information Advice Guidance June 2015

[470], HE Assessment Feedback audit report April 2018 [170], CPL Audit ToR 2021 [172], the Audit Committee ToR [047], Statement in response to evidence request 45 [636], Audit Committee agendas [637 – 641], Audit Committee minutes [642-646] and Board of Governors minutes [077]. The team also considered the Board of Governors Effectiveness Review Update [142] as further evidence of self-assessment and how it is reported to the Board of Governors [minutes 072].

- e To understand and evaluate how LIBF proactively considers views of external parties within its internal monitoring and review processes and mechanisms, the team considered External Review of HE Operations report [139], Academic Board minutes [083-090], CoP Chapter 13 Programme Development Approval Monitoring and Review [027], and guidelines for panel members [237]. To assess LIBF's approach to using expertise from within its organisation, the team reviewed the Thought Leadership Strategy [492], Organisational and Individual Memberships Jan 21 [304] and external activities [305].

How any samples of evidence were constructed

171 The team considered all evidence submitted by LIBF relating to this criterion. This evidence was sufficient to meet the purpose of the assessment and no further sampling was requested.

What the evidence shows

172 The assessment team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

173 LIBF's Code of Practice for Quality Assurance document [015] sets out how it manages quality assurance and enhancement of its higher education provision. The Code of Practice sets out that it has a systematic approach for identifying areas of concern and good practice, analysing how processes can be improved, and implementing and monitoring those changes. LIBF does this through articulated mechanisms and structures such as annual monitoring, course and programme review, internal and external audits and reviews, the use of external examiners and student feedback, which are discussed through LIBF's deliberative committees who identify a course of action and subsequently monitor it.

174 There are clearly articulated mechanisms and structures for the evaluation of performance. The HE Quality and Enhancement Policy [075] and the Course Approval and Review Procedures [054] describe the mechanisms used in the operation of LIBF's higher education provision aimed at ensuring critical self-assessment. The mechanisms of self-assessment include course approval and review; annual course review; the use of external examiner and industry adviser reports; reflecting on student evaluation and feedback; monitoring course performance through the use of data, and a cycle of quality review meetings [HE Quality and Enhancement Policy 075]. The mechanisms for the evaluation of higher education performance sit within the overall LIBF framework for monitoring and review which includes self-assessment of cross-college services such as admissions, library, careers, counselling and welfare through a Services Standards annual report [221].

175 LIBF's Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) [176] uses data sets around attainment, progression and continuation, and evidence such as module survey results to inform a comprehensive review of the performance of each programme. The AMR is first scrutinised by the Learning and Teaching Committee who monitors actions and final approval lies with Academic Board if there are any curriculum changes [SAR; Academic Board Minutes 083-090; LTC minutes 104-107]. The team found that evidence in the report and minutes in meetings demonstrate that the process is being followed and is consistent.

176 The Academic Board has appropriate oversight of periodic reviews, validations and examiner reports and in these Board meetings [083-090; 281-284] members challenge managers and programme teams to enrich further the offer and learning experience for students. For example, revisions proposed for the Sustainable Finance Postgraduate Certificate validation were as a result of the challenge to the teaching of content previously included for groups that had prior subject experience compared to those that did not [Academic Board Minutes 11120 083 p4]. Additionally, it was felt that putting the topic of finance at the forefront of the scheme of work, rather than focusing on more specialist topics, would also help in the structure of the programme [083 p4].

177 The team noted that requirements for programme development, approval, monitoring and review are implemented in line with the principles established within LIBF's Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy [038], and HE Enhancement Strategy [043] and are also supported by a set of guidelines for panel members who engage in the process of validation [237]. These guidelines are particularly helpful for external members as well as an aide memoire for internals and include a set of frequently asked questions ranging from the purpose of a validation event and the role of panel members, to the process following an event [Guidelines for Panel Members 237 pgs 3,4,5,6 & 7; validation reports 216; 215; 217]. Periodic review is required at least every five years [CoP Chapter 13 Programme Development Approval Monitoring and Review 027] and the schedule is monitored by ASQC [minutes 097]. Any action points following approval are monitored by ASQC and the Learning and Teaching Committee [CoP Chapter 13 Programme Development Approval Monitoring and Review 027]. Outcomes of a review might include commendations, observations, recommendations and/or conditions of approval. The team considered the self-evaluation document of the periodic review of the BSc (Hons) Finance, Investment and Risk [244] which included consideration of the module content, and student and external examiner feedback. The team found that the minutes of the Academic Board [083-090] and of the Learning and Teaching Committee [104-107] provide evidence that such reporting mechanism works efficiently and in accordance with LIBF's policy.

