



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

**London School of Science and  
Technology Ltd (LSST)**

**December 2019**

## Contents

Summary of findings and reasons .....	1
About this report.....	12
About London School of Science and Technology Ltd .....	12
How the review was conducted.....	15
Explanation of findings .....	17
S1 The provider ensures that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks.....	17
S2 The provider ensures that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers .....	24
S3 Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them .....	30
S4 The provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent.....	35
Q1 The provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system .....	40
Q2 The provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses .....	45
Q3 The provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience.....	51
Q4 The provider has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience .....	56
Q5 The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.....	61
Q6 The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students .....	65
Q8 Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them.....	69
Q9 The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.....	74
Annex 1.....	79

## Summary of findings and reasons

Ref	Core practice	Outcome	Confidence	Summary of reasons
S1	The provider ensures that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks.	Met	High	<p>From the evidence seen, the review team considers that the standards set for the provider's courses are in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS regulatory framework. Based on the evidence provided, the review team also considers that standards described in the approved programme documentation are set at levels that are consistent with these sector-recognised standards and the provider's academic regulations and policies should ensure that standards are maintained appropriately.</p> <p>The review team considers that, based on the evidence scrutinised, the standards that will be achieved by the provider's students are expected to be line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS's regulatory framework. Based on this information the review team also considers that the provider's academic regulations and policies should ensure that these standards can be maintained. The review team considers that staff fully understand the provider's approach to maintaining these standards and that the evidence seen demonstrates they are committed to implementing this approach. Therefore, based on its scrutiny of the evidence provided, the review team concludes that this Core practice is met.</p> <p>The School follows the academic regulations of its awarding bodies for the courses offered. The standards outlined in the approved course documentation are consistent with the awarding bodies' academic frameworks and sector-recognised standards as set out</p>

				<p>in paragraph 342 of the OfS regulatory framework. The School provided evidence of academic regulations and frameworks in the approved course documentation and associated handbooks supporting the maintenance of academic standards at the relevant threshold level. The plans for maintaining sector-recognised standards are robust and credible through the operation of programme monitoring, review processes and action planning. These are fully understood by the staff the team met. Review of assessed student work by the team confirmed alignment with the learning outcomes and that credit is only awarded where the threshold standards have been met. External examiners' reports further confirm that those sector-recognised threshold standards are consistent with relevant national qualifications frameworks and that qualifications are only awarded where the sector-recognised threshold standards have been met.</p>
S2	<p>The provider ensures that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.</p>	Met	High	<p>The standards set beyond the threshold for the provider's courses are reasonably comparable with those set by other UK providers. The standards described in the approved programme documentation and in the provider's academic regulations and policies ensure that such standards are set appropriately.</p> <p>The School adheres to the academic regulations and frameworks of its awarding bodies to support the maintenance of standards beyond the threshold level, as confirmed through the reports for the awarding bodies. The external examiners confirm that standards beyond the threshold level are reasonably comparable with those of other UK providers. The School has credible and robust plans for maintaining standards that are considered and developed through the course</p>

				<p>committees, Quality Enhancement Committee and the Academic Board. Approved course documentation, external examiner reports and review of assessed student work by the team confirm that standards beyond the threshold level are comparable with those of other providers, and that qualifications are awarded only where those sector-recognised standards are met. Staff met by the team understand and apply the provider's approach to maintaining standards, as confirmed through the engagement with staff from the awarding bodies and with the monitoring and review processes. Students met by the team showed they understand what is required to reach standards beyond the threshold and are given opportunities to do so.</p> <p>The review team concludes therefore that students who are awarded qualifications will have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers and the Core practice is met.</p>
S3	Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them.	Met	High	<p>The review team concludes that where the School works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of awards delivered on behalf of its partners are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them. This is because each awarding body has non-delegated responsibility for standards, which are effectively discharged in partnership with the School. The partnership agreements are clear, comprehensive, up-to-date and reflect the School's and awarding bodies' regulations and policies for the management of the partnerships. The School's academic governance structure, relevant policies and procedures, coupled with clear oversight of</p>

				<p>all key matters by the awarding bodies, allowed the team to confirm that the partnerships are managed effectively and monitored to ensure that the standards of awards are credible and secure. These structures, review processes and associated action planning for operation of the partnerships and placements confirmed to the team that there are robust and credible plans to secure standards. Staff met by the review team from both the awarding bodies and the School were able to articulate clearly that they understand their respective responsibilities for academic standards. External examiners' reports and the team's review of assessed student work confirm that the standards of awards delivered in partnership are aligned with the learning outcomes and are credible and secure. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.</p>
S4	<p>The provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent.</p>	Met	High	<p>The School uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent. This is evident through the academic regulations of the awarding bodies and of the School along with the associated guidance documents that provide a clear and comprehensive framework for the use of external expertise in maintaining sector-recognised standards, and for assessment and classification processes, evident in the institutional approval process and in course documentation as well as through the minutes of the deliberative committees. External examiner reports are positive and confirm that assessment and classification processes are reliable, fair and transparent. The School uses external expertise to enhance the student experience and responds to external examiners confirming that the School gives that expertise appropriate consideration and that it is used to inform action plans. Staff demonstrated clear</p>

				<p>understanding of the requirements for the use of external expertise and of the School's assessment and classification processes. Students met by the team were appreciative of the quality of feedback and the accessibility of assessment and classification information and confirmed that, in their view, the School's assessment and classification processes are reliable, fair and transparent. Review of assessed student work confirmed that assignment briefs and criteria are aligned with the universities' specifications and that assessment and classification processes are carried out in line with the regulations. The records of the approval events confirm that external expertise is used according to the School's and awarding bodies' regulations. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.</p>
Q1	The provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system.	Met	High	<p>The School has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system. This is underpinned by clear policies and procedures for the recruitment, selection and admission of students which ensure that admissions decisions are reliable, fair and inclusive. Its approach to admissions is consistent and robust and the admissions requirements are consistent with the School's policies. There is central oversight and consideration of the admissions processes which is evidence-based, confirming that the School's plans for ensuring that admissions systems are reliable, fair and inclusive are robust and credible. The admissions records reviewed by the team demonstrated that the School operates according to its policies and procedures with no deviations. Staff involved in the admissions process understand their roles and receive regular training. Viewing the documentary and online information provided for applicants allowed the team to confirm that this is transparent, accessible and fit for</p>

				purpose. Students met by the team, and through their responses to surveys indicated that they were very satisfied with their experiences of the admissions process which they found to be fair, inclusive, timely and supportive, and were satisfied with the accuracy and helpfulness of information provided to them. The review team, therefore, concludes that the Core practice is met.
Q2	The provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses.	Met	High	The School delivers high-quality courses which are designed by the awarding universities. This is underpinned by application of the relevant academic regulations and approved course documentation in conjunction with action planning and monitoring by the School and its awarding bodies, demonstrating that the School has robust and credible plans to facilitate the delivery of high-quality courses. The staff understand what high-quality delivery means in the context of the School and are able to show how their courses meet that definition and were able to explain the mechanisms in place such as graded lesson and peer observations, staff development opportunities and internal second marking and moderation of assessment tasks that ensure quality remains high. Internal and external student evaluations and the expressed views of the students met by the team from the different campuses reflect their opinion that the courses they are studying are of high quality. These views were endorsed through direct observation of teaching activities, which demonstrated clarity of objectives, good planning and organisation, a sound approach, good delivery, appropriate content, effective use of resources, and good student engagement. The School's regulations and policies for course delivery facilitate the delivery of high-quality courses and the approved course documentation indicates that the teaching, learning and assessment



				design enables students to meet and demonstrate the intended learning outcomes. External examiner reports confirm that courses are high quality. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.
Q3	The provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience.	Met	High	<p>The School has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience. Evidence to support this includes that the School has robust regulations and credible plans for the recruitment, appointment, induction and support of sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to facilitate delivery of a high-quality academic experience. The team concluded this because the School has a staff structure with sufficient posts to enable it to deliver a high-quality learning experience with plans in place to enable matching of staffing levels to student numbers. Staff met by the team and review of the CVs allowed confirmation that the staff have been recruited, appointed, inducted and supported according to the School's policies. Observations of teaching and learning indicate that teaching staff are appropriately qualified and skilled, and that the quality of the teaching is high. The School is committed to the training and development of its academic and support staff. Evidence from student views expressed through surveys and in meetings with the review team indicates that they agree that there are sufficient appropriately skilled, qualified and experienced staff to perform their roles effectively and to deliver a high-quality academic experience. The review team therefore concludes that the School meets this Core practice.</p>

Q4	The provider has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience.	Met	High	<p>The School has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience. The team was able to determine this because the School's plans for facilities, learning resources and student support services, as demonstrated through the minutes of relevant committees and direct meetings with senior, academic and professional services staff are forward-looking, credible, realistic and demonstrably linked to the delivery of successful academic and professional outcomes for students. Staff roles, as set out in the job descriptions and organisational chart, are focused and the team was able to confirm, through meetings with academic and professional services staff, that they understand their roles and are appropriately qualified and experienced (Q3 also refers). Students were appreciative of the support available to them, commenting positively in meetings, on the Personal Academic Tutor role, the availability of other support services such as the Academic Support Centre and the approachability of staff. This was further confirmed through the positive results of the National Student Survey. The team therefore concludes that students tend to regard facilities, learning resources and student support services as sufficient and appropriate, and facilitating a high-quality academic experience. The review team's own assessment of the facilities and learning resources confirms that they afford a high-quality academic experience because the teaching and learning spaces are appropriate, well-equipped and of good quality, with resources and support functions that support student progress well. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.</p>
----	--	-----	------	---

Q5	The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.	Met	High	The School actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience. As evidenced from the review of committee minutes, actions taken in response to student feedback and direct meetings with students, who report that the School engages them in the quality of their educational experience, the School has a clear and effective approach and, through its policies, robust and credible plans to actively engage students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience. Students are engaged in several ways, including via their Students' Union, the student representative system, and through various formal surveys. There are numerous examples of the School making changes to both the curriculum and the physical infrastructure of the school itself as a result of student engagement. Students met by the team reported that the School engages them in the quality of their educational experience and reflected positively on the responsiveness of the School. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.
Q6	The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students.	Met	High	The School has fair and transparent procedures for the handling of complaints and academic appeals which are accessible to all students. This is because the School has in place a comprehensive set of procedures for the handling of complaints and appeals which are definitive, fair and transparent, and deliver timely outcomes. The procedures in place are aligned to the regulations of the awarding bodies. Complaints and appeals are recorded and, along with the operation of the processes, are monitored and considered by the senior deliberative committees of the School including the Governing Body. The sample of student complaints and appeals scrutinised by the review team demonstrated that they

				<p>have been dealt with according to the School's procedures and within the published timeframes. Meetings with students confirmed that they do not raise any concerns about the fairness, transparency or accessibility of the procedures or their application. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.</p>
Q8	<p>Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them.</p>	Met	High	<p>Working in partnership with the three awarding bodies, the School has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them. The School has robust and credible plans to ensure a high-quality academic experience for provision delivered in partnership. The partnership agreements are clear and comprehensive, up-to-date and reflect the School's regulations and those of the awarding bodies. Staff from the School and the awarding bodies understand their respective responsibilities for quality. The awarding bodies express satisfaction with the arrangements for oversight, and external examiners further confirm that the academic experience is high-quality. The School has in place effective policies and management procedures to ensure that the academic experience of placements is of high quality. Furthermore, students understand the nature of the relationships between the School, awarding bodies and placement providers, and express high satisfaction with their experience, noting that courses are well-designed and of good quality. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.</p>

Q9	The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.	Met	High	<p>The School supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. Assessed student work demonstrates that students are given comprehensive, helpful and timely written feedback, which is reinforced by formative feedback and guidance. Students were overwhelmingly positive with respect to the breadth and depth of the student support measures in place at the School agreeing that they are adequately supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes, in particular with regards to the personal academic tutor system. Academic and professional support staff fully understand their role in supporting student achievement and were able to articulate those responsibilities clearly in meetings with the team. Through its provision of support services, its development of personal tutoring and feedback provision along with personal development planning, and the rolling out of the Strategic Enhancement Plan, the School has comprehensive, credible and robust approaches and plans in place to support the achievement of successful academic and professional outcomes. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.</p>
----	--	-----	------	---

## About this report

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

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

The team for this review was:

Name: Ms Jo Anson  
Institution: Independent  
Role in review team: Subject reviewer, Business and Management, and Computing

Name: Professor Paul Brunt  
Institution: University of Plymouth  
Role in review team: Subject reviewer, Business and Management

Name: Emeritus Professor Diane Meehan  
Institution: Liverpool John Moores  
Role in review team: Institutional reviewer

Name: Mr Paul Taylor  
Institution: Teesside University  
Role in review team: Subject reviewer, Health and social care

The QAA officer for the review was Professor Jon Scott.

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

## About London School of Science and Technology Ltd

The London School of Science and Technology (the School) is a private provider that was established in 2003. At the time of the Quality Standards Review there was a student population of 2,363 distributed across four campuses: London (Elephant and Castle), London (Alperton House), Luton (opened in 2012) and Birmingham (opened in 2014). The School is in the process of planning relocation from Alperton to a site in Wembley. Each campus has its own staffing structure headed by a campus dean, with management,

administrative and academic teams. Each campus also provides its own learning and teaching and social facilities. The School's head office is located at Memo House in London.

The School delivers programmes in the areas of Business, Management, Computing and Health and Social Care, as detailed in the table below. The degree programmes delivered by the School are approved by three universities: University of West London (UWL), London Metropolitan University (LMU) and Buckinghamshire New University (BNU). The School initially offered provision through Pearson, which was phased out when the partnership was established with UWL in 2013. The partnerships with LMU and BNU were established in 2017 and 2018 respectively.

The strategic direction of the School is overseen by a Board of Governors. The Board receives strategy advice from an Advisory Board, which includes independent academic and employer representatives and takes a broad view of the institutional portfolio and external contexts. The work of the Board of Governors is supported by the Academic Board, which is the senior academic body of the School, reporting on the delivery of education, the academic requirements of the partnership organisations and alignment with the expectations of external regulatory bodies. There is also an Executive Committee which is responsible for overseeing the strategic and operational management of the School.

The student population is divided across the programmes and campuses as shown below:

LSST - 18-19					
Course	Awarding body	Alperton	Birmingham	Luton	Elephant and Castle
BA (Hons) Business (top-up)	London Metropolitan University	18	0	0	0
BSc (Hons) Public Health and Health Promotion (top-up)	London Metropolitan University	11	0	0	0
FdA Business	London Metropolitan University	71	0	0	0
FdA Hospitality Management	London Metropolitan University	3	0	0	0
FdA Public Health and Social Care	London Metropolitan University	90	0	0	0
FdSc Computing and Business Information Technology	London Metropolitan University	17	0	0	0
BA (Hons) Business Studies (Final Year)	University of West London	89	66	34	0
BA (Hons) Business Studies with Foundation	University of West London	248	228	195	40
BSc (Hons) Computing and Information Systems (Final Year)	University of West London	0	0	13	0
BSc (Hons) Health Promotion and Public Health with Foundation	University of West London	55	0	44	39
BSc Information Technology Management for Business Studies	University of West London	28	0	28	0
BA (Hons) Business Management with Foundation	Buckinghamshire New University	0	173	62	164
BA (Hons) Business Management	Buckinghamshire New University	47	178	75	0
BSc (Hons) Health and Social Science with Foundation	Buckinghamshire New University	0	81	35	46
BSc (Hons) Health and Social Science	Buckinghamshire New University	47	82	56	0
<b>Total</b>		724	808	542	289



## How the review was conducted

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

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

To form their judgements about the provider's ability to meet the Core practices, the review team considered a range of evidence that was submitted prior to the review visit and evidence gathered at the review visit itself. [Annex 1] To ensure that the review team focused on the principles embedded in the Core practices, and that the evidence they considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews, they used Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers to construct this report and detail the key pieces of evidence seen. Annex 4 expects that review teams will sample certain types of key evidence using a combination of representative sampling, risk-based sampling and randomised sampling. In this review, the team sampled the following areas for evidence for the reasons given below:

- The review team considered a representative sample of 10 courses across the three awarding bodies, subjects taught and campuses, together with the associated approved course documentation to test that specified sector-recognised standards for courses sampled are consistent with national qualifications frameworks; to test that specified standards beyond the threshold for courses sampled are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers; to assess the reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes for the courses sampled; to test whether admissions requirements for the courses reflect the School's overall regulations and policy.
- The team reviewed the 13 external examiner reports for all programmes from the previous academic year to check that external examiners confirm that sector-recognised standards are consistent with national frameworks, and that credit and qualifications are awarded only where those threshold standards have been met; to check that external examiners confirm that standards beyond the threshold for courses sampled are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers; to test whether external examiners consider that standards are credible and secure; to interrogate the use of external examiners and check that the provider considers and respond to externals' reports regarding standards appropriately; to identify externals' views about reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes; to identify their views about the quality of the courses sampled; to test that they consider courses delivered in partnership to be of high quality.
- The review team considered a representative sample of 97 pieces of assessed student work across these courses to consider whether assessed student work reflects the relevant threshold standards; to test that marks and awards given to students are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers; to test that standards of awards are credible and secure; to test that credit and qualifications are awarded only where the relevant sector-recognised standards have been met; to test that specified standards beyond the threshold for courses

sampled are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers; to assess whether students are given comprehensive, helpful and timely feedback.

- The team scrutinised a random sample of 35 admission records from the 2018-19 entry cohorts representing each main subject area, different awarding bodies, and successful and unsuccessful applicants, to assess whether reliable, fair and inclusive admissions decisions were made.
- The review team observed a representative sample of six classes at Alperton and four classes at Birmingham representing provision from each of the awarding bodies to test whether course delivery is high quality and to test that academic staff deliver a high-quality learning experience.
- The team considered a representative sample of 20 staff CVs and eight job descriptions in order to gain a full understanding of specific roles in the School and to assess whether staff are appropriately qualified and skilled to perform their roles effectively along with determining whether the roles are consistent with the delivery of a high-quality academic experience; to determine whether roles are consistent with the delivery of a high-quality learning experience.
- The review team considered a representative sample of 12 student surveys and a student submission in order to identify student views about the courses sampled; to identify students' views about sufficiency, qualifications and skills of staff; to identify students' views about facilities, learning resources and student support services; to identify student views about student engagement in the quality of their educational experience.
- Meetings were held with 50 students from across the four campuses: 12 students from the Alperton campus, 15 students from the Birmingham campus, 11 students from the Elephant and Castle campus, and 12 students from the Luton campus to assess whether students understand what is required of them to reach standards beyond the threshold.
- The team reviewed a sample of five student complaints and four academic appeals from 2018-19 and 2019-20 as well as the complete log of complaints and appeals from the last three academic years to test whether the School has a fair and transparent procedure for handling complaints and appeals.
- The review team also met with a total of 50 students: 12 students at the Alperton campus, including nine elected student representatives, and 15 students at the Birmingham campus, including four elected representatives. Via skype, the team met with 11 students from the Elephant and Castle campus and 12 students from the Luton campus.

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

## Explanation of findings

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

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

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

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

#### The evidence the team considered

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

- a Awarding bodies' academic regulations [LMU - <https://student.londonmet.ac.uk/your-studies/student-administration/rules-and-regulations/academic-regulations/>, UWL - [https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic\\_regulations\\_ay1920\\_for\\_publishing.pdf](https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic_regulations_ay1920_for_publishing.pdf), BNU - [https://bucks.ac.uk/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf](https://bucks.ac.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf)]
- b LMU Collaborative Annual Quality Management Group 2018 and 2019 minutes [001, 006]
- c LSST Governance handbook [002]
- d Terms of Reference [002 pg 5] and Minutes of Board of Governors [023]
- e Terms of Reference [002 pg 8] and Minutes of Academic Board [003, 065, 065.1, 065.2]
- f Terms of Reference [002 pg 15] and Minutes of Quality Enhancement Committee [003.2, 065.3, 065.4, 065.5, 065.6, 065.7]
- g Terms of Reference [002 pg 42] and Minutes of Course Committees [003.6, 012, 017]
- h Quality Handbook [004]

- i LMU External Examiners' Reports [005, 038, 038.1] and UWL External Examiners' Reports [007, 038.2 - 038.10]
- j UWL annual monitoring arrangements: UWL Academic Partnership Link Tutors Annual Reports for BSc Computing and Information Systems top-up 16-17, BSc Health Promotion and Public Health with Foundation 18-19, BSc Computing and IS and BSc Information Technology 18-19, BA Business Studies with Foundation, BA Business Studies top-up 18-19 [010, 040, 040.1, 040.2]
- k Quality report to LSST Academic Board [011]
- l Module handbooks [013, 037 - 037.5, 073, 073.3]
- m Partnership agreements [030, 059, 059.1, 088, 095, 095.1, 095.2, 095.13, 095.14, 095.15, 095.16]
- n Course specifications for LMU FdSc Computing and Business Information Technology, [034] BNU FdA Health and Social Care, [035] UWL BA (Hons) Business Studies, [036] LMU FdA Business Studies, [075] BNU BSc (Hons) Health and Social Science [089]
- o LSST Assessment Regulations and Procedures [039]
- p Second marking/moderation forms for UWL BA Business Studies top-up CLBS BRP resit July 2019 [009], BA Business Studies CLBS May 2019 - Birmingham, [051] UWL BA Business Studies top-up MSME A1 May 2019 - Luton [051.1] and BNU BA Business Studies OB – Birmingham. [051.2] BA Business Studies CW2 – Luton, [051.3] BSc Health Studies LC460 Ex1, [051.4] BSc Health Studies LC459 [051.5]
- q Course handbooks for BNU BA (Hons) Business Management 2019-20, [052] BA (Hons) Business with Foundation, [052.1] BSc (Hons) Health and Social Science 2019-20, [052.2] BA (Hons) Business Management top-up. [052.10] LMU BA (Hons) Business top-up, [052.3] BSc (Hons) Public Health and Health Promotion, [052.4] FdA Health and Social Care 2019-20, [052.5] FdA Business 2018-19, [052.6] UWL BA (Hons) Business top-up 2019-20, [052.7] BA (Hons) Business Studies with Foundation 2019-20, [052.8] BSc (Hons) Health Promotion and Public Health 2019-20, [052.9] BSc (Hons) Information Technology and Business Management with Foundation 2018-19 and 2019-20 [074, 074.3]
- r BNU Approval Panel Report [058]
- s Verification of assessment between LMU and LSST [079 - 079.3]
- t LMU Course Level Agreements [095.3 - 095.12]
- u BNU LSST Annual Monitoring Action Plan and Statement [101, 108]
- v LMU-LSST institutional Approval Conditions [106]
- w LSST UWL Response to Conditions and Recommendations [106.1]
- x BNU-LSST Operations Manual [112]
- y Assessed student work [CW1]
- z Senior Staff Meeting [M1]
- aa Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Alperton) [M6]
- bb Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Birmingham) [M7]
- cc Link Tutors Meeting (BNU and UWL). [M5]

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

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

### **How any samples of evidence were constructed**

7 The review team considered a representative sample of courses across the three awarding bodies, subjects taught and campuses, together with the associated approved course documentation to test that specified sector-recognised standards for courses

sampled are consistent with national qualifications frameworks.

8 The review team reviewed a representative sample of 97 pieces of assessed student work across these courses to assess whether credit and qualifications are awarded only where the relevant sector-recognised standards have been met.

9 The review team considered the 13 external examiner reports for all programmes from the previous academic year to check that external examiners confirm that sector-recognised standards are consistent with national frameworks, and that credit and qualifications are awarded only where those threshold standards have been met.

### **Why and how the team considered this evidence**

10 As highlighted, all the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the review team holistically either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

11 To identify the School's approach to course and assessment design, marking and moderation, requirements for awards, and approaches to classification as the underlying basis for the standards of awards, the team reviewed the School's partnership agreements with its awarding bodies [030, 059, 059.1, 088, 095 - 095.2, 095.13 - 095.16] and for LMU provision course-level agreements, [095.3 - 095.9] current academic regulations of the three awarding bodies, [LMU - <https://student.londonmet.ac.uk/your-studies/student-administration/rules-and-regulations/academic-regulations/>, UWL - [https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic\\_regulations\\_ay1920\\_for\\_publishing.pdf](https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic_regulations_ay1920_for_publishing.pdf) BNU - [https://bucks.ac.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf](https://bucks.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf)] the School's Academic Regulations and Procedures, [039] the Quality Handbook [004] and evidence of moderation of assessment tasks and marking. [009, 051 - 051.5, 079 - 079.3]

12 To interrogate the robustness and credibility of the School's plans for ensuring sector-recognised standards, the team reviewed the School's partnership agreements with its awarding bodies, [030, 059, 059.1, 088, 095 - 095.2, 095.13 - 095.16], outcomes of partnership approval events, [058, 106, 106.1] BNU-LSST Operations Manual, [112] approved course documentation including course specifications, [034, 035, 036, 075, 089] course handbooks, [052 – 052.10] the School's Governance Handbook, [002] Terms of Reference [002 pg 5] and minutes of Board of Governors, [023] Terms of Reference [002 pg 8] and minutes of Academic Board, [003, 065, 065.1, 065.2] Terms of Reference [002 pg 15] and minutes of Quality Enhancement Committee, [003.2, 065.3 - 065.7] Terms of Reference [002 pg 42] and minutes of course committees, [003.6, 012, 017] and the outcomes of the awarding bodies annual monitoring processes. [001, 006, 010, 040, 040.1, 040.2, 101, 108]

13 To test whether the specified sector-recognised standards for the courses sampled are consistent with relevant national qualifications' frameworks, the team reviewed the approved course documentation including course specifications, [034, 035, 036, 075, 089] course handbooks, [052 – 052.10] and module handbooks. [013, 037 – 037.5, 073]

14 To check that external examiners confirm that sector-recognised standards are consistent with relevant national qualifications' frameworks and that credit and qualifications are awarded only where those standards have been met, the team reviewed the external

examiner reports for 2017-19 for LMU [005, 038, 038.1] and UWL. [007, 038.2 - 038.10] As the provision with Buckinghamshire New University is only in its second year of operation, no external examiner reports were available.

15 To test whether the work reflects the relevant sector-recognised standards, the team reviewed 97 pieces of assessed student work from across the courses sampled.

16 To test whether staff understand and apply the School's approach to maintaining sector-recognised academic standards, the team met with senior staff, [M1] academic and professional services staff at the Alperton [M6] and Birmingham [M7] campuses, and partnerships staff [M5] from BNU and UWL.

### **What the evidence shows**

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

18 The School delivers courses in partnership with its three awarding bodies: London Metropolitan University (LMU), University of West London (UWL) and Buckinghamshire New University (BNU). As confirmed in the respective partnership agreements, LMU, [059, 088, 095.1, 095.1] UWL [059.1, 095.13 - 095.16] and BNU, [030] and course-level agreements, [095.3 - 095.9] the awarding bodies design and develop the courses delivered by the School and retain overall responsibility for setting the sector-recognised standards for the awards, and for oversight of the provision.

19 The School abides by the academic regulations of its awarding bodies [<https://student.londonmet.ac.uk/your-studies/student-administration/rules-and-regulations/academic-regulations>, [https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic\\_regulations\\_ay1920\\_for\\_publishing.pdf](https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic_regulations_ay1920_for_publishing.pdf) [https://bucks.ac.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf](https://bucks.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf)] as set out in its own Assessment Regulations and Procedures, which are fully aligned with those of its awarding bodies. [039] These regulations support the maintenance of sector-recognised standards which are confirmed by the awarding bodies through their monitoring processes, including through LMU's Collaborative Annual Quality Management Group (AQMG), [001, 006] UWL's Academic Partnerships Link Tutors' annual reports [010, 040, 040.1, 040.2] and BNU's annual monitoring process. [101,108] These processes also enable confirmation that these sector-recognised standards are consistent with relevant national qualifications frameworks. Further guidance for staff on the School's approach to assessment is set out in the School's Quality Handbook. [004]

20 The School's Assessment Regulations and Procedures set out the requirements for grading, classification and award and clearly define arrangements for marking, moderation and sampling. [039] With the exception of LMU, the awarding bodies set all assessment tasks. For LMU provision, School staff set assessments, aligned to learning outcomes, which are moderated and approved by the University. [079 - 079.3] Monitoring by the awarding bodies, including LMU's AQMG meetings, [001, 006] UWL's Academic Partnerships Link Tutors' annual reports [010, 040, 040.1, 040.2] and BNU's annual monitoring process [101,108] confirm the sector-recognised standards of awards delivered by the School. These monitoring processes consider management of academic standards, assessment processes, external examiner feedback, identify actions to be taken and report on actions taken in response to previous recommendations.

21 The School's plans for ensuring sector-recognised standards are encapsulated in the partnership agreement documentation with BNU [030 ], LMU [059, 088, 095.1, 095.1] and UWL [059.1, 095.13 - 095.16] and course-level agreements for all of the LMU-validated programmes, [095.3, 095.4 - 095.9] and in the partner approval documentation for BNU,

[058] LMU [106] and UWL, [106.1] and the BNU-LSST Operations Manual. [112] The review team was able to confirm that the School's compliance with its awarding body regulations, together with its plans to secure standards, are effectively monitored throughout its deliberative committee structure and reported on through the minutes of the course committees, [003.6, 012, 017] the Quality Enhancement Committee, [003.2, 065.3 - 065.7] Academic Board [002, 011, 065 - 065.2] and through to the Board of Governors. [023] Review of the minutes of these committees provided the team with evidence that the School has robust, credible and evidence-based plans for maintaining sector-recognised standards because the minutes show the detailed consideration given to the monitoring processes, including consideration of external examiners' reports and the implementation of associated action plans. As noted in paragraph 19, the standards are also confirmed by the awarding bodies.

22 The School adheres to the awarding bodies' regulations, requirements for grading, classification and award and feedback which are clearly defined in the School's Assessment Regulations and Procedures, [039] in course and programme specifications, [034, 035, 036, 075, 089] and module and course handbooks. [013, 037 - 037.5, 073, 052 - 052.9, 074, 074.3] Review of the assessed student work [CW1] by the team allowed confirmation that there is alignment between the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and the applied marking criteria with mapping of the learning outcomes from the module specifications to the assessment briefs. Through these processes, the School complies with the expectations of its university partners and the sector-recognised standards are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks.

23 Review of the assessed work further allowed the team to confirm that the marking criteria and second marking and moderation processes are applied in accordance with the School's policies. [004] The team also reviewed the marking grades against the approved criteria and confirmed credit is awarded only when the students achieve the relevant sector-recognised standards.

24 External examiners are appointed by the awarding bodies. At the time of the review visit no external examiner reports had been received for BNU provision which had only commenced in the academic year 2018-19. External examiner reports for LMU [005, 038, 038.1] and UWL [007, 038.2 - 038.10] provision consistently confirm that the sector-recognised standards of the School's courses conform to the national qualifications' framework and that credit and qualifications are awarded only where those standards are met.

25 Academic staff met by the team [M6, M7] were able to fully articulate the School's approach to maintaining sector-recognised standards, including the requirements of the different awarding bodies and how these requirements are met in practice through their engagement with the regulations of the partner universities. The academic staff from each of the campuses [Alperton M6, Birmingham M7] also spoke positively of the close working arrangements between the School and its partners through the Academic Partner Link Tutors and ongoing communication with the module leaders from the partner universities, which support the maintenance of sector-recognised standards. Courses are delivered in line with the approved course specifications: where assessments are prepared by the School's academic staff these are aligned with programme learning outcomes and approved by LMU. [079 - 079.3] The School has in place a robust internal verification process involving standardisation meetings for the mapping of assessments against the learning outcomes and checking that the tasks are appropriate to the academic level. This involves review of the assessment by an internal verifier who checks that each assessment brief has clear deadlines for submission; shows the relevant assessment criteria of the unit; the specific assessment criteria for the task to be undertaken and clearly states what evidence the student needs to provide. [004] Assessments are also subsequently confirmed by the

awarding body. [M6, M7] All student work is subject to internal sample second-marking processes, which support the maintenance of standards, these being further enhanced by the awarding bodies' moderation of marking before the work is reviewed by the external examiners. [009, 051 - 051.5] Partnership staff from the awarding bodies also confirmed that the School fully meets its requirements in relation to the maintenance of sector-recognised standards. [Link Tutor meeting M5] The team therefore concludes that the staff understand and apply the School's and the awarding bodies' approach to maintaining sector-recognised standards.

## Conclusions

26 As described above, the review team considered all the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that their judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. Their conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

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

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

29 The School follows the academic regulations of its awarding bodies for the courses offered. The standards outlined in the approved course documentation are consistent with the awarding bodies' academic frameworks and sector-recognised standards as set out in paragraph 342 of the OfS regulatory framework. The School provided evidence of academic regulations and frameworks in the approved course documentation and associated handbooks supporting the maintenance of academic standards at the relevant threshold level. The plans for maintaining sector-recognised standards are robust and credible through the operation of programme monitoring, review processes and action planning. These are fully understood by the staff the team met. Review of assessed student work by the team confirms alignment with the learning outcomes and that credit is only awarded where the threshold standards have been met. External examiners' reports further confirm that those sector-recognised threshold standards are consistent with relevant national qualifications' frameworks and that qualifications are only awarded where the sector-recognised threshold standards have been met.



30 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

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

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

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

### **The evidence the team considered**

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

- a Governance Handbook [002]
- b Quality Handbook [004]
- c LSST Assessment Regulations [039]
- d Programme Approval Policy [042]
- e Lesson Observation Policy [043]
- f Awarding organisation Annual Reviews and link tutor reports [072-072.1; 080]
- g Link Tutor reports [040-040.2]
- h QEC minutes [003.2]
- i Academic Board minutes [003; 065-065.7]
- j Board of Governor minutes [032]
- k Assessment Board minutes all awarding organisations [045-045.5]
- l Student Support and Disability Policy [049]
- m Learning and Teaching Handbook [019]
- n Moderation reports [051-051.5]
- o Peer Review and Lesson Observation reports [020-020.4]
- p Teaching and Learning Forum Minutes [061]
- q Personal Academic Tutorial Policy [064]
- r Student Support Services Operational Plan [069]
- s Academic Support Centre Panel Terms of Reference and minutes [057]
- t Personal Tutor Committee Terms of Reference and minutes [056]
- u Student Support and Welfare Committee minutes [054]
- v Student Support Initiatives [055-055.6]
- w Course committee minutes [003.6; 012; 017]
- x Assessment Verification [079-079.3]
- y Module Handbooks [037-037.5; 073-073.5]
- z Course Handbooks [052-052.9; 074-074.4]
- aa External examiner reports [005; 007; 038-038.10]
- bb Programme Approval and Review Group minutes [017.1]
- cc LSST response approval panel report [058]

dd	Course Specifications [034-036; 075-075.4]
ee	BNU Annual Course Report for Health - 2018-19 [080]
ff	LMU FdSc Computing Course-Action-Plan 19.08.2019 [080.1]
gg	Buckinghamshire New University Partnership agreement [030]
hh	Buckinghamshire Partnership Operations Manual [112]
ii	Partnership Agreements for London Metropolitan University and University of West London [059-059.1]
jj	Buckinghamshire New University Partnership Agreement Sep 2019 [095]
kk	London Metropolitan University partnership addendums [095.1-095.12]
ll	University of West London franchise agreement extensions [095.13-095.15]
mm	Senior Staff meeting [M1]
nn	Alperton Students meeting [M2]
oo	Luton Students meeting [M3]
pp	Elephant and Castle Students meeting [M4]
qq	Link Tutors Meeting (BNU and UWL) [M5]
rr	Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Alperton) [M6]
ss	Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Birmingham) [M7]
tt	Birmingham Students meeting [M8]
uu	Sample of 97 items of assessed student work. [CW1]

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

35 Third party endorsements, as none are available for the provision on offer at the School.

### **How any samples of evidence were constructed**

36 The review team considered a representative sample of 10 courses across the three awarding bodies, subjects taught and campuses, together with the associated approved course documentation to test that specified standards beyond the threshold for courses sampled are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.