178 The Learning and Teaching Committee has robust oversight of programme monitoring [Learning Teaching Committee ToR 049] and formally review module content across all programmes [LTC Minutes 104; 105; 106; 107] to ensure standards are maintained and developed and that the student learning experience is of high quality.

179 LIBF commissioned an external review of its provision with a specific view to draw lessons from practice elsewhere in the sector regarding the quality and sustainability of higher education operations at LIBF [SAR; External Review of Higher Education 139]. The team considered the review wide ranging because it covered topics from finance and student recruitment, to evaluation of the student experience, teaching quality and academic governance, and the final report was reviewed formally by the Board of Governors [Minutes 074]. The report concluded that a more sustainable business model was needed and made recommendations on student numbers, putting more effort into student recruitment, reducing the complexity of LIBF's multi-mode operations, and reprioritisation of some spending [139]. The Governors' response to the report was to request priority be given to meeting the recommendations and, where possible, establish measurable targets in judging progress against them [Board of Governors minutes 074].

180 LIBF evaluates its performance through academic-related audits undertaken by the Quality, Policy and Regulation team such as the Certification audit report May 2017 [171]. The audit involved the review of systems and procedures as set out in supporting documents for certification for the Higher Education, Financial Capability and Corporate & Professional qualifications, and the report was received at Audit Committee [171]. Standard internal audits [Audit Report HE Career Education Information Advice Guidance June 2015 470] are carried out as well as others undertaken by external auditors [HE Assessment Feedback

audit report April 2018 170; Consumer Protection Law CPL Audit ToR 2021 172]. The report of Assessment Feedback Audit in 2018 [170] made three commendations and four recommendations which highlighted that more detail needed to be included in the process documents outlining the procedures for assessment feedback.

181 Audit reports are received into LIBF's Audit Committee [ToR 047, Agendas and minutes 636 – 646] and the resulting minutes are received at the Board of Governors [077]. LIBF also instigated a Board Effectiveness Review [Progress 142] where a working group was established to respond to the recommendations, such as updating the skills matrix for the Remuneration and Nominations Committee and developing and conducting a member survey on individual and collective effectiveness. Minutes of meetings confirm that updates on progress are discussed at Board of Governors [072].

182 LIBF seek the views of external parties to draw lessons from practice elsewhere in the sector regarding the quality and sustainability of higher education operations [SAR; External Review of Higher Education 139]. The Quality, Policy and Regulation team (QPR) oversees the nomination of external panel members for validation and review events and maintains a register of approved chairs. A final panel is approved by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) against criteria set by the Academic Board [minutes 083-090]. QPR is responsible for ensuring all panel members, including external representatives and student representatives, receive training and guidance as appropriate to enable their effective engagement with the validation or review processes [CoP Chapter 13 Programme Development Approval Monitoring and Review 027]. This may include observing other validation and/or review meetings, participating in pre-event briefings and post-event update meetings, and provision of panel guidance documentation [CoP Chapter 13 Programme Development Approval Monitoring and Review 027, Guidelines for panel members 237]. LIBF has several approaches to using expertise from within its organisation. Two of the aims of LIBF's Thought Leadership Strategy's [492] is to advance understanding about banking and finance by its staff and to enrich the learning of students through the development of innovative and teaching methods. It does this by encouraging academic staff to engage in external activities such as conferences and events, and by publishing articles. LIBF uses internal expertise on teaching and assessment through the industry experience of its own teaching staff and membership of external organisations [Organisational and Individual Memberships Jan 21 304]. Staff also engage with activities of other providers in roles as validation members and external examiners [External activities Jan 21 305].

Conclusions

183 The assessment team formulated its judgement against this criterion according to the process set out in the Guidance for Providers, in particular Annex 4.

184 Critical self-assessment is integral to the operation of its higher education provision and LIBF undertakes a robust approach to the self-critical review of its operations using clearly defined internal and external monitoring processes, which are comprehensive and evidence-based, drawing on sourced internal and external feedback. The outcomes of these processes are considered throughout LIBF's deliberate committee structure where action is taken in response to matters raised.

185 LIBF has clear mechanisms for assigning and discharging action in relation to the scrutiny and monitoring of its academic provision through its governance and committee structure, where there is a clear allocation of responsibility through the terms of reference, and minutes show the monitoring of the academic provision through internal and external reviews and audits and responses and actions taken as a result of recommendations or issues raised.

186 LIBF seek ideas and expertise from within and outside the organisation on programme, development and review by recruiting external experts onto its periodic and validation panels where external expertise and feedback inform curriculum development and currency of programme content. Internal staff are encouraged to engage with external activity and other organisations to develop their expertise and in turn share practice and add knowledge to programme development and teaching. The team concludes therefore that this criterion is met.