37 The review team considered the 13 external examiner reports for all programmes from the previous academic year to check that external examiners confirm that standards beyond the threshold for courses sampled are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers, and that credit and qualifications are awarded only where those standards have been met.

38 The team reviewed a representative sample of 97 pieces of assessed student work across these courses to test that marks and awards given to students are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.

39 Meetings were held with 50 students from across the four campuses: 12 students from the Alperton campus, 15 students from the Birmingham campus, 11 students from the Elephant and Castle campus, and 12 students from the Luton campus to assess whether students understand what is required of them to reach standards beyond the threshold.

### **Why and how the team considered this evidence**

40 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the review team holistically either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the providers' ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure

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

41 To identify the approach to course delivery, assessment design, marking and moderation, [051-051.5] requirements for awards and approaches to classification as the underlying basis for the standards of awards, the review team considered the School's quality assurance framework including the Governance Handbook, [002] the Quality Handbook 2018-2019, [004] the Programme Development and Review Policy, [042] the Lesson Observation Policy, [043] the Student Support and Disability Policy [049] and the Personal Academic Tutorial Policy, [064] academic regulations and assessment framework, [039, 079-079.3] and approach to learning and teaching as evidenced in the School's handbook. [019, 020-020.4]

42 To interrogate the robustness of the School's plans for maintaining comparable standards, the team considered the formal agreements with the awarding bodies and their review reports. [030, 112, 059-059.1, 095, 095.1-095.12, 095.13-095.15, 040-040.2] To ensure plans are credible and evidence based, the team reviewed the School's Governance Handbook [002] illustrating terms of reference for the established deliberative committees and boards and their minutes. [003, 003.2, 065-065.7, 061, 057, 056, 054, 032, 003.6, 012, 017, 045-045.5, 069]

43 To assess whether students understand what is required of them to reach standards beyond the sector-recognised standards the team met with 50 students from the different programmes and campuses [Alperton M2, Luton M3, Elephant and Castle M4, Birmingham M8].

44 To test and confirm that staff understand and apply the School's policies and procedures for maintaining comparable standards and that these comply with those of the awarding bodies, the team met with senior staff, [M1] Link Tutors (BNU and UWL) [M5] and teaching and professional services staff from Alperton [M6] and Birmingham [M7] involved in assessment of the programmes sampled.

### **What the evidence shows**

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

46 The School has a coherent and consistent institutional approach to course and assessment design, articulated in its governance handbook [002] and operational documentation, including the Quality Handbook [004] and Assessment Regulations and Procedures, [039] through which it maintains the standards set by the awarding bodies. This is achieved through staff engagement with University Link Tutors and staff development events [060] to ensure that the awarding bodies' requirements for assessment are fully understood. [004, 039] The awarding bodies define the curricular structures and specify the assessments and the School's procedures include mapping against the FHEQ. [Assessment regulations and assessment framework 039] The partner universities' regulations for maintaining and setting the standards for the courses are clearly expressed in the course level and validation agreements. [030, 112, 059-059.1, 095, 095.1-095.12, 095.13-095.15] There are robust internal verification processes [079-079.3] which include standardisation meetings, that encompass reviews of the assessments, intended learning outcomes, marking criteria and the moderation processes. There is also moderation by the Link Tutors prior to review by the external examiners. [M5, M6] These measures ensure that students' assessments are marked, moderated, and sampled in accordance with the requirements for awards and approaches to classification specified by the awarding bodies.

47 The School's plans for maintaining comparable standards include programme monitoring and review mechanisms and internal self-assessments, such as annual reports and action plans in relation to each awarding body. [080, 080.1, 080.2] These include an overview of the partnership operation in relation to the programme, the identification of any specific issues related to delivery, assessments, student performance and standards, with associated actions, allocation of responsibility for implementation of the action plans and updates on the progress against actions from the previous year. Evidence of the School's plans and approaches for maintaining comparable standards is further set out in the minutes of the deliberative committee meetings, including the Academic Board and Quality Enhancement Committee. The minutes show consideration of the internal and external verification processes and external examiner feedback and the associated action plans. [003, 003.2, 065-065.7, 057, 056, 054] These processes enable the team to confirm that the School has robust and credible plans for maintaining comparable standards, as defined.

48 The School's Quality Handbook, [004] Assessment Regulations and Procedures [039] and Teaching and Learning Handbook [019] include detailed guidance regarding the assessment strategies, verification processes [079-079.3] and the role of the external examiners, and the establishment of credible approaches to set and maintain comparable standards. Comparability of those standards to those of other providers is confirmed by the external examiners' reports [005, 007, 038-038.10] and reported through to course committees and award boards, [012, 017, 045 – 045.11] Quality Enhancement Committee [003.2, 065.3 – 065.7] and Academic Board. [003, 065 – 065.2]

49 The course specifications are set by the awarding bodies and these are articulated through the School's approved course documentation, including course specifications [034-036, 075] and approval and review outcomes [058, 017.1] and the detailed course [074, 074.3, 052-052.9] and module handbooks [037-037.5, 073-073.5] for the courses. These include details of the course structures and criteria for marking and awarding, including specification of the standards beyond the threshold. Review of the minutes of the Academic Board and the Quality Enhancement Committee demonstrates that these committees are effective in their oversight of learning and teaching approaches and in maintaining standards. [003, 003.2, 065-065.7] The minutes of these deliberative committees identify an appropriate level of discussion and analysis of the School's approaches to maintaining comparable academic standards confirming that these plans are robust and credible. For example, the quality of teaching practice is monitored via a developmental peer-review process, which is undertaken on an annual basis for all staff with a reporting process that identifies areas for enhancement and resultant actions taken [020-020.2, M1, M6, M7] and informs the agenda for the Learning and Teaching Forum, [M1, 021] in conjunction with graded observations with constructive advice which feeds into appraisal with associated identification of training needs. [043, 020.3, 020.4, M1]

50 The Academic Support Centre provides students with opportunities to improve their academic skills for example through writing and study skills workshops. This also links to the personal academic tutorial system so that tutors can signpost students to the support. These aspects contribute to student achievement beyond threshold level [055-055.7, 054, 057] because they underpin the delivery of high-quality programmes with associated assessments and support individual student achievement.

51 The external examiner reports consistently confirm that the marks awarded to students and the standards beyond the threshold for courses sampled are comparable with those achieved in other providers. [005, 007, 038-038.10] The review by the team of 97 pieces of assessed student work [CW1] confirmed that the marking was aligned with the grading criteria and that specified learning outcomes were met. It is also confirmed in the annual monitoring reports for each of the awarding bodies [072-072.1, 080] that academic standards are assured, and that credits and qualifications are awarded only when standards

are met.

52 The students understand what is required of them to reach standards beyond the threshold on their programmes. This is because there is guidance of academic expectations given in all the assignment briefs [CW1] and within module handbooks. [037-037.5, 073-073.5] Grading criteria and award classification details are set out in the module handbooks and in course handbooks. [052-052.9, 074-074.4] The students met by the team [Alperton M2, Luton M3, Elephant and Castle M4, Birmingham M8] were able to confirm their understanding of the marking criteria, describing how they were informed of the assessment strategy at the start of each module, along with the assessment briefs and submission deadlines. They stated that the lecturers went through the assessment briefs and explained the linkage to the learning outcomes. The students were also fully aware of how feedback provided in assessments is beneficial in helping them to improve their grades for their next assessments and described the mechanisms for provision of formative feedback and the provision of additional feedback through the tutorials to enable them to achieve their best marks.

53 The teaching staff met by the team [Alperton M6, Birmingham M7] were able to articulate their understanding of the School's approach to maintaining comparable standards, as set by the awarding bodies through the internal verification processes and associated mapping to learning outcomes when preparing assessments and courses. The meetings with representatives of the awarding bodies [M5] exemplified the close working relationships between the School's and the awarding bodies' module teams and, along with review of the monitoring reports and action plans, confirmed that the staff effectively apply those standards. [072-072.1, 080]

## Conclusions

54 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. Its conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

55 The standards set beyond the threshold for the provider's courses are reasonably comparable with those set by other UK providers. The standards described in the approved programme documentation and in the provider's academic regulations and policies ensure that such standards are set appropriately.

56 The School adheres to the academic regulations and frameworks of its awarding bodies to support the maintenance of standards beyond the threshold level, as confirmed through the reports for the awarding bodies. The external examiners confirm that standards beyond the threshold level are reasonably comparable with those of other UK providers. The School has credible and robust plans for maintaining standards, that are considered and developed through the course committees, Quality Enhancement Committee and the Academic Board. Approved course documentation, external examiner reports and review of assessed student work by the team confirm that standards beyond the threshold level are comparable with those of other providers, and that qualifications are awarded only where those sector-recognised standards are met. Staff met by the team understand and apply the provider's approach to maintaining standards, as confirmed through the engagement with staff from the awarding bodies and with the monitoring and review processes. Students met by the team showed they understand what is required to reach standards beyond the threshold and are given opportunities to do so.

57 The review team concludes, therefore, that students who are awarded qualifications will have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers and the Core practice is met.

58 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

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

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

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

#### **The evidence the team considered**

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

- a Governance Handbook, including Terms of reference for Academic Board, Quality Enhancement Committee [002]
- b Awarding bodies academic regulations [LMU - <https://student.londonmet.ac.uk/your-studies/student-administration/rules-and-regulations/academic-regulations/>, UWL - [https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic\\_regulations\\_av1920\\_for\\_publishing.pdf](https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic_regulations_av1920_for_publishing.pdf), BNU - [https://bucks.ac.uk/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf](https://bucks.ac.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf)]
- c Quality Handbook 2018-19 [004]
- d Work Placement Policy [117]
- e Work Placement Handbooks [044, 044.1]
- f Minutes of Awarding Body annual review meetings [001, 006, 072]
- g Minutes of Academic Board [003, 065-065.2]
- h Minutes of Quality Enhancement Committee [065.3-065.7]
- i Minutes of Programme Development and Review Group [003.4, 018]
- j Academic Partnership Link Tutor Annual Reports [010, 040, 080.2]
- k Course and module annual reviews [080, 080.1, 110]
- l Work Placement Agreements [091-091.6]
- m BNU partnership agreement [030]
- n Institutional Memorandum of Agreement with London Metropolitan University and Addendum [088, 059]
- o Franchise agreement with University of West London [059.1]
- p External examiners' reports [005, 007, 038, 038.1, 038.2, 038.3, 038.4, 038.5, 038.6, 038.7, 038.8, 038.9, 038.10]
- q Assessed student work [CW1]
- r Link Tutors meeting (BNU and UWL) [M5]
- s Senior Staff meeting [M1]
- t Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Alperton) [M6]



u Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Birmingham). [M7]

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

63 Third party endorsements, as none are available for the provision on offer at the School.

### **How any samples of evidence were constructed**

64 The team considered 13 external examiner reports to test whether external examiners consider that standards are credible and secure and to confirm the effectiveness of the School's arrangements for ensuring the standard of awards they deliver.

65 The review team reviewed a representative sample of 97 pieces of assessed student work across these courses to test that standards of awards are credible and secure.

### **Why and how the team considered this evidence**

66 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the review team holistically either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

67 To interrogate the basis for the maintenance of academic standards and to confirm there are regulations in place to ensure that the Universities' awards are secure and credible when delivered by the School, the team reviewed all current partnership agreements [BNU 030, LMU 059, UWL 059.01] and course and module documentation with a risk-based focus on those with LMU that involve mandatory work placements (FdA Public Health and Social Care, Public Health and Social Care (Top Up), FdA Business, FdSc Computing and Business Information Technology), [081] the School's Quality Handbook, [004] the regulations of the partner awarding bodies, [Awarding bodies academic regulations [LMU - <https://student.londonmet.ac.uk/your-studies/student-administration/rules-and-regulations/academic-regulations/>], UWL - [https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic\\_regulations\\_ay1920\\_for\\_publishing.pdf](https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic_regulations_ay1920_for_publishing.pdf)], BNU - [https://bucks.ac.uk/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf](https://bucks.ac.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf)] and terms of reference and minutes for Academic Board and Quality Enhancement Committee. [002, 003, 065]

68 The team also reviewed monitoring reports on the operation of the partnerships to test the maintenance of sector-recognised standards and the robustness of evidence-based plans for securing standards. [001, 010, 040]

69 To test the maintenance of academic standards and the robustness of evidence-based plans for securing standards, the team also reviewed the Work Placement Policy, [117] Work Placement Handbooks, [044, 044.1] Work Placement Agreements, [091-091.6] Placement Assessment, [116 – 116.3] and met with professional services and academic staff. [M6, M7] These were reviewed because the awarding bodies identify it as the School's responsibility to oversee placement operation.

70 To test that staff understand and effectively discharge their responsibilities within the partnership, the team met with academic [M6, M7] and senior staff [M1] from the School and representatives from the awarding bodies. [M5]

### **What the evidence shows**

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

72 There are clear, comprehensive and up-to-date partnership agreements in place with each awarding body, [030, 059, 059.1, 088] which specify the responsibilities of the partners regarding curriculum delivery and assessment, including the quality assurance and reporting processes and the nature of the engagements. These, along with the partner universities' regulations and policies for working with collaborative partners, [LMU - <https://student.londonmet.ac.uk/your-studies/student-administration/rules-and-regulations/academic-regulations/>, UWL - [https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic\\_regulations\\_ay1920\\_for\\_publishing.pdf](https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic_regulations_ay1920_for_publishing.pdf), BNU - [https://bucks.ac.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf](https://bucks.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf)] and the School's own regulations and policies [004, <https://www.lsst.ac/about/lsst-policies/>] provide a well-defined structure for the operation of each partnership, which ensures that standards are secure. Clarity over staff responsibilities with each partner is achieved through dissemination of awarding body regulations, regular liaison with awarding body staff and staff development. [M1, M6, M7]

73 Academic Board [002, p.8] has responsibility to keep under review policies and procedures to ensure the School is operating in line with awarding body requirements. [002, p15] The Quality Enhancement Committee [002, p15] is responsible for ensuring quality and standards of provision and ensuring the School is meeting the requirements of awarding body partners. [002, p.15 pt8] Minutes for Academic Board and Quality Enhancement Committee evidence that the School's partnership responsibilities are monitored and discussed annually. [003, 065] The team was therefore able to confirm that the School has in place appropriate governance structures to oversee its partnership work with awarding bodies.

74 Minutes of the Programme Development and Review Group (PDRG) [003.4, 018] show detailed identification of action planning and updates on implementation in relation to partnership operation. These include reviews of existing provision and high-level planning in regard to development of new provision with awarding bodies, such as the development of the new programmes in association with BNU that were introduced in 2019 and additional in-year intakes.

75 Processes are in place for annual review of the partnership arrangements to ensure the standard of awards is being maintained by the School, including discussions with the awarding bodies of operation through the Annual Quality Monitoring Group [001, 006] and the Academic Partnerships Annual Review [072] meetings, which reflect on overviews of the academic programmes. These meetings also facilitate shared overview of enhancement aspects such as the enhancement of the personal tutoring system and improvements in provision of formative feedback. Annual reviews at course and module level confirmed the plans and processes ensuring ongoing security of standards, which include consideration of external examiners' reports, action plans and updates on implementation of previous plans [080, 080.1, 110] with reporting through to the Quality Enhancement Committee. [065.3-065.7] The evidence from these reviews and processes, in conjunction with the deliberations of PDRG, enabled the team to confirm that the School has robust and credible plans to secure the academic standards.

76 The School works with Academic Partnership Link Tutors from each awarding body

to ensure standards of awards are appropriately maintained. Link Tutors visit the School and observe teaching activities, and their Link Tutors' Annual Reports [010, 040, 080.2, M5] are positive about the working partnership arrangements and confirm the maintenance of sector-recognised standards of the awards delivered. Link Tutors met by the team confirmed the effective working arrangements with the School. [M5]

77 Each awarding body responsibility checklist identifies it as the School's responsibility to work with other partner organisations for the provision of placements. In practice, the only courses currently requiring placements are those awarded by LMU (FdA Public Health and Social Care, Public Health and Social Care (Top Up), FdA Business, FdSc Computing and Business Information Technology). [081] The Work Placement Policy, [117] students' and tutors' Work Placement Handbooks [044] and sample Work Placement Agreements [091] demonstrate effective processes for the oversight and monitoring of placement provision including specification of the roles and responsibilities of the tutor, student and employer (see Q8 for further details).

78 The Work Placement Unit is responsible for approving suitable placements and monitoring their ongoing appropriateness [M6] and supports students to find a suitable placement. The Work Placement Unit sits under the Student Support Service, [044 – 044.1] and the Work Placement Officers provide guidance and support to students in finding and applying for work placement opportunities, which directly contributes to and supports the professional development of students. [M2] The Officers also undertake due diligence of the placement providers prior to students starting a work placement, including risk assessments, and confirmation of the suitability of the placement for the academic requirements of the student. [116-116.3, 117, 123] To ensure the standards of placements are suitable and in line with LMU requirements, the Work Placement Unit retains a database of placement providers where up-to-date due diligence records are maintained, including risk assessments, health and safety checks and liability insurance. [117]

79 Review of assessed student work by the team allowed confirmation of the clear application of partnership procedures for assessment design, marking, grading and moderation, ensuring that standards are secure [CW1] (see also S1 and S2). External examiner reports [005, 007, 038 – 038.10] explicitly confirm that the School operates within the regulations of the awarding body in terms of the academic standards of the awards and provided further confirmation that the standards of awards delivered by the School are in line with the awarding body requirements and are credible, secure and comparable to other similar awards and institutions.

80 Senior, academic and professional services staff met by the review team were able to articulate their understanding of the different partnership arrangements and their responsibilities towards each of the awarding bodies. [M1, M6, M7] The arrangements with awarding body Link Tutors, which include regular visits and development opportunities, enable the responsibilities of both the School and the awarding body to be discharged effectively. [M1, M5, M6, M7] The development opportunities include joint course committee meetings, development workshops for teaching and professional services staff and training in the awarding bodies' expectations. Senior and academic staff were able to clearly explain the requirements of each awarding body in relation to approval of assessments, moderation, the role of external examiners, review of student evaluations and annual action plans, as well as approval of staff CVs. [M1, M6, M7] The effectiveness of these operations was confirmed by staff from the awarding bodies. [M5]

## **Conclusions**

81 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In

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

82 The review team concludes that where the School works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of awards delivered on behalf of its partners are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them. This is because each awarding body has non-delegated responsibility for standards which are effectively discharged in partnership with the School. The partnership agreements are clear, comprehensive, up-to-date and reflect the School's and awarding bodies' regulations and policies for the management of the partnerships. The School's academic governance structure, relevant policies and procedures, coupled with clear oversight of all key matters by the awarding bodies, confirmed to the team that the partnerships are managed effectively and monitored to ensure that the standards of awards are credible and secure. These structures, review processes and associated action planning for operation of the partnerships and placements allowed the team to confirm that there are robust and credible plans to secure standards. Staff met by the review team from both the awarding bodies and the School were able to articulate clearly that they understand their respective responsibilities for academic standards. External examiners' reports and the team's review of assessed student work confirm that the standards of awards delivered in partnership are aligned with the learning outcomes and are credible and secure. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.

83 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

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

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

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

### **The evidence the team considered**

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

- a Awarding bodies' academic regulations [LMU - <https://student.londonmet.ac.uk/your-studies/student-administration/rules-and-regulations/academic-regulations/>, UWL - [https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic\\_regulations\\_ay1920\\_for\\_publishing.pdf](https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic_regulations_ay1920_for_publishing.pdf), BNU - [https://bucks.ac.uk/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf](https://bucks.ac.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf)]
- b LMU Collaborative Annual Quality Management Group 2018 and 2019 minutes [001, 006]
- c LSST Governance handbook [002]
- d Terms of Reference [002 pg 5] and minutes of Board of Governors [023]
- e Terms of Reference [002 pg 8] and minutes of Academic Board [003, 065, 065.1, 065.2].
- f Terms of Reference [002 pg 15] and minutes of Quality Enhancement Committee [003.2, 065.3, 065.4, 065.5, 065.6, 065.7]
- g Terms of Reference [002 pg 42] and minutes of Course Committees [003.6, 012, 017]
- h Quality Handbook [004]
- i External Examiners' Reports [005,007, 038 – 038.10]
- j Exam Board meeting minutes [003.5, 008, 045 – 045.15]
- k EE Responses 2018-19 [090 – 090.2]
- l Details of awarding body development workshops [053 -053.2]
- m Examples of moderation reports [051 - 051.5]
- n Course Action Plans [080, 080.1, 110 – 110.3]
- o Programme Development and Review Policy [042]
- p Annual monitoring reports [010, 040, 040.1, 040.2]
- q Quality report to LSST Academic Board [011]
- r Module handbooks [013, 037 – 037.5, 073 - 073.3]
- s Course specifications [034, 035, 036, 075, 089]
- t LSST Assessment Regulations and Procedures [039]
- u Course handbooks [052 – 052.10, 074, 074.3]
- v BNU Approval Panel Report [058]
- w Verification of assessment between LMU and LSST [079 - 079.3]

x	BNU LSST Annual Monitoring Action Plan and Statement [101, 108]
y	LMU-LSST institutional Approval Conditions [106]
z	LSST UWL Response to Conditions and Recommendations [106.1]
aa	BNU-LSST Operations Manual [112]
bb	Senior Staff meeting [M1]
cc	Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Alperton) [M6]
dd	Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Birmingham) [M7]
ee	Alperton Students meeting [M2]
ff	Luton Students meeting [M3]
gg	Elephant and Castle Students meeting [M4]
hh	Birmingham Students meeting. [M8]

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

88 Third party endorsements, as none are available for the provision on offer at the School.

### **How any samples of evidence were constructed**

89 The review team considered a representative sample of 10 courses across the three awarding bodies, subjects taught and campuses, together with the associated approved course documentation to assess the reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes for the courses sampled.

90 The review team reviewed the 13 external examiner reports for all programmes from the previous academic year to interrogate the use of external examiners and check that the provider considers and responds to externals' reports regarding standards appropriately, and to identify externals' views about reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes.

### **Why and how the team considered this evidence**

91 As highlighted, all the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the review team holistically either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the providers' ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

92 To identify how external experts are used in maintaining academic standards and how the School's assessment and classification processes operate, the team reviewed the academic regulations of the three awarding bodies, [LMU- <https://student.londonmet.ac.uk/your-studies/student-administration/rules-and-regulations/academic-regulations/>], UWL - [https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic\\_regulations\\_ay1920\\_for\\_publishing.pdf](https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic_regulations_ay1920_for_publishing.pdf), BNU - [https://bucks.ac.uk/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf](https://bucks.ac.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf)] the School's Academic Regulations and Procedures, [039] Quality Handbook, [004] the School's BNU Operations Manual, [112] virtual learning environment (VLE), [VLE] the terms of reference for the Advisory Board [002] and the terms of reference for the Programme Development and Review Policy. [042]

93 To assess the reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes, the team considered the approved course documentation including course specifications, [034, 035, 036, 075, 089] along with course handbooks, [052 - 052.10, 074, 074.3] module handbooks, [013, 037 - 037.5, 073 - 073.5] and the outcomes of partnership approval events. [058, 106, 106.1]

94 The review team considered external examiner reports [005, 007, 038 – 038.10] and minutes of Exam Boards [003.5, 008, 045-045.15] to identify their views about the reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes.

95 To interrogate the use of external examiners and that the School considers and responds to their reports regarding standards, the team reviewed the minutes of the Board of Governors, [023] Academic Board, [003, 011,065, 065.1, 065.2] minutes of Quality Enhancement Committee, [003.2, 065.3, 065.4, 065.5, 065.6, 065.7] minutes of Course Committees [003.6, 012, 017] and the outcomes of the awarding bodies' annual monitoring processes, [001, 006, 010, 040, 040.1. 040.2, 101,108] course action plans, [080, 080.1, 110 – 110.3] responses to external examiners' reports, [090 – 090.2] examples of moderation reports, [051 – 051.5] verification of assessments between LMU and the School, [079 – 079.3] and details of awarding body development workshops. [053 - 053.2]

96 Assessed student work was reviewed by the team to evidence assessment and classification processes in operation and confirm compliance with the regulatory frameworks. [CW1]

97 The team met with senior staff [M1] and academic and professional services staff at the Alperton [M6] and Birmingham [M7] campuses, and partnerships staff [M5] from BNU and UWL, to consider their understanding of the requirement to use external expertise and their understanding of assessment and classification processes.

98 The team met with students from all four campuses [M2, M3, M4, M8] to understand how they regard the reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes.

### **What the evidence shows**

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

100 The academic regulations from LMU, UWL and BNU together provide a clear and comprehensive framework for the setting of standards, the use of external expertise and assessment and classification processes (S1 and S2 also refer). These frameworks are applied by the School, which contextualises some of the detail within its own Academic Regulations and Procedures, [039] the Quality Handbook [004] and the School's BNU Operations Manual. [112] While the School's Programme Development and Review Policy [042] does not include reference to the use of external expertise since the responsibility for programme development and design and the setting of sector-recognised standards is located with the awarding bodies, the School's Academic Regulations and Procedures [039] set the expectation that expertise from academics external to the School is incorporated into the assessment process through the approval of assessments and the moderation of marking by the awarding universities, as well as review by university-appointed external examiners. These frameworks and the implementation of the associated processes enabled the team to confirm that the plans for using external expertise are robust and credible.

101 The work of the Board of Governors is supported by an Advisory Board, which is chaired by an independent academic adviser and the membership also includes representatives from legal and financial fields. The Advisory Board therefore brings in

external expertise in the form of academic as well as business operation advice and so acts to advise the Board of Governors on the wider external context and the School's strategic direction. [002]

102 Approved course documentation including course specifications [034, 035, 036, 075, 089] along with course handbooks, [052 - 052.10, 074, 074.3] module handbooks, [013, 037 - 037.5, 073 - 073.5] and the outcomes of partnership approval events [058, 106, 106.1] were considered to assess the reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes. These evidence the provision of clear assessment strategy content including the external scrutiny of summative assessments by the respective partner universities and mapping against specified learning outcomes, together with appropriate classification content. Relevant and appropriate external expertise is evident in the Institutional Approval Event and Courses Approval Events, [058, 106, 106.1] which include external members from the University as well as advisers from other universities. The VLE provides clear access to relevant policies, including marking, awarding and moderation practices in addition to course and module specifications. [VLE]

103 Course action plans take the form of a template provided by the awarding bodies with a section specifically dedicated to external examiner feedback, which is addressed through the module and course action plans. [080, 080.1, 110 – 110.3] With UWL courses a specific external examiner response form, completed by the course leaders, [090 – 090.2] is required, which is further evidenced in the course leaders' annual reports. [001, 006, 010, 040, 040.1, 040.2, 101, 108] In the case of the sample provided, [101, 108] the School acknowledges the external examiners' positive comments including confirmation of the comparability of standards and appropriate application of awarding body regulations. Actions identified via the external examiners' feedback and reports are fed into course action plans, further scrutinised by the Quality department where a school action plan is implemented and monitored by the course committees and the Quality Enhancement Committee. Review of the minutes of the Quality Enhancement Committee, [003.2, 065.3 - 065.7] of course committees [003.6, 012, 017] and details of awarding body development workshops [053 - 053.2] enabled the team to confirm that there is appropriate use of external expertise and that the School gives that expertise due consideration. Furthermore, the evidence of consideration by the deliberative committees enabled the team to confirm that the plans for maintaining sector-recognised standards and assessment and classification are robust and credible.

104 Assignment briefs clearly reference the learning outcomes and assessment criteria which must be met, and which are aligned with the universities' specifications, [CW1] demonstrating clear evidence of verification [079 – 079.3] and double marking. [051-051.5] The review of the assessed student work confirms that the assessment briefs, the application of the marking criteria and the moderation processes are carried out in line with the partner university requirements and course requirements.

105 The team reviewed the external examiners' reports in relation to LMU and UWL provision [005, 007, 038 -038.10] and the minutes of exam boards. [003.5, 008, 045 – 045.15] The external examiners reported that the standards are secure, that assessment and classification processes are reliable, fair and transparent and that feedback is supportive. At the time of the review visit no external examiner reports had been received for BNU provision which had only commenced in the academic year 2018-19.

106 The team met senior staff, [M1] academic and professional services staff at the Alperton [M6] and Birmingham [M7] campuses, and partnerships staff [M5] from BNU and UWL to consider their understanding of the requirement to use external expertise and their understanding of assessment and classification processes. In these meetings, staff commented on the effective and appropriate application of awarding body assessment and



classification processes, including the robustness of the verification process. External expertise in the form of external examiner feedback was clearly articulated by the staff and included in the annual reports, course action plans [080, 080.1, 110 – 110.3] and consideration by the deliberative committees, including the course committees and the Quality Enhancement Committee. [003.6, 012, 017, 065.3 - 065.7] The close working arrangements between the School and its partners, via module leads, partner Link Tutors and partner development days support the external oversight. [053 – 053.2, 040 -040.2] The latter activities included quality assurance updates by the awarding bodies and keynote presentations by employers to the students. [M1, M5, M6, M7] The Link Tutors of the partner universities confirmed that their institutions hold the responsibility for determining learning outcomes and setting standards, which the School then maintains and reviews, with each university providing clear oversight. [M5]

107 Students the review team met from each of the campuses confirmed that they understood how their marks had been allocated, that the process was fair and transparent, and that grade descriptors and criteria were clear and accessible in various places, including in the assignment briefs, in handbooks and on the VLE. [M2, M3, M4, M8]

## **Conclusions**

108 As described above the review team considered all the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that their judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. Their conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

109 The School uses external expertise and assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent. This is evident through the academic regulations of the awarding bodies and of the School along with the associated guidance documents that provide a clear and comprehensive framework for the use of external expertise in maintaining sector-recognised standards, and for assessment and classification processes, evident in the institutional approval process and in course documentation as well as through the minutes of the deliberative committees. External examiner reports are positive and confirm that assessment and classification processes are reliable, fair and transparent. The School uses external expertise to enhance the student experience and responds to external examiners confirming that the School gives that expertise appropriate consideration and that it is used to inform action plans. Staff demonstrated clear understanding of the requirements for the use of external expertise and of the School's assessment and classification processes. Students met by the team were appreciative of the quality of feedback and the accessibility of assessment and classification information and confirmed that, in their view, the School's assessment and classification processes are reliable, fair and transparent. Review of assessed student work confirmed that assignment briefs and criteria are aligned with the universities' specifications and that assessment and classification processes are carried out in line with the regulations. The records of the approval events confirm that external expertise is used according to the School's and awarding bodies' regulations. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.

110 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

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

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

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

### The evidence the team considered

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

- a Admissions Policy [<https://www.lsst.ac/wp-content/uploads/Admissions-Policy.pdf> ]
- b Equality and Diversity Policy [066]
- c Governance Handbook Terms of Reference for Admissions and Marketing Committee [002]
- d Minutes of Admissions and Marketing Committee [015]
- e Bucks New University partnership agreement [030]
- f Institutional Memorandum of Agreement with London Metropolitan University and Addendum [088, 059]
- g Franchise agreement with University of West London [059.1]
- h Admissions guidance on School website [<https://www.lsst.ac/how-to-apply/>]
- i Admissions flowchart [014]
- j Admissions Process booklet [083]
- k Approved Course specifications [035, 036, 075]
- l Sample of 35 admissions records viewed during visit, covering courses, awarding bodies, successful and unsuccessful applications
- m Admission Panel Minutes [082]
- n Student Submission [093]
- o Senior Staff meeting [M1]
- p Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Alperton) [M6]
- q Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Birmingham) [M7]
- r Alperton Students meeting [M2]
- s Luton Students meeting [M3]
- t Elephant and Castle Students meeting [M4]
- u Birmingham Students meeting. [M8]

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

115 Arrangements with recruitment agents, because the School reported that they do not use recruitment agents. [033]

## **How any samples of evidence were constructed**

116 The team reviewed a random sample of 35 admissions records from the 2018-19 cohorts representing each main subject area, different awarding bodies, and successful and unsuccessful applicants to assess whether reliable, fair and inclusive admissions decision were made for the applicants sampled.

117 To test whether admissions requirements for the courses reflect the School's overall regulations and policy, the team reviewed the approved course documentation. [035, 036, 075]

## **Why and how the team considered this evidence**

118 As highlighted, all the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the review team holistically either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

119 To identify institutional policy, roles and responsibilities relating to the recruitment, selection and admission of students and the procedures for handling admissions complaints and appeals, the team reviewed the School's partnership agreements, [030, 088, 059, 059.1] Admissions Policy, [<https://www.lsst.ac/wp-content/uploads/Admissions-Policy.pdf>] Equality and Diversity Policy ,[066] Terms of Reference of the Admissions and Marketing Committee, [002, p.19] and meeting with senior staff, [M1]

120 To identify roles and responsibilities of staff involved in supporting applicants, the admissions process and how the School verifies applicants' entry qualifications and recognition of prior experience, the team reviewed the School's Admissions Policy, [<https://www.lsst.ac/wp-content/uploads/Admissions-Policy.pdf>] admissions flowchart, [014] and met with academic and support staff. [M1, M6, M7]

121 Meetings were held with senior, [M1] academic and professional staff [M6, M7] to test their understanding of their responsibilities and to ensure that they are appropriately skilled and supported in making inclusive admissions decisions.