Full Degree Awarding Powers overarching criterion

187 The Full DAPs overarching criterion is that ‘the provider is a self-critical, cohesive academic community with a proven commitment to the assurance of standards supported by effective quality systems’.

Conclusions

188 LIBF has in place effective means of critically reviewing its own performance, responding to identified weakness and developing on its strengths. The main mechanism for the scrutiny and monitoring of its academic provision at course and institutional level is through annual monitoring which is a clear and rigorous process considering data, student feedback and external examiner input with the outcomes received and discussed through its deliberative committees and received at the Board of Governors. Actions are agreed upon and implemented. LIBF also engages with internal and external audits as another means in reviewing its own performance and involves internal and external expertise. LIBF is proactive in seeking the views to improve practice from within and outside the organisation and engages its staff and students as well as external examiners and external advisers in areas of programme design, course approval and review.

189 LIBF has a cohesive academic community. The intent is outlined in its Higher Education Strategic Statement and demonstrated through the opportunities it provides to staff to develop while delivering or supporting its higher education provision. There are well-defined deliberative structures attended by staff and students as members who demonstrably engage in debate and sharing of ideas. Staff involved in the delivery and support of higher education are also involved in the design and development of curriculum. LIBF encourages and supports staff development and promotes opportunities for staff to engage in pedagogical development through further qualifications and scholarship while providing support in specific pedagogical areas such as digital learning. Students are effectively engaged throughout LIBF’s deliberative structure and are given opportunities in feeding back on their experience of the curriculum and on programme design through the course approval process. Collaboration between staff and students is evident in meetings and through the development and monitoring of the Student Charter.

190 LIBF has clear and effective quality systems in place for the setting and maintenance of academic standards. Programme approval and review arrangements are robust and demonstrate the use of external and independent expertise and take account of external reference points to ensure that standards are set at levels which correspond to the relevant levels of *The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies*. Responsibility for approving new programme proposals is clearly assigned while LIBF staff, students and external advisers are well supporting in engaging with the development and approval of programmes. The assessment team considered LIBF’s qualifications to be well defined and set at appropriate level(s). The team was clear that credits and qualifications are awarded in accordance with LIBF’s academic regulations and only awarded where the achievement of relevant learning outcomes and academic standards have been demonstrated through appropriate assessment. The team was clear that the annual monitoring process and reporting mechanisms are in place to provide ongoing monitoring of standards, which they appear to do effectively. The team was content that the process for the setting of assessments ensures that the standards have been set appropriately. The team was also content that LIBF makes appropriate use of external examiners for assessment by providing advice and guidance to ensure that assessments are set at the right levels and they attend relevant assessment boards. LIBF’s quality systems are guided by a framework of regulations and Code of Practice which the team considers to be clear in detailing its approach to admissions, appeals, complaints, assessments, marking, moderation and programme approval and monitoring. The team also found the framework of

regulations to be being implemented as designed and written, leading it to be content that the framework is also robust in its implementation.

191 The observations in the above paragraphs in this section, along with the conclusions for each of the DAPs criteria A-E in this report, demonstrate that LIBF meets the overarching criterion and has a self-critical, cohesive academic community with a proven commitment to the assurance of standards, supported by effective quality systems.

Annex

Evidence

001 Royal Charter.pdf
002 Charity Commission.pdf
003 The Privy Council.pdf
004 LIBF By Laws.pdf
005 Statement of Primary Responsibilities.pdf
006 Standing Orders for Academic Subcommittees.pdf
007 Governance Structure Chart.pdf
008 LIBF Board of Governors.pdf
009 LIBF Executive Team.pdf
010 LIBF Senior Team Structure Chart.pdf
011 Higher Education Structure Chart.pdf
012 Quality Policy and Regulation Structure Chart.pdf
015 CoP Chapter 1 Introduction.pdf
016 CoP Chapter 2 Recruitment and Admissions to HE.pdf
017 CoP Chapter 3 Accreditation of Prior Learning.pdf
018 CoP Chapter 4 Learning and Teaching.pdf
019 CoP Chapter 5 Work based Learning.pdf
020 CoP Chapter 6 Student Support and Guidance.pdf
021 CoP Chapter 7 Assessment.pdf
022 CoP Chapter 8 External Examining.pdf
023 CoP Chapter 9 Malpractice.pdf
024 CoP Chapter 10 Complaints and Appeals.pdf
025 CoP Chapter 11 Student Engagement.pdf
026 CoP Chapter 12 Staff Development.pdf
027 CoP Chapter 13 Programme Development Approval Monitoring and Review.pdf
028 CoP Chapter 14 Collaborative Provision.pdf
029 CoP Chapter 15 Public Information.pdf
030 General and Academic Regulations.pdf
031 Student Charter.pdf
032 Degree Outcomes Statement 2018 to 19.pdf
033 Access and Participation Plan 2019 to 20.pdf
034 Access and Participation Plan 2020 21 to 2024 25.pdf
035 Student Protection Plan.pdf
036 Terms and Conditions of Offer.pdf
037 Higher Education Strategic Statement.pdf
038 Learning Teaching and Assessment Strategy.pdf
039 Collaborative Provision Strategy.pdf
040 Careers and Employability Strategy.pdf
041 Mental Health Strategy 2020.pdf
042 Digital Transformation Strategy Presentation for Leadership Group Nov 17.pdf
043 HE Enhancement Strategy.pdf
045 ToR Academic Board AB.pdf
046 ToR Senior Executive Team SET.pdf