122 To test whether the information given to applicants is transparent, inclusive and fit for purpose and facilitation of an inclusive approach, the team reviewed the admissions information and guidance provided for applicants, [<https://www.lsst.ac/how-to-apply/>], 014, 083] and the Equality and Diversity Policy. [066]

123 To assess the students' views about their experience of the admissions process, the team reviewed the admissions survey [015] and met with students from the different campuses. [M2, M3, M4, M8]

## **What the evidence shows**

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

125 Formal agreements between the School and its awarding bodies confirm that responsibility is delegated to the School for the recruitment and admission of students. [030, 088, 059, 059.1] The School has a comprehensive Admissions Policy

[\[https://www.lsst.ac/wp-content/uploads/Admissions-Policy.pdf\]](https://www.lsst.ac/wp-content/uploads/Admissions-Policy.pdf) for the recruitment, selection and admission of students that clearly articulates how the admissions process operates, including standardised testing, admissions interviews, and clear recording of the outcomes, as evidenced from the admissions records. There is also detail of the support an applicant may expect from the School, including an initial discussion and consultation about the applicant's interests and the suitability of the courses, support with completion of the application form and support during the assessment day to help guide the students through the processes. [014, 083]

126 The Admissions Policy [\[https://www.lsst.ac/wp-content/uploads/Admissions-Policy.pdf\]](https://www.lsst.ac/wp-content/uploads/Admissions-Policy.pdf) sets out the School's procedures for handling complaints and appeals in relation to the admissions process, which are distinct from those specified in the School's Student Complaints Procedures and Appeals Policy and Procedures (dealt with under Core practice Q6). Unsuccessful applicants are given details of the complaints and appeals process and the team was able to confirm that the guidance for making such appeals or complaints was clear and accessible on the website. Admissions complaints and appeals are reviewed by the Admissions Panel: [082] minutes reviewed by the team [082] show that formal appeals are appropriately considered by reviewing the students' full admissions file and the outcome fed back to applicants. [M6]

127 Roles and responsibilities in relation to the recruitment, selection and admission of students are also defined in the Admissions Policy including those of both academic and support staff, and are well understood by staff, in particular the role of the Dean in assessing the applications. [M1, M6, M7] Academic and professional services staff involved in the admissions process receive training including updates on the School's admissions policies and training in interviewing. [M6, M7, 015] The staff further articulated their awareness of and commitment to widening participation as documented in the School's Equality and Diversity Policy [066] demonstrating the School's strong commitment to inclusivity and diversity which is reflected in a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system. Staff were able to clearly articulate how the School's approach to inclusivity manifests itself in the admissions process and the resulting student body and expressed their own commitment to providing opportunities for applicants from all backgrounds. [M6, M7] The team therefore concludes that staff involved in admissions understand their role and are appropriately skilled and trained.

128 Admissions decisions on standard applicants, as described in the approved course documentation [035, 036, 075] and in the Admissions Booklet [083] are made by the relevant Academic Dean of each campus. Applicants with non-standard qualifications or experience needing a discretionary decision are referred to the Admissions Panel. [002, M1, M6] Minutes from Admissions Panel meetings [082] show that it considers applications that fall outside of standard admissions processes (for example, those students with special educational needs, safeguarding concerns and so on). Students' individual needs are appropriately considered, and a decision made on the course of action and any reasonable adjustments that may be required. [082, M6]

129 Minutes of the Admissions and Marketing Committee, as well as results from the Admissions Survey [015] and discussions with staff [M1, M6] demonstrate that the School evaluates its admissions processes and has credible, robust and evidenced-based plans for ensuring its admissions systems are reliable, fair and inclusive. The Admissions Report and Admissions Survey are both discussed by the Admissions and Marketing Committee. [015] Evaluation is used to identify suitable actions to enhance the admissions process, for example increased use of academic interviewers to speed up application times (October 2018) and implementing processes to help ensure applicants provide all relevant documentation to reduce delays to decision making. [015] Its robust admissions system includes a consistent approach to the admissions process across each campus, which

involves agreed entry criteria, admissions teams responsible for the provision of applicant advice, support for applicants, initial assessment of applications and entry qualifications by the Admissions Officers, an online application form and assessments including tests for Maths and English ability and interviews for all applicants. These requirements are well defined in both the Admissions Policy [<https://www.lsst.ac/wp-content/uploads/Admissions-Policy.pdf>] and the Admissions Process booklet [083] and the associated flowchart [014] that are accessible to applicants. [<https://www.lsst.ac/how-to-apply/>] Oversight of the process across the campuses is maintained by the central Admissions and Marketing Committee. [015]

130 Review of the sample of 35 admissions records showed details of the tests and interviews with applicants and a clear summary record of the admissions decisions reached against the admissions criteria, thereby allowing the team to confirm that the School has a consistent approach to handling admissions and to implementing its Admissions Policy with no evidence of deviations. The sample included applicants with non-standard qualifications who completed an additional interview/test for recognition of prior experiential learning (recorded in their admissions file) as well as unsuccessful applicants, with a clear record of where those applicants did not meet the admissions requirements as set by the awarding bodies. Applicants who were unsuccessful were given details of the appeals process; successful applicants were informed as to the next steps in the registration process and points of contact within the School. This was further confirmed through the meeting with academic staff involved in the admissions process who had reported that they received training each year with updates on the admissions policies and training in interviewing, and they were able to fully articulate the School's processes and policy. [M1, M6] The School does not offer academic credit for prior experience or learning (AP(E)L).

131 The outcome of the admissions survey [015] of 583 applicants, which was considered by the Admissions and Marketing Committee, and the student submission [093] show that applicants are satisfied with the admissions process and support available. The review team met 12 students studying at Alperton campus, 12 studying at Luton campus, 11 studying at Elephant and Castle campus and 15 studying at Birmingham campus who all agreed that, in their experience, the admissions procedure had been very encouraging, supportive, fair and transparent. [M2, M3, M4, M8]

132 Students confirmed that after making their initial enquiries, their experiences of the admissions process were the same, including the processes for conducting the tests, and that they had all been interviewed. They further reported that the interview processes were helpful also in helping them ascertain the suitability of the course for them. They found the information they received during the admissions process was clear, helpful, accessible and that their experience of the course matched their expectations. [M2, M3, M4, M8]

## **Conclusions**

133 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. Their conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

134 The review team formulated its judgement against this Core practice according to the process set out in the Guidance for Providers, in particular Annex 5.

135 The School has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system. This is underpinned by clear policies and procedures for the recruitment, selection and admission

of students, which ensure that admissions decisions are reliable, fair and inclusive. Its approach to admissions is consistent and robust and the admissions requirements are consistent with the School's policies. There is central oversight and consideration of the admissions processes which is evidence-based confirming that the School's plans for ensuring that admissions systems are reliable, fair and inclusive are robust and credible. The admissions records reviewed by the team demonstrated that the School operates according to its policies and procedures, with no deviations. Staff involved in the admissions process understand their roles and receive regular training. Viewing the documentary and online information provided for applicants allowed the team to confirm that this is transparent, accessible and fit for purpose. Students met by the team, and through their responses to surveys, indicated that they were very satisfied with their experiences of the admissions process which they found to be fair, inclusive, timely and supportive, and were satisfied with the accuracy and helpfulness of information provided to them. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.

136 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

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

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

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

### The evidence the team considered

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

- a Awarding bodies academic regulations [LMU - <https://student.londonmet.ac.uk/your-studies/student-administration/rules-and-regulations/academic-regulations/>, UWL - [https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic\\_regulations\\_av1920\\_for\\_publishing.pdf](https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic_regulations_av1920_for_publishing.pdf), BNU - [https://bucks.ac.uk/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf](https://bucks.ac.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf)]
- b LSST VLE [<https://portal.lsst.ac>]
- c Partnership agreements [030, 059, 059.1, 088, 095 - 095.2, 095.13 - 095.16]
- d LSST Governance Handbook [002]
- e Terms of Reference [002 pg 31] and minutes of Learning and Teaching Forum [021, 061]
- f Terms of Reference [002 pg 8] and minutes of Academic Board [003, 065, 065.1, 065.2].
- g Terms of Reference [002 pg 15] and minutes of Quality Enhancement Committee [003.2, 065.3 - 065.7]
- h Terms of Reference [002 pg 42] and minutes of Course Committees [003.6, 012, 017, 04]
- i Terms of Reference [002 pg 44] and minutes of Programme Development and Review Group [017.1]
- j Quality Handbook [004]
- k LMU External Examiners' Reports [005, 038, 038.1] and UWL External Examiners' Reports [007, 038.2 - 038.10 ]
- l Quality Report to LSST Academic Board [011]
- m Module handbooks [013, 037 - 037.5, 073, 073.3]
- n Learning and Teaching Handbook [019]
- o Reports from peer reviews and lesson observations [020 - 020.4]
- p HEA Contract [022]
- q Staff Development Policy [026]
- r Course specifications for LMU FdSc Computing and Business Information Technology, [034] BNU FdA Health and Social Care, [035] UWL BA (Hons) Business Studies, [036] LMU FdA Business Studies, [075] BNU BSc (Hons) Health and Social Science [089]
- s Assessment Regulations and Procedures [039]
- t Evidence of staff development on 'Understanding and using levelness' [041]

u	Programme Development and Review Policy [042]
v	Lesson Observation Policy [043]
w	Details of Continuing Professional Development workshops [048]
x	Course handbooks for BNU BA (Hons) Business Management 2019-20, [052] BA (Hons) Business with Foundation, [052.1] BSc (Hons) Health and Social Science 2019-20, [052.2] BA (Hons) Business Management top-up. [052.10] LMU BA (Hons) Business top-up, [052.3] BSc (Hons) Public Health and Health Promotion, [052.4] FdA Health and Social Care 2019-20, [052.5] FdA Business 2018-19, [052.6] UWL BA (Hons) Business top-up 2019-20, [052.7] BA (Hons) Business Studies with Foundation 2019-20, [052.8] BSc (Hons) Health Promotion and Public Health 2019-20, [052.9] BSc (Hons) Information Technology and Business Management with Foundation 2018-19 and 2019-20 [074, 074.3]
y	Details of awarding body development workshops [053, 053.1, 053.2]
z	Evidence of staff development training relating to learning, teaching and assessment by campus Deans [060, 060.1, 060.2]
aa	Staff Continuing Professional Development Records [070, 070.1]
bb	Module evaluations [071 - 071.9]
cc	LSST Staff qualifications - HEA, PGCE, PhD Oct 2019
dd	LMU Course Level Agreements [095.3 - 095.12]
ee	Course and module action plans [110 - 110.3]
ff	Senior Staff meeting [M1]
gg	Alperton Students meeting [M2]
hh	Luton Students meeting [M3]
ii	Elephant and Castle Students meeting [M4]
jj	Birmingham Students meeting [M8]
kk	Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Alperton) [M6]
ll	Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Birmingham). [M7]

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

141 Third party endorsements, as none are available for the provision on offer at the School.

### **How any samples of evidence were constructed**

142 The review team considered the 13 external examiner reports for all programmes from the previous academic year to identify their views about the quality of the courses sampled.

143 The team observed a representative sample of six classes at Alperton and four classes at Birmingham representing provision from each of the awarding bodies to test whether course delivery is high quality.

144 The team reviewed a representative sample of 12 student surveys in order to identify student views about the courses sampled.

### **Why and how the team considered this evidence**

145 As highlighted, all the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the review team holistically, either prior to the visit or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for



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

146 To identify the School's approach to designing and delivering high-quality courses the team reviewed the partnership agreements, [030, 059, 059.1, 088, 095, 095.1, 095.2, 095.13 - 095.16] LMU course-level agreements, [095.3 - 095.12] the awarding bodies' academic regulations, [<https://student.londonmet.ac.uk/your-studies/student-administration/rules-and-regulations/academic-regulations/>, [https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic\\_regulations\\_ay1920\\_for\\_publishing.pdf](https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/default/files/academic_regulations_ay1920_for_publishing.pdf), [https://bucks.ac.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf](https://bucks.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0026/9539/Academic-Assessment-Regulations.pdf)] the School's Assessment Regulations and Procedures, [039] the School's Quality Handbook, [004] the Learning and Teaching Handbook, [019] the Staff Development Policy, [026] a range of staff development activities held by the School and its partners, [022, 041, 048, 053, 053.1, 053.2, 060, 060.1, 060.2] staff qualifications, [076] Lesson Observation Policy, [043] reports from peer reviews [020, 020.1, 020.2] and lesson observations, [020.2, 020.3, 020.4] staff appraisals, [105, 105.1, 105.2] and Terms of Reference [002 pg 31] and minutes of the Learning and Teaching Forum. [021, 061]

147 To assess whether the School has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for delivering and designing high-quality courses, the team reviewed the School's Governance Handbook, [002] Programme Development and Review Policy, [042] Terms of Reference [002 pg 44] and minutes of the Programme Development and Review Group, [003.4, 017.1, 018] Terms of Reference [002 pg 31] and minutes of course committees, [003.6, 012, 017, 104] Terms of Reference [002 pg 8] and minutes of Academic Board [003, 065, 065.1, 065.2], Terms of Reference [002 pg 15] and Minutes of Quality Enhancement Committee, [003.2, 065.3 - 065.7] module [013, 037 - 037.5, 073, 073.3] and course [052 - 052.9, 074, 074.3] handbooks, module evaluations, [071 - 071.9] external examiner reports, [005, 007, 038, 038.1 - 038.10] course materials posted on the VLE, [<https://portal.lsst.ac>] course and module action plans. [110.1, 110.2, 110.3]

148 To test that the programmes are high quality in terms of curriculum design, content and organisation, learning, teaching and assessment approaches and that the teaching, learning and assessment design will enable students to demonstrate the intended learning outcomes, the team reviewed approved course documentation including course specifications [034, 035, 036, 075, 089] and module [013, 037 - 037.5, 073, 073.3] and course [052 - 052.9, 074, 074.3] handbooks.

149 The team met senior [M1] academic and professional support staff [M6, M7] to assess how staff ensure courses are high quality.

150 To identify students' views about the quality of the programmes and of their learning experience, the team reviewed student views as expressed through external surveys, [025] feedback from module evaluations, [071 - 071.9] and met with students from each of the campuses. [M2, M3, M4, M8]

## **What the evidence shows**

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

152 The School delivers courses designed by its awarding bodies. [030, 059, 059.1, 088, 095 - 095.16] Course specifications [034, 035, 036, 075, 089] demonstrate that these are aligned with the appropriate level of the FHEQ and take account of Subject Benchmark Statements and Qualification Characteristics Statements. In the case of LMU, the School has been able, as discussed at Programme Approval and Review Group meetings (PARG) [017.1] and with approval from the University, to make some minor modifications to the assessment structures, reducing the number of assessment tasks from three to two for each

module taught to better align with its delivery structure and in response to feedback from students. [017.1, M1] Following consideration at the Programme Approval and Review Group, [017.1] the approval process involves discussion with the University, following which the School completes LMU's 'Course Modification Statement of Compliance' document which is sent to the University and approved through its formal quality assurance processes. [M1] Module learning outcomes remain unchanged. [M1]

153 The School complies with the academic regulations of its awarding bodies for course delivery and assessment as defined in the partnership agreements [030, 059, 059.1, 088, 095, 095.1, 095.2, 095.13 - 095.16] and the School's Assessment regulations and procedures. [039] The School's Quality Handbook [004] and Teaching and Learning Handbook [019] provide comprehensive guidance to academic members of staff on how to deliver high-quality courses, [M6, M7] including guidance on teaching practices, assessment design, marking practices and grading criteria as well as signposts for student support. This guidance is further supplemented by a range of teaching and learning development activities for academic staff including workshops and staff development days. These have included additional guidance on marking practices and also approaches to delivery such as flipped teaching; [041, 048, 060, 060.1, 060.2] development days held by partner organisations; [053, 053.1, 053.2] graded lesson and peer observations [043, 020.2 - 020.4] which feed into staff appraisals with associated identification of development needs; [105 - 105.2] peer reviews of teaching practice; [020 - 020.2] the Learning and Teaching Forum [021, 061] and, in line with its staff development policy, [026] an allocation of 20 days per year development time built into workload models. The School also provides support for applications for Fellowship to AdvanceHE, with 27 staff members currently holding Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy (HEA) and a further eight staff members having successfully applied for Fellowship and awaiting certification, one being for Senior Fellowship; [022, 076, M1, M6, M7] and for staff to gain higher academic or teaching qualifications with eight members of staff currently studying for a PhD and nine for a PGCE. [M1, M6, M7, 070, 070.1, 076] Together, these various mechanisms support the delivery of, and illustrate the School's commitment to, high-quality courses by demonstrating that the School complies fully with the requirements and regulations of its awarding bodies, provides staff development opportunities and guidance to ensure the delivery of courses is high quality, and observes course delivery, taking appropriate remedial action where required.

154 The School's plans for delivering high-quality courses are set out in its Programme Development and Review policy. [042] This defines the School's approach to selecting programmes from its awarding bodies, which includes consideration of compatibility with the School's vision, the market need and the School's resource base, as well as the review, evaluation and enhancement of programmes through consideration by the PARG. [017.1, 018] The PARG [002 pg 44] is responsible for the oversight and consideration of academic development and enhancement of the School's provision, which is achieved through the review of current partnership arrangements and consideration of proposals for new developments. [003.4, 017.1, 018] Course committees [002 pg 31] monitor the quality of programme delivery based on the reports from the external examiners, student and staff feedback and student progression data. [03.6; 012; 017, 104] The School responds to issues and recommendations arising from feedback on the quality of delivery of its courses: this feedback emanates from student module evaluations, [071 - 071.9] course committees [03.6; 012; 017] and external examiners' reports and is fed up through Quality Enhancement Committee [002 pg 15, 003.2, 065.3 - 065.7] to Academic Board. [002 pg 15, 003, 011, 065, 065.1, 065.2] The associated action plans are followed up through course committees [110 - 110.3] and minutes of deliberative committees, including course committees, [03.6; 012; 017, 110] the Programme Development and Review Group [003.4, 017.1, 018] and Academic Board. Academic Board considers the School's annual Quality Report which analyses the outcomes from annual monitoring, external examiner reports, student feedback and a range of data including progression and completion statistics. [03, 011, 065, 065.1,

065.2] Together these deliberations and plans provide clear evidence of credible, robust and evidence-based plans for delivering high-quality courses.

155 The School follows the academic regulations of the awarding bodies for course delivery, [039] which ensures that the schemes of work, lesson content and organisation, and learning, teaching and assessment are high quality. [052 - 052.9, 074, 074.3] Approved course documentation for the courses clearly outlines learning outcomes, schemes of work, assessment requirements, marking criteria and classifications, [034, 035, 036, 075, 089] [013, 037 - 037.5, 073, 073.3] enabling students to demonstrate the intended learning outcomes.

156 External examiners' reports confirm that the courses are high quality through their comments on the teaching and learning, and assessment tasks of the courses taught by the School. [005, 007, 038 - 038.10] External examiners' suggestions and recommendations are considered through course committees, [03.6; 012; 017, 104] module and course action plans, [110, 110.1, 110.2, 110.3] and reflected on through Quality Enhancement Committee, which monitors their implementation as well as through the annual reports to the awarding bodies. [002 pg 15, 003.2, 010, 065.3 - 065.7, 080, 101]

157 Staff met by the team clearly understood and articulated what high quality courses entail by explaining the internal processes for course delivery, assessment design (where appropriate), assessment marking and moderation, collecting and responding to student feedback, lesson and peer observation and staff development activities. [M1, M6, M7] The School also runs Learning and Teaching Forums to bring staff together from all the campuses to discuss teaching and assessment practices [021, 061] and participate in shared collaborative partner development workshops that allow academic staff to share good practice in learning and teaching. [053, 053.1, 053.2]

158 The team reviewed the internal and external student evaluations of teaching and course quality. Students' views were that the staff are good at explaining things and that the courses are intellectually stimulating and challenged them to achieve their best work. [025, 071 - 071.9] This was also confirmed by the students met by the team from the different campuses who considered their courses to be of high quality, spoke very positively of the skill and professionalism of their academic staff, the comprehensive support provided by staff and of the quality of their overall learning experience. [M2, M3, M4, M8]

159 The review team observed 10 classes across the courses sampled [TO1-TO10] and determined that content was appropriate, the learning outcomes for the classes are achievable within the set teaching timeframe, with evidence of planning and organisation, effective use of resources and engaging delivery with active participation by the students, supporting the conclusion that the School delivers high-quality courses. The review team considered that the staff delivering the teaching observed were knowledgeable about their subjects and were using their own industrial or research experience to inform their practice. These observations support the view that academic staff deliver an appropriate and high-quality academic experience.

## **Conclusions**

160 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. Its conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

161 The School delivers high-quality courses that are designed by the awarding universities. This is underpinned by application of the relevant academic regulations and approved course documentation in conjunction with action planning and monitoring by the School and its awarding bodies, demonstrating that the School has robust and credible plans to facilitate the delivery of high-quality courses. The staff understand what high-quality delivery means in the context of the School and are able to show how their courses meet that definition and were able to explain the mechanisms in place such as graded lesson and peer observations, staff development opportunities and internal second marking and moderation of assessment tasks that ensure quality remains high. Internal and external student evaluations and the expressed views of the students met by the team from the different campuses reflect their opinion that the courses they are studying are of high quality. These views were endorsed through direct observation of teaching activities that demonstrated clarity of objectives, good planning and organisation, a sound approach, good delivery, appropriate content, effective use of resources and good student engagement. The School's regulations and policies for course delivery facilitate the delivery of high-quality courses and the approved course documentation indicates that the teaching, learning and assessment design enable students to meet and demonstrate the intended learning outcomes. External examiner reports confirm that courses are high quality. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.

162 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

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

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

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

#### **The evidence the team considered**

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

- a Quality Handbook [004]
- b Staff Development Policy [026]
- c Staff Recruitment and Selection Policy [084]
- d Learning and Teaching Forum minutes [021]
- e Campus Peer Review Reports [020]
- f Peer Review and Lesson Observation Reports [020.1-020.4]
- g Staff Development workshop: Understanding Levelness [041]
- h Teaching Observation Policy [043]
- i Awarding Organisation workshops [053-053.3]
- j Staff development reports of campus Deans [060-060.2]
- k New Staff Details [076]
- l Staff Continuing Professional Development records [070-070.1]
- m External Examiner Reports [005; 007; 038-038.10]
- n Link Tutor Reports [040-040.2; 010]
- o Staff Organisational Chart [094]
- p Staff Job descriptions [047-047.5]
- q Staff CVs [092-092.19]
- r Staff Continuing Professional Development records [071]
- s Buckinghamshire Partnership Operations Manual [112]
- t Examples of module evaluations [071-071.9]
- u Student submission [093]
- v Teaching observations [TO1 – TO8]
- w Senior Staff meeting [M1]
- x Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Alperton) [M6]
- y Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Birmingham) [M7]
- z Link Tutors meeting (BNU and UWL) [M5]
- aa Alperton Students meeting [M2]
- bb Luton Students meeting [M3]
- cc Elephant and Castle Students meeting [M4]
- dd Birmingham Students meeting. [M8]

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

167 Third party endorsements, as none are available for the provision on offer at the School.

### **How any samples of evidence were constructed**

168 The review team considered a representative sample of 20 staff CVs and eight job descriptions in order to gain a full understanding of specific roles in the School and to assess whether staff are appropriately qualified and skilled to perform their roles effectively.

169 The review team observed a representative sample of six classes at Alperton and four classes at Birmingham representing provision from each of the awarding bodies to test whether academic staff deliver a high-quality learning experience.

170 The review team considered a representative sample of 12 student surveys to identify students' views about sufficiency, qualifications and skills of staff.

### **Why and how the team considered this evidence**

171 As highlighted, all the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the review team holistically either prior to the visit or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

172 The team reviewed the School's staff recruitment and selection policy and other relevant policies, [084; 026; 043] as well as Continuing Professional Development records [071; 070-070.10; 053-053.3; 060-060.2] to identify how the School recruits, appoints, inducts and supports staff [M1] to ensure there are sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience and to confirm that the staff were recruited according to the School's and awarding bodies' policies and procedures. [112; 026; 084]

173 To assess whether the School has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for ensuring they have sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience, the team also considered the staff development activities organised internally by the School and in collaboration with its awarding bodies. [021; 020; 020.1-020.4; 053; 053.1; 053.2; 060; 060.1; 060.2; 070; 076] In addition, the team reviewed the Lesson Observation Policy [043] and Peer Review Reports and Lesson Observation Summary Reports. [020-020.4]

174 The team considered the staffing structure [094; M1; M6; M7] to identify the roles or posts the provider has to deliver a high-quality academic experience and assess whether they are sufficient, and considered 20 staff CVs and associated job descriptions [092-092.19; 047-047.5] to assess whether the staff sampled are appropriately qualified and skilled to perform their roles effectively.

175 The team met School senior staff [M1] and representatives from the awarding bodies [M5] and reviewed external examiner reports [005; 007; 038-038.10] to identify other organisations' views about sufficiency, qualifications and skills of staff.

176 The team met 50 students from across the four campuses [M2; M3; M4; M8] and considered documentary comments from students in module evaluation surveys [071-071.9] and the student submission [093] to identify students' views about sufficiency, qualifications and skills of staff.

177 The team undertook 10 Teaching Observations [TO1-TO10] to test whether academic staff deliver a high-quality learning experience.

### **What the evidence shows**

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

179 The School has a robust staff recruitment and selection policy [084] that sets out the scope, principles and procedures to ensure that the staff who are recruited are appropriately qualified and skilled and that staffing is based on admissions numbers. [M1] Applications for academic staff posts are assessed and reviewed in accordance with the person specification; shortlisted applicants are interviewed and undertake a teaching exercise. [084, M1, M6; M7] The awarding bodies confirm the suitability of academic applicants' qualifications within the recruitment process. [M5; 112] The School conducts an established induction process for new members of staff, including mentoring [084, M1; M6; M7] and ensures that staff remain skilled by sponsoring applications for Fellowship through AdvanceHE and allocating time for personal development. [M1; M6; M7] This demonstrates that the School recruits, inducts and supports staff so that it has appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience. It further shows that staff are recruited, appointed, inducted and supported according to both the School's and awarding bodies' policies.

180 The School's staff development activities, including those supported by the awarding bodies, were appropriate to the needs of higher education provision and extended to individual support to maintain subject currency and support for higher qualifications. These include the Learning and Teaching Forum, [021] which brings all staff together from across the different campuses to workshop teaching activities identified through feedback and external advice, and collaborative partner workshops. Examples of the topics of these activities included: plagiarism; extensions; mitigations; VLE training; assessment marking standards; library services; student well-being; student experience; retention; and academic support. Staff also reported that they have individual time allocations (20 days per year) for personal development and scholarship. [026; 021; 041; 053 - 053.2; 060 - 060.2; 071; 076; M6; M7] In addition, review of the Lesson Observation Policy [043] and Peer Review Reports and Lesson Observation Summary Reports [020-020.4], which feed into appraisal and the identification of development needs such as developing skills in class management and presentation, which also inform the agendas for the learning and teaching forums, [M1; M5; M6; M7] demonstrated the School's approach to supporting and maintaining appropriately skilled staff. Examples of Continuing Professional Development records [070 - 070.4] and annual staff appraisal records for teaching staff [071 - 071.3] demonstrate engagement with these developmental activities and that the School has credible, robust and evidence-based ongoing plans to ensure it has sufficient qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience.

181 The review team considered the School's staff organisation structure [092] to be sufficient for the scope of the delivery and displays the wide-ranging posts that are in place to deliver a high-quality learning experience. The teaching, professional services and support staff met by the review team confirmed their active participation in development activities, similarly affirming that there is skilled staffing to ensure delivery of a high-quality academic experience. [M6; M7] The team also heard from staff who observed that the recruitment process was rigorous but supportive and that mentoring was in place to support

teaching development as well as an induction programme. [M6; M7]

182 A review of the CVs of 20 members of academic and professional services staff [092-092.19] demonstrated that staff are appropriately qualified and skilled to perform their roles effectively in terms of the academic qualifications and/or industrial experience as well as, in many cases, prior teaching experience in other providers. All the examples of CVs of academic staff showed they held academic qualifications to a level higher than that being taught, and relevant teaching and often industrial experience. The School's approach to staff recruitment and selection, with clear job descriptions for both academic and professional services staff, [047-047.7] demonstrates the School's commitment to ensuring that staff are recruited according to its stipulated policies and procedures, [084] which include interviews and teaching observations as well as review of academic qualifications. Representatives from the awarding bodies also confirmed that they approve the CVs for academic staff appointments. [M5; 112; 084]

183 The external examiners report positively on the quality of teaching by the staff, their understanding of the modules, the consistency achieved across the campuses and the supportive provision of feedback. These reports identify that there are sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience. [007, 032, 033, 038-038.10, 085]

184 Student evaluations and surveys [071-071.9] and the student submission [093] generally confirm that students agree or strongly agree that staff are enthusiastic, knowledgeable and skilled. Students whom the review team met endorsed these views, being highly complimentary in their comments about the staff, in particular their belief that staff are well qualified with the relevant experience. [M2, M3, M4; M8] Together these perspectives allowed confirmation that students agree that there are sufficient appropriately skilled and qualified academic staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience.

185 The review team observed 10 classes across all programmes at two campuses. [TO1-TO10] The lecturers presented appropriate lesson plans, actively engaged with the students and provided feedback to student responses in class with additional materials being made available online through the VLE. The review team considered that the staff delivering the teaching observed were knowledgeable about their subjects and were using their own industrial or research experience to inform their practice. These observations support the view that the academic staff are appropriately qualified and skilled to deliver a high-quality academic experience.

## **Conclusions**

186 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. Its conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

187 The School has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience. Evidence to support this includes that the School has robust regulations and credible plans for the recruitment, appointment, induction and support of sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to facilitate delivery of a high-quality academic experience. The team concluded this because the School has a staff structure with sufficient posts to enable it to deliver a high-quality learning experience with plans in place to enable matching of staffing levels to student numbers. Staff met by the team and review of the CVs allowed confirmation that staff have been recruited, appointed, inducted



and supported according to the School's policies. Observations of teaching and learning indicate that teaching staff are appropriately qualified and skilled, and that the quality of the teaching is high. The School is committed to the training and development of its academic and support staff. Evidence from student views expressed through surveys and in meetings with the review team indicates that they agree that there are sufficient appropriately skilled and qualified and experienced staff to perform their roles effectively and to deliver a high-quality academic experience. The review team therefore concludes that the School meets this Core practice.

188 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

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

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

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

### **The evidence the team considered**

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

- a Executive Committee minutes [003.1, 078, 078.1, 115, 118, 119]
- b Quality Enhancement Committee minutes [003.2, 114]
- c Publications Committee minutes [003.3, 018]
- d Programme Development and Review Group minutes [003.4,118]
- e Learning and teaching handbook [019]
- f Board of Governors [023]
- g NSS overview 2019 [025]
- h Campus Infrastructure Alperton [027]
- i Campus Infrastructure Elephant and Castle [027.1]
- j Campus Infrastructure Luton [027.2]
- k Campus Infrastructure Birmingham [027.3]
- l Student Representation Development Programme [028]
- m Student Handbook 2018-19 [031]
- n Principal's Statement Procedure for purchasing core texts and resources for approved LSST courses [046]
- o Academic staff job descriptions [047 – 047.7]
- p Student support and disability policy [049]
- q Student support and welfare committee minutes [054]
- r Evidence of student support initiatives [055 – 055.7]
- s Personal Tutor Committee TOR and minutes [056]
- t Academic Support Centre TOR and minutes [057]
- u Personal Academic Tutorial Policy [064]
- v QEC and Academic Board minutes [065 – 065.7]
- w Equality and Diversity Policy [066]
- x Student engagement policy [067]
- y Principal's statement details of how access to resources are introduced [068]
- z Student support services operational plan [069]
- aa Examples of module evaluations [071 – 071.9]

bb	Plans and strategy for move from Alperton to Wembley including student information [077 – 077.14]
cc	LSST student engagement strategy 2019-20 [085]
dd	Staff CVs [092 – 092.19]
ee	LSST organisational chart 2019 [094]
ff	LSST Operations Manual [112]
gg	Operations Panel meeting [113]
hh	Alperton Students meeting [M2]
ii	Luton Students meeting [M3]
jj	Elephant and Castle Students meeting [M4]
kk	Birmingham Students meeting [M8]
ll	Senior Staff meeting [M1]
mm	Academic and Professional Services Staff meetings (Alperton) [M6]; (Birmingham). [M7]

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

193 Third party endorsements, as none are available for the provision on offer at the School.

### **How any samples of evidence were constructed**

194 The review team considered a representative sample of 12 student surveys to identify students' views about facilities, learning resources and student support services.

195 The review team considered a representative sample of eight job descriptions to determine whether roles are consistent with the delivery of a high-quality learning experience.

### **Why and how the team considered this evidence**

196 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the review team holistically either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

197 To identify how facilities, learning resources and student support services are monitored and contribute to delivering a high-quality academic experience, the team reviewed strategies for facilities, learning resources and student support services considered through key discussions in a Board of Governors meeting, [023] Executive Committee meetings, [003.1, 078, 078.1, 115, 118, 119] Quality Enhancement Committee, [003.2, 114, 065 – 065.7] Programme Development and Review Group minutes, [003.4, 118] Publications Committee minutes, [033.3] and a Student Support and Welfare Committee. [054]

198 The team reviewed the developmental and business plans for ensuring sufficient and appropriate facilities, [027 – 027.3, 077 – 077.14] learning resources purchasing and access, [046, 068] the Operations Manual and Executive Committee planning meetings [112, 113] to ensure that plans to provide student support services are credible and robust. This also included the Personal Academic Tutoring approach, [064, 055 – 055.7, 056] the Terms of Reference for Academic Support Centre and associated minutes [057] and the

Student Support Centre, [054, 069, 085] which is being developed to further enhance the support, retention and success of the students.

199 The Equality and Diversity Policy, [066] Student Engagement Policy, [067] Student support and disability policy, [049] the School's Student Handbook, [031] the Teaching and Learning Handbook [019] and Student Representative Development Programme [028] were reviewed to identify how the School's approach enables accessibility, inclusion and support for students to facilitate a high-quality student experience.

200 The review team examined documentary comments from students in module evaluation surveys, [071 – 071.9] and the NSS [025] and additionally asked the students they met [M2, M3, M4, M8] to identify their views on the sufficiency and quality of the facilities, learning resources and student support services available to them.

201 The School's organisational chart [094] and the job descriptions of seven roles [047 – 047.7] involved in the provision of facilities and support for students were examined to determine if they were consistent with the delivery of a high-quality learning experience.

202 The views of senior [M1] and academic and professional services staff [M6, M7] whom the team met, key role descriptions [047 – 047.7] and staff CVs [092 – 092.19] were explored to test the sufficiency and quality of provision and to determine if staff are appropriately qualified and skilled and that they understand their roles and responsibilities (Q3 also refers).

203 To identify how the provider's facilities, learning resources and student support services contribute to delivering a high-quality academic experience, the team undertook direct examination of the learning resources at two campuses, including classrooms, computer rooms, the VLE, libraries, student social spaces and student support areas; [LR1, LR2] there was also a virtual tour of one of the campuses the team could not visit in person.