047 ToR Audit Committee AC.pdf
048 ToR Academic Standards and Quality Committee ASQC.pdf
049 ToR Learning Teaching Committee LTC.pdf
050 ToR Student Experience Committee SEC.pdf
051 ToR HE Assessment Boards.pdf
052 ToR Data Returns Group DRG.pdf
053 ToR OfS Compliance Working Group OCWG.pdf
054 ToR Complaints and Appeals Review Group CARG.pdf
055 ToR Malpractice Committee MALC.pdf
056 ToR HE Concessionary Board ConBoard.pdf
057 ToR Staff Student Liaison Committee SSLC.pdf
058 ToR Academic Partnerships Risk Advisory Group APRAG.pdf
059 ToR Scholarships Bursaries Grants Committee SBG.pdf
060 ToR Module Review Group MRG.pdf
061 ToR Research Ethics Group REG.pdf
062 ToR CPL Working Group CPL.pdf
063 ToR External Examiners appointment group.pdf
064 Committee Schedule of Work.pdf
070 BoG minutes HE 191120 BoG20 04.pdf
071 BoG minutes HE 100920 BoG20 03.pdf
072 BoG minutes HE 110620 BoG20 02.pdf
073 BoG minutes HE 050320 BoG20 01.pdf
074 BoG minutes HE 281119 BoG19 04.pdf
075 BoG minutes HE 260919 BoG19 03.pdf
076 BoG minutes HE 200619 BoG19 02.pdf
077 BoG minutes HE 140319 BoG19 01.pdf
083 Academic Board Minutes 111120 AB20 03.pdf
084 Academic Board Minutes 080720 AB20 02.pdf
085 Academic Board Minutes 110320 AB20 01.pdf
086 Academic Board Minutes 271119 AB19 03.pdf
087 Academic Board Minutes 030719 AB19 02.pdf
088 Academic Board Minutes 300119 AB19 01.pdf
089 Academic Board Minutes 120718 AB18 02.pdf
090 Academic Board Minutes 230217 AB17 01.pdf
096 ASQC Minutes 060820 ASQC20 01.pdf
097 ASQC Minutes 241019 ASQC19 02.pdf
098 ASQC Minutes 190619 ASQC19 01.pdf
104 LTC Minutes 291020 LTC20 02.pdf
105 LTC Minutes 210520 LTC20 01.pdf
106 LTC Minutes 091019 LTC19 02.pdf
107 LTC Minutes 220519 LTC19 01.pdf
113 SSLC Minutes 120520 SSLC20 02.pdf
114 SSLC Minutes 170220 SSLC20 01.pdf
115 SSLC Minutes 221019 SSLC19 03.pdf
116 SSLC Minutes 300419 SSLC19 02.pdf
117 SSLC Minutes 070219 SSLC19 01.pdf
118 SSLC Minutes 221118 SSLC18 03.pdf