### **What the evidence shows**

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

205 Review of the minutes of key discussions at different levels, from the Board of Governors, [023] the Executive Committee [003.1, 078, 078.1, 115, 118, 119] to the Quality Enhancement Committee [003.2, 114, 065 – 065.7] and the Programme Development and Review Group [003.4, 118] and through to module reviews [071 – 071.9] showed effective consideration of provision of facilities, learning resources and student support services to underpin the delivery of a high-quality academic experience, in particular the matching of resource provision to projected student numbers. The team was able to confirm that the plans and approaches for ensuring sufficient and appropriate facilities, [033.3, 027 – 027.3, 089] learning resources [113] and student support services [054] are credible and robust because these minutes detail the consideration given to the planning and monitoring of resources, including consideration of planned student numbers to ensure that the facilities and staffing levels for the period ahead are appropriate. Meetings with senior staff further confirmed the integrity of the planning processes. [M1]

206 The Personal Academic Tutoring system, [064, 055 - 055.7, 056] the Academic Support Centre [057] and the Student Services Centre [054, 069, 085] at each campus are being developed to make a significant contribution to the retention and success of students. [027 – 027,003, 077 – 071.14, 046, 068, 112, 113] All students are allocated a personal tutor and there are timetabled personal tutor meetings that enable the provision of academic and pastoral support as well as engagement with personal development plans. Student Services also provide pastoral and academic support, the latter including skills development sessions

such as study and writing skills. These were all viewed very positively by all students the team met from across the different campuses, who also commented on the open-door policy of all staff, reflecting the consistent approach to support. [M2, M3, M6, M8]

207 Relevant policies for student support, personal academic tutor support, student engagement and equality and diversity, including the Equality and Diversity Policy, [066] Student Engagement Policy, [067] Student Support and Disability Policy, [049] Personal Academic Tutorial Policy, [064] the School's Student Handbook, [031] the Teaching and Learning Handbook [019] and Student Representative Development Programme [028] were reviewed to identify how the School's approach enables accessibility. The School's Student Handbook [054] and Teaching and Learning Handbook [019] include clear guidance and expectations around inclusivity, equality and diversity, personal development planning, safeguarding and employability skills, in order to facilitate a high-quality student experience for all students and successful academic and professional outcomes. The School's Student Handbook [054] further includes detailed sections regarding the resources that students are expected to use and fully engage with and the support mechanisms in place to provide a high-quality academic experience. These include, for example, guidance regarding the Personal Academic Tutoring System, the Academic Support Centre and the Student Services Centre. The team therefore concludes that there are sufficient processes and structures in place to facilitate a high-quality and accessible academic experience.

208 Comments from students in module evaluation surveys [071 – 071.9] and the NSS [025] indicate that students regard the facilities supporting learning positively including IT and library resources. These views were confirmed in meetings with the team [M2, M3, M4, M8] during which the students also noted the easy access to IT equipment, to the well designed and accessible VLE, and in the main to library resources. The School evaluates student feedback, including from the internal and external surveys, as part of the ongoing review processes undertaken by the course committee meetings and the Quality Enhancement Committee, and develops action plans to improve the student experience. [003.2, 114] Students were appreciative of the support available to them, commenting positively on the Personal Academic Tutor role for both academic and pastoral support, the availability of other support services, for example in terms of study skills and careers advice, and the approachability of staff. [M2, M3, M4, M8] The team therefore concludes that students regard the facilities, learning resources and student support services as sufficient and appropriate and that they facilitate a high-quality academic experience.

209 Job descriptions of key staff [047 – 047.7] and a sample of 20 staff CVs [092 – 092.19] demonstrate that staff roles are appropriately defined and focused in order to deliver a high-quality student experience (Q3 also refers). The School's organisation chart [094] indicates that appropriate structures and resources are in place, and academic and professional services staff that the team met [M1, M6, M7] were able to demonstrate their understanding of their roles and responsibilities, and their contribution to supporting a high-quality academic experience. They noted particularly the impact of student feedback on the services they provide, articulating where they had made improvements as a result, such as the improvement in provision in social space and core textbooks. [M6, M7, LR1, LR2]

210 Direct examination by the team of physical facilities and resources at two of the campuses and a virtual tour of another campus revealed appropriate and well-equipped teaching, break-out spaces and student support areas which appeared adequate for the number of students. [LR1, LR2] The provider operates a VLE that contains all the programme information for students and course materials are uploaded in advance of teaching sessions. [M2, M3, M4, M8] The physical libraries at each of the School's campuses are small; however, students are also able to access online texts and resources and use the partner universities' libraries and a package of online resources including the partner universities' VLEs. The team was therefore able to confirm that the facilities and

learning resources provide a high-quality academic experience.

## **Conclusions**

211 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. Its conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

212 The School has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience. The team was able to determine this because the School's plans for facilities, learning resources and student support services, as demonstrated through the minutes of relevant committees and direct meetings with senior, academic and professional services staff are forward-looking, credible, realistic and demonstrably linked to the delivery of successful academic and professional outcomes for students. Staff roles, as set out in the job descriptions and organisational chart are focused and the team was able to confirm, through meetings with academic and professional services staff, that they understand their roles and are appropriately qualified and experienced (Q3 also refers). Students were appreciative of the support available to them, commenting positively in meetings, on the Personal Academic Tutor role, the availability of other support services such as the Academic Support Centre and the approachability of staff. This was further confirmed through the positive results of the National Student Survey. The team therefore concludes that students tend to regard facilities, learning resources and student support services as sufficient and appropriate, and facilitating a high-quality academic experience. The review team's own assessment of the facilities and learning resources confirms that they afford a high-quality academic experience because the teaching and learning spaces are appropriate, well-equipped and of good quality, with resources and support functions that support student progress well. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.

213 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

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

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

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

### **The evidence the team considered**

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

- a Governance Handbook [002]
- b Academic Board Minutes [003, 065 – 065.2]
- c Quality Enhancement Committee Minutes [003.2, 065.3 – 065.7]
- d Course Committee Documentation [003.6, 012, 017, 104]
- e Quality Handbook [004]
- f Student Handbook [031]
- g Student Representative Development Programme [028]
- h Strategic Enhancement Plan [032, 107]
- i Course Handbooks [052 – 052.9]
- j Student Engagement Policy [067]
- k Module Questionnaires [071 – 071.9]
- l Student Engagement Strategy 2019-20 [085]
- m Student Written Submission [093]
- n Students' Union Constitution and Organogram [096 – 096.1]
- o Quality Enhancement Framework Nov 2019 [102]
- p Meetings with Senior Staff [M1]
- q Alperton Students meeting [M2]
- r Luton Students meeting [M3]
- s Elephant and Castle Students meeting [M4]
- t Birmingham Students meeting [M8]
- u Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Alperton) [M6]
- v Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Birmingham). [M7]

### **How any samples of evidence were constructed**

217 The review team considered a representative sample of 12 student surveys to identify student views about student engagement in the quality of their educational experience.

218 Meetings were held with 50 students from across the four campuses: 12 students from the Alperton campus, 15 students from the Birmingham campus, 11 students from the Elephant and Castle Campus, and 12 students from the Luton campus to assess whether

students consider they are engaged in the quality of their educational experience.

### **Why and how the team considered this evidence**

219 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the review team holistically either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

220 To identify how the School actively engages students in the quality of their educational experience, the team reviewed the Student Handbook, [031] Governance Handbook, [002] Quality Handbook, [004] Student Engagement Strategies, [067, 085] Students' Union Constitution, [096 – 096.1] and the Quality Enhancement Framework. [102]

221 To assess whether the provider has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for engaging students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience, the team reviewed the Student Engagement Policy [067] and Strategy 2019/20, [085] Student Representative Development Programme, [028] and the Strategic Enhancement Plan. [032, 107]

222 To identify students' views about student engagement in the quality of their educational experience, the team reviewed module evaluations [071 – 071.9] and the student written submission. [093]

223 The team met with senior staff [M1] and academic and professional services staff [M6, M7] to identify their views about student engagement and to identify actions taken in response to student feedback.

### **What the evidence shows**

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

225 The School's approach to actively engaging students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience is defined in the School's Student Engagement Policy. [067, 102] This outlines a comprehensive set of measures which ensure that students, regardless of their programme or campus, are fully engaged with the School's quality assurance framework. This includes an established Students' Union [096] with representatives for each of the School's four campuses, [096.1] elected student representation on a number of committees charged with maintaining sector-recognised standards, including the School's Academic Board [004, 003, 065 – 065.2] and Quality Enhancement Committee, [004, 003.2, 065.3 – 065.7] as well as module and course evaluations. [071 – 071.9]

226 The arrangements for engaging students in the quality of their educational experience are clearly outlined in the School's Student Engagement Policy. [067] Quality Handbook, [004] Student Handbook, [031] and Course Handbooks. [052 – 052.9] These include details of the operation of the student representation system, the representation on different committees and a role descriptor for the representatives. Course committees for each programme take place, are attended by both academic teaching staff and relevant student representatives and are formally minuted. [003.6, 12, 017, 104] The minutes of these meetings record feedback reports from the representatives and there is evidence of actions



taken in response, such as a reduction in the number of assessments for LMU provision which was adopted and actioned. [003.6, 012, 017, 104, M2] This evidence along with that set out in paragraph 207 enabled the team to conclude that the School has a clear approach to engaging students individually and collectively in the quality of their educational experience and that its plans are robust and credible.

227 Student representatives undergo a comprehensive training programme through the School's Representative Development Programme, which is designed to ensure representatives fully understand their roles in the broader context of the School's quality assurance processes while also equipping representatives with the skills to operate effectively. This programme includes details of their responsibilities as representatives, guidance regarding engaging with committee work, the sources of support and the roles of the different committees of which they are members. [M1, 028] Meetings with student representatives from each of the School's four campuses confirmed that this training was helpful and that both their views and the views of students more broadly were taken seriously by the School and acted on; for example, the reduction in the number of LMU assessments, amendments to the teaching week timetable and addressing behaviour in some classes. [M2 – M4, M8] Together, this evidence demonstrates that the School has a robust, credible, and evidence-based plan for engaging students individually and collectively in the quality of their educational experience.

228 The review team was provided with a number of examples where the School has changed and improved students' experience as a result of engagement with students and student representatives, including the introduction of a canteen facility to the Birmingham campus and the provision of additional learning resources for specific programmes, for example provision of books and availability of IT resources at one of the campuses. [032, 107, M1, M3, M6, M7] The review team also met with 12 students from the Alperton campus, 15 students from the Birmingham campus, 11 students from the Elephant and Castle campus, and 12 students from the Luton campus. Students and student representatives met by the team were overwhelmingly positive when reflecting on how responsive the School has been to student feedback providing additional examples of changes the School has made following their feedback. [M2 – M4, M8] Students confirmed that the communication from both their representatives and the School meant that they were aware of the impact of their feedback. This was also reinforced by the posting of 'You Said... We Did' posters, which the review team observed in communal areas and corridors around the building.

229 These students confirmed that the School engages them fully in the quality of their educational experience and that staff are open to receiving their feedback. [M2 – M4, M8] Responses to the School's end-of-module and course surveys [025, 071 – 071.9] alongside the student written submission [093] reinforced the picture of a positive close working relationship between the School and its student body. Students commented on the outstanding level of support that the academic and professional support staff provide them with and confirmed that they are encouraged to provide feedback, which is acted on wherever possible.

## **Conclusions**

230 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. Its conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

231 The School actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of

their educational experience. As evidenced from the review of committee minutes, actions taken in response to student feedback and direct meetings with students who report that the School engages them in the quality of their educational experience, the School has a clear and effective approach, and through its policies, robust and credible plans to actively engage students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience. Students are engaged in several ways, including via their Students' Union, the student representative system, and through various formal surveys. There are numerous examples of the School making changes to both the curriculum and the physical infrastructure of the School itself as a result of student engagement. Students met by the team reported that the School engages them in the quality of their educational experience and reflected positively on the responsiveness of the School. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.

232 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

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

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

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

### **The evidence the team considered**

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

- a Governance Handbook [002]
- b Academic Board Minutes [003, 065 – 065.2]
- c Quality Enhancement Committee Minutes [003.2, 065.3 – 065.7]
- d Quality Handbook [004]
- e Quality Report to Academic Board [011]
- f Student Complaints Log (last 3 years) [029, 050.2 – 050.3, 099]
- g Academic Appeals Log (last 3 years) [029.1, 050 – 050.1]
- h Student Handbook [031]
- i Academic Support Tutor Job Description [047]
- j Student Support and Disability Policy [049]
- k Course Handbooks [052 – 052.9]
- l Example Student Support Initiatives (19/20) [055.7]
- m Partnership Agreements with LMU, UWL, BNU [059 – 059.1, 095 – 095.1]
- n Academic Appeals Policy [062]
- o Student Complaints Policy [063]
- p Personal Academic Tutoring Policy [064]
- q Student Support Services Operational Plan [069]
- r Example Academic Appeals [097 – 097.3]
- s Example Student Complaints [098 – 098.4]
- t Registry Committee minutes [124]
- u Public Website [<http://lsst.ac>]
- v VLE [<http://portal.lsst.ac>]
- w Meetings with Senior Staff [M1]
- x Alperton Students meeting [M2]
- y Luton Students meeting [M3]
- z Elephant and Castle Students meeting [M4]
- aa Birmingham Students meeting [M8]
- bb Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Alperton) [M6]
- cc Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Birmingham). [M7]

## **How any samples of evidence were constructed**

236 The team reviewed a sample of five student complaints and four academic appeals from 2018-19 and 2019-20 as well as the complete log of complaints and appeals from the last three academic years to test whether the School has a fair and transparent procedure for handling complaints and appeals.

## **Why and how the team considered this evidence**

237 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the review team holistically either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the providers' ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

238 To identify the provider's processes for handling complaints and appeals, and to further confirm that these processes were fair and transparent the team reviewed the Governance Handbook, [002] Quality Handbook, [004] Student Handbook, [031] Course Handbooks, [052 – 052.9] Partnership Agreements, [059 – 059.1, 095] and the Personal Academic Tutoring Policy. [064]

239 To assess whether the provider has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for developing and operating fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students, the team reviewed the Academic Appeals Policy, [062] Student Complaints Policy, [063] Academic Board and Quality Enhancement Committee minutes. [003, 003.2, 065 – 065.7] The team also met with senior, [M1] academic and professional support staff. [M6 – M7]

240 To assess whether the information for potential and actual complainants and appellants is clear and accessible, the team reviewed the School's public website, [<http://lsst.ac>] their VLE, [<http://portal.lsst.ac>] which is available to staff and students, as well as course documentation including the Student Handbook [031] and Course Handbooks. [052 – 052.9]

241 The team also met with students [M2 – M4, M8] to identify their views about the clarity and accessibility of the provider's complaints and appeals procedures.

242 To identify the level and nature of submitted complaints and appeals, the team examined the full Complaints Log [029, 050.2 – 050.3, 099] and Academic Appeals Log [029.1, 050 – 050.1] for the past three academic years.

243 To test that the sampled complaints and appeals were dealt with in a fair, transparent and timely manner and to confirm the consideration of complaints and appeals by the relevant bodies within the School's quality assurance framework, the team reviewed a sample of student complaints and academic appeals, alongside reviewing minutes from the Registry Committee, [124] Quality Enhancement Committee, [003.2, 065.3 – 065.7] and Academic Board. [003, 065 – 065.2]

## **What the evidence shows**

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

245 The School's responsibilities for handling student complaints and appeals are set out in the regulations of the different awarding bodies. [002, 063] For LMU, students must exhaust the School's internal processes for handling complaints and academic appeals but may then seek redress from the University should they remain dissatisfied. [059, 095.1] For UWL, students submit formal complaints to the School but must submit academic appeals directly to the University. [059.1] Students may appeal to the University should the outcome of any formal complaint be unsatisfactory. For BNU, students must submit both formal complaints and academic appeals directly to the University. [095] Should a student exhaust the processes outlined above, they may still seek remediation from the Office of the Independent Adjudicator. [062 – 063]

246 Where applicable, student complaints are handled as part of the School's Student Complaints Policy, [063] whereas academic appeals are dealt with under the School's Student Appeals Policy. [062] Each policy document outlines the scope, processes, and likely timescales for each, including clear details as to what constitutes the grounds for an appeal or complaint. [062, 063] Information for complainants and appellants is clear and transparent with the Student Complaints Policy available via the School's VLE [<http://portal.lsst.ac>] and signposted in the Student Handbook [031] and relevant Course Handbooks. [052 – 052.9] Meetings with students confirmed that they considered that the complaints and appeals procedures were easily understood and accessible. [M2 - M4, M8] Students did not raise any serious concerns about the fairness, transparency or accessibility of the procedures and agreed that they were aware of sources of support for submitting complaints or appeals, including their personal academic tutor and the Student Support Offices. [M2 – M4, M8]

247 Students are encouraged to resolve issues informally via their personal academic tutor, the Students' Union, or the School's student support team; [047, 063, 069] however, where this is not possible, students may submit a formal complaint or academic appeal to the School's Registry. Student complaints are heard by a Complaints Panel convened by the Principal upon receipt of the report investigating the substance of the complaint. [063] Academic appeals are heard by an Appeals Panel [062] that can make recommendations to appropriate persons or decision-making bodies within the School. Review of these processes by the team allowed the conclusion that the School's plans and approaches to develop and implement fair, transparent and accessible complaints and appeals procedures are robust and credible and are aligned with the regulations and procedures of the respective partner universities.