119 SSLC Minutes 230418 SSLC18 02.pdf
132 Faculty Meeting Agenda 180121.pdf
133 Faculty Meeting Agenda 060820.pdf
139 External Review of Higher Education.pdf
140 HE governance 2020.pdf
141 LIBF Board Effectiveness Review June 2019.pdf
142 Board Effectiveness Review Progress Update.pdf
143 Student Report to the BoG.pdf
144 Report to BoG on the National Student Survey.pdf
145 Academic Board Annual Report 2020.pdf
146 LIBF OfS Monitoring Log.pdf
147 Academic Board Annual Report 2019.pdf
148 2019 2020 Extracts from the Chief Executive Reports for BoG.pdf
149 Board of Governors session.pdf
150 QPR update to the BoG Nov 2020.pdf
154 Collaborative Provision Annual Report 2018 2019.pdf
155 Value for Money statement.pdf
156 HE update QPR Audit Com Nov 2020.pdf
157 SET Presentation 7 Nov 19.pdf
163 HE Brightspace plan Subitems of Migration timeline.pdf
164 Digital Learning Report Lets Get Digital Dec 17.pdf
170 HE Assessment Feedback audit report April 2018.pdf
171 Certification audit report May 2017.pdf
172 Consumer Protection Law CPL Audit ToR 2021.pdf
173 Report on Accreditation of Prior Learning 2018.pdf
174 Report on Accreditation of Prior Learning 2019 20.pdf
175 Complaints and Review Group CARG quarterly report.pdf
176 Annual Monitoring Report 1 Aug 2018 to 31 July 2019.pdf
181 Document Control Spreadsheet 2020.xlsx
182 Assessment Feedback Policy.pdf
183 HE Module Review Policy.pdf
184 Teaching Observation Policy.pdf
185 Recruitment to Faculty Policy.pdf
186 HE Special Consideration Policy.pdf
187 HE Reasonable Adjustments Policy.pdf
188 Safeguarding Policy.pdf
189 Prevent Duty Guidelines.pdf
195 Health and Safety Policy.pdf
196 IT Acceptable Use Policy.pdf
197 Equality and Diversity Policy.pdf
198 Values and Competency framework.pdf
204 BSc Hons Banking and Finance programme specification.pdf
205 BSc Hons Finance Investment and Risk programme specification.pdf
206 6INF Module Specification.pdf
207 4PDE Personal Development Employability Mod Spec.pdf
212 Validation report PGCert Fintech MSc framework and PGCertSF.pdf
213 Validation report BSc Hons Financial Services Management.pdf

214 BSc BF PDPM PPR SS Validation report.pdf
215 BSc FIR PPR BSc Re Validation report.pdf
216 Validation Report BSc Hons Finance and Investment.pdf
217 FSM Validation Extract regarding Benchmarking.pdf
223 Validation SED MSc Framework Certificate in Fintech Cert in Sustainable Finance.pdf
224 Validation SED BSc Hons Financial Services Management.pdf
230 Validation Action Plan PGCert Fintech MSc framework and PGCertSF.pdf
236 HE Validation Schedule.pdf
237 Guidelines for Validation and Review Panel Members.pdf
238 Agenda BSc Hons Financial Services Management Validation.pdf
244 PPR Finance Investment and Risk.pdf
255 HE malpractice report 2019 2020.pdf
256 HE malpractice report 2018 2019.pdf
257 Malpractice Outcome Categories.pdf
263 NSS 2016 2020.pdf
264 NSS Action Plan 2020 2021.pdf
265 Full time 2019 20 Module Survey Semester 1.pdf
266 Early Module Feedback Principles of Finance 201819.pdf
267 Early Module Feedback Semester 1 2020-21.pdf
268 End of Module Survey Results 2018.pdf
269 End of Module Survey Results 2019.pdf
270 Personal Development and Employability Module Surveys 2018 20.pdf
271 PT Module Survey Nov 19 collated results and feedback.xlsx
272 Level 6 Year 3 Module Feedback 2019 2020.pdf
273 Example of Year Tutor sharing feedback with Lecturer.pdf
274 Extracts from Apprentice Staff Liaison Forum Meeting and Survey.pdf
275 The Student Academic Experience Survey 2020.pdf
276 Apprentice Feedback via Forum Meeting.pdf
277 Academic Task Writing Submission for Library Feedback.jpg
278 Evaluating Library Study Skills Programmes.pdf
279 Extract from apprentice survey showing professional question.pdf
280 Apprentice Workshop Feedback Modules 1 and 2.pdf
281 External Examiner Annual Report 2019.pdf
282 External Examiner Results Sheet Example.pdf
283 External Examiner Nomination Form.pdf
284 External Examiner Annual Report Form.pdf
285 External Examiner Log.xlsx
286 Guidelines for External Examiners.pdf
292 LIBF TEF Submission.pdf
293 Extract of Prevent Submission 2020.pdf
299 Faculty CPD Entries Examples 2019 20.pdf
300 LIBF Talks 2019.pdf
301 Job Description Head of Academic Development.pdf
302 Examples of Staff Conference Presentations and Thought Leadership.pdf
303 Did You Know Assessments.pdf
304 Organisational and Individual Memberships Jan 21.pdf

305 External activities Jan 21.pdf
311 Learning Design Development and Production Process.pdf
312 Notes from Year Tutor meetings Semester 1 2020 21.pdf
313 Academic Community Expertise.pdf
314 TARGET Learning Design Tool.xlsx
315 Curriculum Design and External Exposure.pdf
321 Grade Classification Descriptors UG.pdf
322 Grade Classification Descriptors PG.pdf
328 Faculty meeting Sandwich Model Aug 20.pdf
329 Faculty meeting CM Aug 20 Assessment Feedback and support presentation.pdf
335 Types of Assessment.pdf
336 Assessment Mapping Document.pdf
337 Presentation General Guidance.pdf
338 Group Work General Guidance.pdf
339 Online Discussion General Guidelines.pdf
340 Blog General Guidance.pdf
341 Viva General Guidance.pdf
342 Remote Examination Guide Moodle Quiz.pdf
343 Remote Examination Guide Written Test or Exam.pdf
344 Guide to referencing.pdf
350 Outreach Ambassador Training.pdf
351 Student Representative Role Description.pdf
352 Student Rep Handbook.pdf
353 Student Representative Training.pdf
358 Banking and Finance Programme Structure.pdf
359 BSc Hons Banking and Finance tuition fees.pdf
360 Welcome brochure 2020.pdf
361 Student Suggestion example.pdf
362 Aleks student registration LIBF.pdf
363 Copy of Weekly Attendance 02 Nov 21 06 Nov 21.xlsx
364 Guest Speakers 2019 20.pdf
365 Ethnicity Data.pdf
370 MSc Programme 2017 Offer Key Information.pdf
371 MSc Course Welcome and Induction Activities.pdf
372 MSc Conditional offer letter template.pdf
373 MSc Product Card.pdf
379 Apprenticeships Employer Engagement Policy and Process.pdf
380 Level 6 FSP Retail Pathway Module Outlines.pdf
381 Extracts from Minutes of Client Programme Planning Meeting.pdf
382 Apprenticeships Personal Tutor Job Description.pdf
383 Initial Assessment to recognise Prior Learning Policy and Procedure.pdf
384 Approved Prior Learning Assessment.pdf
385 Evaluating Quality of training and outcome in Apprenticeships.pdf
386 Individual Writing Task.pdf
387 Skills Development VLE.jpg
388 Study Skills Screen Shot 1.jpg
389 Study Skills Screen Shot 2.jpg

390 Workshop Survey Analysis.pdf
391 Apprentice Online Logs Names Omitted.jpg
392 Apprentice Assessment Report Extract with Names Omitted.jpg
393 Career support for apprentices.pdf
394 Weekly Report Template.xlsx
395 Apprenticeship Enrolment Form.pdf
396 Learner Progress Review Form.pdf
397 Apprenticeship Induction Presentation.pdf
398 Client Programme Day Presentation.pdf
399 Workshop Analysis Jan 2018.pdf
400 Workshop analysis June 2018.pdf
401 Screenshot of VLE webinar attendance and recordings.pdf
402 Screenshot of apprentice cohort online progression log.pdf
404 FT UG Student Handbook.pdf
405 PT UG Student Handbook.pdf
406 Higher Apprenticeship Programme Handbook.pdf
407 MSc BF Programme Handbook.pdf
413 Teaching Assessment Process UG.pdf
414 Full Time Student Admissions Guidelines.pdf
415 Feedback Process.pdf
416 Process for Writing and Moderating Assessments.pdf
417 Invigilator booklet.pdf
423 Prevent Elearning Education Certificate.pdf
424 Prevent monitoring outcome of recent assessment.pdf
431 Counselling Support Services information.pdf
432 Mental Health Awareness guide for staff.pdf
433 Mental Health First Aid Training Refresher Certificate of Attendance.pdf
434 Half day MH awareness workshop HE 22 January 2019.pdf
435 Counsellor Client Agreement.pdf
436 Counselling Initial Assessment Form.pdf
437 Counsellor Client Feedback Form.pdf
438 Counselling Qualification.pdf
439 BACP Registration Certificate.pdf
440 BACP Membership Confirmation Letter.pdf
441 Telephone Counselling Certificate of Attendance.pdf
442 Certificate in Online and Telephone Counselling.pdf
448 Apprentice Study Skill week.pdf
449 Workshops webinars stats 2020 21.xlsx
450 KnowledgBank redesign.pdf
451 Study skills area.pdf
457 Module Survey Form.pdf
458 Marking Moderation Form.pdf
459 Feedback Appointment Record.pdf
460 PG Feedback Form.pdf
461 UG Feedback Form.pdf
462 Programme or Module change request form.pdf
463 Assessment Design Moderation Form.pdf

464 Peer Evaluation Form.pdf
465 Development Request Form.pdf
466 Lecturer Feedback Form.pdf
467 Student Detail form.pdf
468 LIBF Student Suggestion Form.pdf
469 Supervision Record MSc and BSc.pdf
470 Audit Report HE Career Education Information Advice Guidance June 2015.pdf
471 Head of Careers and Employability Job description.pdf
472 Careers and Employability Year1 17 18.pdf
473 Career and Employability Year2 and 3 SEM2 2018.pdf
474 Careers and Employability Year1 SEM2 2018.pdf
475 Careers Corporate Brochure 2017.pdf
476 Careers in Fintech Conference.pdf
477 Careers and Employability Guidance Handbook .pdf
478 Telling your story Part 1 The Application Process.pdf
479 Telling your story Part 2 Selection process.pdf
480 Registrants on My Career Users.pdf
481 Careers Events.pdf
482 Job Ads.pdf
483 Careers Employ Timetable 2020.pdf
484 DLHE 16 17 analysis information.pdf
485 Statement in response to Evidence Request 1.pdf
486 CC report ifs010615af.pdf
487 Bog Mins extract 230915 Strategy approval.pdf
488 BoG Mins extract 25112015 Strategy presentation.pdf
489 Evidence ifs member alumni questions.pdf
490 Evidence ifs student questions.pdf
491 HE Quality Assurance Strategy.pdf
492 Thought Leadership Strategy.pdf
493 Statement in response to Request 3.pdf
494 Board Skills Matrix November 2020.pdf
495 RN 200305i Board Composition Nov 2020.pdf
496 Statement in response to Request 5.pdf
497 Kaplan LIBF Contract Redacted for QAA.pdf
498 Statement in response to Request 7.pdf
499 Paper UGMAB19 02MIN APPROVED.pdf
500 Paper UGMAB19 03MIN APPROVED.pdf
501 Paper UGMAB20 02MIN APPROVED.pdf
502 Paper UGMAB20 03MIN APPROVED.pdf
503 Paper UGPAB19 02MIN APPROVED.pdf
504 Paper UGPAB19 03MIN APPROVED.pdf
505 Paper UGPAB20 02MIN APPROVED.pdf
506 Paper UGPAB20 03MIN APPROVED.pdf
507 Statement in response to Request 8.pdf
508 Certificate BSc Hons Finance Investment Risk.pdf
509 Certificate MSc Banking and Finance.pdf
510 LIBF certificate paper sample.pdf

511 Statement in response to Request 9.pdf
512 LIBF transcript watermark hologram paper.pdf
513 Transcript BSc FIR phase out programme Non Hons Exit.pdf
514 Transcript BSc Hons B and F Certificate Exit Award.pdf
515 Transcript BSc Hons Banking Practice and Management Apprenticeship.pdf
516 Transcript BSc Hons BPM Apprenticeship Certificate Exit Award.pdf
517 Transcript BSc Hons BPM Apprenticeship Non Hon Exit Award.pdf
518 Transcript BSc Hons BPM Part Time.pdf
519 Transcript BSc Hons FIR Diploma Exit Award.pdf
520 Transcript BSc Hons FIR Phase Out Programme.pdf
521 Transcript Certificate in Sustainable Finance.pdf
522 Transcript Chartered Associate programme Finance and Investment.pdf
523 Transcript MSc Banking and Finance.pdf
524 Transcript PG Cert Banking and Finance MSc Exit or Stand Alone.pdf
525 Transcript PG Dip Banking and Finance MSc Exit or Stand Alone.pdf
526 Transcript Prof Dip in Banking Practice and Management.pdf
527 Statement in response to Request 10.pdf
528 Staff Student Liaison Committee Meeting Agenda Oct 22nd.pdf
529 000 Staff Student Liaison Committee Meeting Minutes Oct 22nd.pdf
530 Statement in response to Request 11.pdf
531 SSLC Meeting Minutes 23 April 2018.pdf
532 Legal and Compliance Review T and Cs.pdf
533 Statement in response to Request 13.pdf
534 Statement in response to Request 14.pdf
535 4PDE FT Mapping document.pdf
536 4PDE FT MCA 2020.pdf
537 4PDE FT MCA Mark Scheme 2020.pdf
538 5COM App HSBC cohort 031120 intake Mapping Document.pdf
539 5COM App HSBC cohort 3 Coursework 14 Jan 21.pdf
540 5COM App HSBC cohort 3 Coursework Mark Scheme.pdf
541 6INF FT Mapping Document.pdf
542 6INF FT Exam Jan 2021.pdf
543 6INF FT 2021 Exam Mark Scheme.pdf
544 7SDC PT Mapping Document.pdf
545 7SDC PT Assignment Jan 2021 cohort.pdf
546 7SDC Assignment Mark Scheme.pdf
547 Statement in response to Request 15.pdf
548 Assessment Mapping Document.pdf
549 Employability Attributes mapping template and examples.xlsx
550 Types of Assessment.pdf
551 Statement in response to Request 16.pdf
552 Draft Annual Monitoring Report 1 Aug19 31 July20.pdf
553 Statement in response to Request 17.pdf
554 EE action Reply topdf
555 EE action Reply topdf
556 EE action MRG minutes.pdf
557 EE action Reply topdf

558 EE action Reply to ... Response to comment.pdf
559 Statement in response to Request 18.pdf
560 Sample instruction to lecturer and moderate to mark.pdf
561 Feedback Process.pdf
562 Marking Moderation Form.pdf
563 Sample Marking Moderation no issues.pdf
564 Sample Marking Moderation issues.pdf
565 Emails HEP to Assessment and Feedback Lead requesting feedback.pdf
566 Sample Assessment and Feedback Lead to Lecturer 1.pdf
567 Sample Assessment and Feedback Lead to Lecturer 2.pdf
568 EE Review MCA Results sheet.pdf
569 Statement in response to Request 19.pdf
570 Statement in response to Request 20.pdf
571 SMIF Design Meeting agenda and DRAFT topic outline.pdf
572 Examples of project design collaboration.pdf
573 Examples of collaboration in ongoing delivery.pdf
574 4FIM Briefing Meeting Minutes and Notes EXTRACT.pdf
575 Statement in response to Request 21.pdf
576 Apprenticeship MCA fintech.pdf
577 Fulltime MCA.pdf
578 Level 7 Report.pdf
579 Statement in response to Request 22.pdf
580 Statement in response to Request 23.pdf
581 Lecturer CV.pdf
582 Senior Lecturer CV.pdf
583 Visiting Professor CV.pdf
584 Statement in response to Request 24.pdf
585 Job description Lecturer.pdf
586 Job description Senior Lecturer.pdf
587 Job description Director of Studies.pdf
588 Job description Dean.pdf
589 Interview questions.pdf
590 Recruitment procedure.pdf
591 Shortlisting form.pdf
592 Conferment of Professor Regulations.pdf
593 Statement in response to Request 27.pdf
594 WFH Induction checklist LIBF.pdf
595 Induction Day Timetable.pdf
596 Staff handbook.pdf
597 Overview of Faculty Induction Programme.pdf
598 Lecturer Handbook FT programme 2020 21.pdf
599 Statement in response to Request 28.pdf
600 Statement in response to Request 29.pdf
601 HR report.xlsx
602 Development Request CABS LTSC conference 2020.pdf
603 Objectives and Development from Clear Review.pdf
604 Statement in response to Request 30.pdf

605 Workload Allocation Model 2019 2020.xlsx
606 Workload Allocation 2020 2021.xlsx
607 Statement in response to Request 31.pdf
608 Capability policy 2014 updated with UC.pdf
609 Example feedback and development.pdf
610 Large Group and Classroom Management event.pdf
611 Statement in response to Request 32.pdf
612 Teaching observation.pdf
613 Statement in response to Request 33.pdf
614 Statement in response to Request 34.pdf
615 Paper AB1803MIN AB Minutes 151118 approved.pdf
616 Statement in response to Request 35.pdf
617 Academic Community Matrix with qualifications.xlsx
618 Statement in response to Request 36.pdf
619 Statement in response to Request 37.pdf
620 Statement in response to Request 38.pdf
621 Statement in response to Request 39.pdf
622 Introduction to the Year Tutors.pdf
623 Personal Tutor Role.pdf
624 Apprenticeships Personal Tutor JD.pdf
625 Programme Support Officer JD 2020.pdf
626 Statement in response to Request 40.pdf
627 Careers and Employability Centre Events listing screen shot.pdf
628 List of LIBF Careers Employability events.xls
629 Graduate Outcomes 2017 18 analysis summary.pdf
630 Statement in response to Request 41.pdf
631 Statement in response to Request 42.pdf
632 Statement in response to Request 43.pdf
633 APP monitoring 19 20 provider submission 10008289.pdf
634 APP monitoring 19 20 supporting info 10008289.xlsx
635 Statement in response to Request 44.pdf
636 Statement in response to Request 45.pdf
637 Audit Committee Agenda 5 Nov 2020.pdf
638 Audit Committee Agenda 6 Nov 2019.pdf
639 Audit Committee Agenda 16 Jul 2020.pdf
640 Audit Committee Agenda 17 Jul 2019.pdf
641 Audit Committee Agenda 22 Feb 2019.pdf
642 Audit Committee Minutes 5 Nov 2020 redacted.pdf
643 Audit Committee Minutes 6 Nov 2019 redacted.pdf
644 Audit Committee Minutes 16 Jul 2020 redacted.pdf
645 Audit Committee Minutes 17 Jul 2019 redacted.pdf
646 Audit Committee Minutes 22 Feb 2019 redacted.pdf

QAA2680 - R13120 - July 2022

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2022
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB
Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786

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