248 The School has established processes for monitoring complaints [063] and appeals [062] via the Registry Committee, [124] which maintains a log of the complaints and appeals that have been lodged, Quality Enhancement Committee [003.2, 065.3 – 065.7] and, ultimately, via the Academic Board which reports to the Governing Body. [003, 065 – 065.2] The School's complaints log [029, 050.2 – 050.3, 099] shows that, over the past three years, 18 formal complaints have been received, all of which at the time of the review visit had been resolved in accordance with the School's published procedures. Examination of the School's academic appeals log [029.1, 050 – 050.1] shows that, over the past three years, they received 140 formal academic appeals. While this number is relatively high, analysis by the team found that the majority (91) of these appeals were registered in 2016-17 and relate to a small number of HND courses and a previous partnership which the School discontinued in 2016-17. Analysis of the remaining appeals by the team did not reveal any particular trend or concerns, therefore the review team did not consider this to be a problem area going forward.

249 The team scrutinised five student complaints from 2018-19 and 2019-20 [098 – 098.4] and four academic appeals from 2018-19 [097 – 097.3] to ensure that the sampled complaints and appeals were dealt with in a fair, transparent and timely manner. The team

found that the complaints and appeals had all been dealt with according to the School's internal processes in a fair and transparent manner, each with a timely outcome and with summary reporting in place to the senior committees. As a result, the team concluded that the School has fair and transparent procedures that allow for timely outcomes for complainants and appellants.

## **Conclusions**

250 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. Its conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

251 The School has fair and transparent procedures for the handling of complaints and academic appeals which are accessible to all students. This is because the School has in place a comprehensive set of procedures for the handling of complaints and appeals which are definitive, fair, and transparent and deliver timely outcomes. The procedures in place are aligned to the regulations of the awarding bodies. Complaints and appeals are recorded and, along with the operation of the processes, are monitored and considered by the senior deliberative committees of the School including the Governing Body. The sample of student complaints and appeals scrutinised by the review team demonstrated that they have been dealt with according to the School's procedures and within the published timeframes. Meetings with students allowed the team to confirm that students do not raise any concerns about the fairness, transparency or accessibility of the procedures or their application. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.

252 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

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

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

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

### **The evidence the team considered**

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

- a London Metropolitan University Collaborative Annual Quality Management Group 2019 minutes [001]
- b Governance Handbook [002]
- c Work Placement Policy [117]
- d Academic Board minutes 24.07.2019 [003]
- e Executive Committee Meeting 05.02.2019 [003.1]
- f Quality Enhancement Committee minutes 06.03.2019 [003.2]
- g Programme Development and Review Group minutes 30.01.2019 [003.4]
- h LMU Exam Board Meeting [003.5]
- i Course Committee minutes [003.6; 012; 017]
- j Quality Handbook 2018-19 [004]
- k Programme Approval and Review Group Minutes [017.1]
- l Assessment regulations [039]
- m Academic Partnership Link Tutor reports [010; 040-040.2]
- n Partnership Agreements [059-059.1; 088; 095; 095.1-095.12; 095.13-095.14; 095.15; 095.16]
- o Annual Course reports [080; 081; 101]
- p Course Specifications [034-036; 075-075.4]
- q Module Handbooks [037-037.5; 073-073.5]
- r Course Handbooks [052-052.9; 074-074.4]
- s Work Based Learning Module Handbook and Specification [075.1, 075.2, 100]
- t Work Placement Handbooks [044, 044.1]
- u Work Placement Agreements [091-091.7]
- v Work Based Learning Module Assessment Briefs [075.3, 075.4]
- w Work Placement due diligence processes [116, 116.1, 116.2, 116.3, 120, 123]
- x Work Experience Visit Reports [109, 109.1]
- y External Examiner reports [005; 007; 038-038.10]
- z Examples of module evaluations 2019 [071-071.9, 086, 087]

aa	Student Submission [093]
bb	Awarding body development workshops [053-053.2]
cc	Link Tutor Reports [040-040.2; 010]
dd	Assessed Student Work [CW1]
ee	Alperton Students meeting [M2]
ff	Luton Students meeting [M3]
gg	Elephant and Castle Students meeting [M4]
hh	Birmingham Students meeting [M8]
ii	Meetings with Senior Staff [M1]
jj	Link Tutors meeting (BNU and UWL) [M5]
kk	Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Alperton) [M6]
ll	Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Birmingham). [M7]

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

257 Third party endorsements, as none are available for the provision on offer at the School.

### **How any samples of evidence were constructed**

258 The team reviewed the 13 external examiner reports for all programmes from the previous academic year to test that courses delivered in partnership are of high quality thus confirming the effectiveness of the underpinning arrangements.

### **Why and how the team considered this evidence**

259 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the review team holistically either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

260 To assess how the School ensures that courses are of high quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them, the team scrutinised the awarding body academic regulations, [039] partnership agreements, [059-059.1; 088; 095; 095.1-095.12; 095.13-095.14; 095.15; 095.16] and institutional and course approval events [058; 017.1] were scrutinised.

261 To confirm that the provider has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for delivering a high-quality experience in partnership, the team reviewed the Governance Handbook, which sets out committee terms of reference, [002] and the minutes of relevant committees, [003; 003.1; 003.4; 003.5; 003.6; 012; 017; 017.1] including the Quality Enhancement Committee, [003.2] reports from the Link Tutors of the awarding bodies, [010; 040-040.2] and awarding body review reports. [080; 081; 101]

262 To assess the credibility and robustness of plans for delivering a high-quality experience on placement, the team reviewed course specifications, [034-036; 075-075.4] student handbooks, [037-037.5; 073-073.5; 052-052.9; 074-074.4] Work Placement Policy [117] and associated documents. [044, 044.1]

263 Meetings with students [M2; M3; M4; M8] and documentary comments from



students in module evaluation surveys [071-071.9, 086, 087] and the student submission [093] were considered to assess their views about the quality of courses delivered in partnership.

264 Meetings with academic, professional [M6, M7] and senior staff took place [M1] to test whether they understand and discharge their responsibilities effectively.

265 To test that the awarding bodies and the School are meeting their respective responsibilities the team met with Link Tutors from two of the awarding bodies. [M5]

### **What the evidence shows**

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

267 Clear and comprehensive awarding body academic regulations, [039] detailed and up-to-date partnership agreements, [059-059.1; 088; 095; 095.1-095.12; 095.13-095.14; 095.15; 095.16] and institutional and course approval events [058; 017.1] ensure that there is a robust framework for the operation of the partnerships, enabling a high-quality academic experience to be facilitated in line with the School's policies (S3 also refers).

268 The School operationalises that framework through its committee structure, including the Quality Enhancement Committee and Academic Board, [002; 003; 003.1; 003.2; 003.4; 003.5; 003.6; 012; 017; 017.1] where key reports and data are considered. The awarding bodies' Academic Partner Link Tutors provide annual, detailed reviews and oversight of the partnership which are incorporated into the annual course reports [040-040.2; 010, 080; 081; 101] and which identify clear plans for evidence-based and credible improvements where appropriate. For example, the team was informed that the School had worked with LMU to revise the students' assessment schedule for January intakes in response to their internal review of the course and students feeding back about difficulties meeting the bunched assessment deadlines. [M1] These are discussed and acted upon appropriately, as evidenced by the minutes of the deliberative committees, and are also underpinned by twice-yearly visits by the Link Tutor. [M5]

269 The course specifications and handbooks, [034, 075, 052.4, 052.5, 052.6] Work Placement Policy, [117] module documentation [075.1, 075.2, 100] and associated documents for the management of placements [044, 044.1] ensure that plans for delivering a high-quality experience through work placements are credible and robust. The Work Placement Policy [117] clearly states it is the student's responsibility to find a placement, though support can be provided by the Work Placement Unit. All placements must be approved as suitable and students must receive clear information about placements. The Work Placement Handbooks for students [044] and tutors [044.1] make all these requirements clear.

270 Course documentation states the role of placements within the course. [034, 075, 052.4, 052.5, 052.6] Module documentation [075.1, 075.2, 100] makes clear the required number of hours of placement for students. Staff the review team met confirmed the role of the Work Placement Unit in supporting students to find a suitable placement. [M6] The Work Placement Unit sits under the Student Support Service [044 – 044.1] and the Work Placement Officers provide guidance and support to students in finding and applying for work placement opportunities which directly contribute to and support the professional development of students. [M2] The Officers also undertake due diligence of the placement providers prior to students starting a work placement, including risk assessments and confirmation of the suitability of the placement for the academic requirements of the student. [116-116.3, 117, 123] Staff also confirmed the significance of the signed tripartite agreement between the employer, student and the School to the quality process, setting out the

respective responsibilities, line management and monitoring for the operation of the placement. [091-091.7] The team was therefore able to confirm that the arrangements were clear, comprehensive, and reflect the School's regulations.

271 Students met by the team confirmed they receive clear guidance on finding a placement and on the expectations and assessment of their work experience. [M2, 075.3, 075.4] The team's review of assessed student work confirmed the quality of the experience gained through work experience because the assessed work clearly demonstrated achievement of the required placement hours (confirmed by completed timesheets and employer's signatures) and meeting relevant module learning outcomes (confirmed by tutor grading and feedback). [CW1] Students reported positively to the team regarding the benefits of their workplace experience and the support provided through the Work Placement Unit, the lecturers and their personal tutors during the placement, as also confirmed by positive module evaluations and reports from placement visits by tutors. Students were clear regarding the relationships between the School and the awarding bodies. Documentary comments from students in module evaluation surveys, including those for modules with placements [086, 087] and the student submission [093] similarly confirmed that overall satisfaction was high. [M2, 071-071, 109, 109.1, 086, 087]

272 Review of the external examiner reports [005; 007; 038-038.10] enabled the team to confirm that the courses and student academic experience are considered to be of high quality (S1, S2 and Q2 also refer), thus confirming the effectiveness of the underpinning arrangements.

273 The students the review team met [M2, M3, M4, M8] spoke very positively about their experiences and said that their courses were well designed.

274 Academic and professional staff the review team met [M1, M6, M7] were able to articulate their understanding of the partnership arrangements and their responsibilities to the awarding bodies. An additional meeting with Academic Partner Link Tutors and other staff from two of the awarding bodies [M5] provided additional clarity around some of the mechanisms used to ensure a high-quality student experience, such as regular visits with teaching observations, staff development activities, including collaborative workshops [053-053.2] and the monitoring of actions resulting from the Link Tutor reports whereby the Link Tutors also reported on actions taken to address the plans from the previous year's report. [040-040.2; 010]

## **Conclusions**

275 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. Its conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

276 Working in partnership with the three awarding bodies, the School has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them. The School has robust and credible plans to ensure a high-quality academic experience for provision delivered in partnership. The partnership agreements are clear and comprehensive, up-to-date and reflect the School's regulations and those of the awarding bodies. Staff from the School and the awarding bodies understand their respective responsibilities for quality. The awarding bodies express satisfaction with the arrangements for oversight, and external examiners further confirm that the academic experience is high quality. The School has in place

effective policies and management procedures to ensure that the academic experience of placements is of high quality. Furthermore, students understand the nature of the relationships between the School, awarding bodies and placement providers, and express high satisfaction with their experience, noting that courses are well-designed and of good quality. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.

277 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

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

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

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

### The evidence the team considered

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

- a Governance Handbook [002]
- b Academic Board minutes [003, 065 – 065.2]
- c Quality Enhancement Committee minutes [003.2, 065.3 – 065.7, 114]
- d Course Committee Documentation [003.6, 012, 017, 104]
- e Quality Handbook [004]
- f Learning and Teaching Handbook [019]
- g Learning and Teaching Forum Documentation [021]
- h Campus Infrastructure Information [027 – 027.3]
- i Student Handbook [031]
- j Strategic Enhancement Plans for 2018-19 and 2019-20 [032, 107]
- k Module Handbooks [038 – 038.9, 073 – 073.5, 100]
- l Assessment Regulations and Grading Rubric [039]
- m Student and Staff Placement Handbooks [044 – 044.1]
- n Student Support and Disability Policy [049]
- o Course Handbooks [052 – 052.9, 074 – 074.4]
- p Student Support and Welfare Committee Minutes [054]
- q Evidence of Student Support Initiatives [055 – 055.7]
- r Personal Tutoring System Documentation [056, 064]
- s Academic Support Centre Documentation [057]
- t Partnership Agreements with LMU, UWL, BNU [059 – 059.1, 095]
- u Equality and Diversity Policy [066]
- v Student Support Services Operational Plan [069]
- w Module Questionnaires [071 – 071.9]
- x Student Written Submission [093]
- y Quality Enhancement Framework [102]
- z VLE [<https://portal.lsst.ac>]
- aa Assessed Student Work [CW1]
- bb Senior Staff meeting [M1]
- cc Alperton Students meeting [M2]
- dd Luton Students meeting [M3]
- ee Elephant and Castle Students meeting [M4]
- ff Birmingham Students meeting [M8]

- gg Link Tutors meeting (BNU and UWL) [M5]
- hh Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Alperton) [M6]
- ii Teaching and Professional Services Staff meeting (Birmingham). [M7]

### **How any samples of evidence were constructed**

281 The team reviewed a representative sample of 97 pieces of assessed student work across these courses to assess whether students are given comprehensive, helpful and timely feedback.

### **Why and how the team considered this evidence**

282 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the review team holistically either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the review team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

283 To identify the School's approach to student support, including how it identifies and monitors the needs of individual students, the team reviewed the School's agreement with its awarding partners, [059 – 059.1, 095] its Governance Handbook, [002] Quality Handbook, [004] Learning and Teaching Handbook, [019] module handbooks, [038 – 038.9, 073 – 073.5, 100] assessment regulations and grading rubric, [039] Student Support and Disability Policy [049] Equality and Diversity Policy, [066] the School's Quality Enhancement Framework, [102] and met with senior staff, [M1] academic and professional support staff, [M6 – M7] and with students and student representatives from across all the campuses. [M2 – M4, M8]

284 To assess whether the School has credible, robust, and evidence-based plans for ensuring that all students are supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes, the team reviewed the Learning and Teaching Forum documentation, [021] Student Handbook, [031] Strategic Enhancement Plans for 2018-19 and 2019-20, [032, 107] Student Support and Welfare Committee minutes, [054] evidence of student support initiatives, [055 – 055.7] personal tutoring system documentation, [056, 064] academic support centre documentation, [057] and student support services operational plan. [069]

285 To identify students' views about the student support mechanisms available to them and to assess whether students who have made particular use of the student support services found them to be accessible and effective, the team met with students [M2 – M4, M8] from all four campuses and considered the student written submission, [093] module evaluations, [071 – 071.9] minutes from course committees, [003.6, 012, 017, 104] the Quality Enhancement Committee [003.2, 065.3 – 065.7, 114] and Academic Board. [003, 065 – 065.2]

286 To test whether students are given comprehensive, helpful and timely feedback, the team considered the School's assessment regulations and marking rubric, [039] assessed student work, [CW1] and met with students from the four campuses. [M2 – M4, M8]

287 To examine whether staff understand their responsibilities and are appropriately skilled and supported in their roles, the team met with senior staff, [M1] academic and professional support staff from Alperton [M6] and Birmingham, [M7] and reviewed the job descriptions for personal academic tutors. [056, 064]

## What the evidence shows

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

289 The School is responsible for the provision of student support services, as outlined in the School's Student Support and Disability Policy, [049] which sets out the provision and sources of support for all students and the processes for supporting disabled students from admission and registration through to support with their studies. This and the Equality and Diversity Policy [066] are available on the School's VLE [<http://portal.lsst.ac>] and are clearly signposted in the Student Handbook [031] and Learning and Teaching Handbook. [019] The School is committed to working with the local communities to ensure all their students, including those from low participation areas and widening participation backgrounds, are supported fully. This is demonstrated through implementation of the range of student support policies as well as outreach work and community meetings. [049, 066, 055 – 055.7, 056, 064, 069, M1]

290 The development of the personal academic tutoring system provides students with face-to-face academic tuition ensuring a parity of experience, regardless of background. This is also true for careers and professional development advice from the careers service and, more broadly, the student support service, which students spoke of positively. [M2 – 4, M8] There is a strategic commitment in the Quality Enhancement Framework [102] to widening participation through demand analysis for low participation groups as well as educating the educators to implement practices that encourage and promote engagement with low participation demographics; the enactment of these commitments is reflected in the student demographics.

291 The School's Student Support Service is responsible for providing pastoral support to students, including providing assistance with student finance and careers advice, [055 – 055.7, 069] whereas the Academic Support Centre acts as the central hub for all academic support activities coordinating the support provision across all the campuses through the Academic Support Centre Panel. [055 – 055.7, 057] The review team heard several examples of initiatives put in place by the School to support and develop students academically and professionally, for example by providing academic writing and referencing tutorials alongside CV-building sessions and courses designed to improve interview performance which were welcomed by the students met by the team. [055 – 055.7, M2 – M4, M8]

292 Each campus has its own dedicated Student Support Service and Academic Support Centre ensuring students have access to the same support, regardless of their programme or delivery site. [027 – 027.3] The School also operates a personal academic tutoring system, through which every student is allocated a personal tutor and has timetabled meetings, and which supports students more broadly via the creation of an individual personal development plan to identify any development needs and help with career planning. [056, 064] The School's Student Support and Welfare Committee provides institutional oversight of student support arrangements. [054] Students and student representatives met by the team, and through their student submission and responses to surveys, reflected positively on the breadth and depth of the support available to them. [M2 – M4, M8, 093, 025] Based on the evidence identified in paragraphs 283-287, the team concludes that the School's policies and approaches to student support facilitate successful academic and professional outcomes.

293 Students undertaking work placements as part of their programme are supported by the Work Placement Service, which sits under the Student Support Service. [044 – 044.1] The Work Placement Officers provide guidance and support to students in finding and

applying for work placement opportunities which directly contributes and supports the professional development of students. [M2]

294 The information relating to the Student Support Services available to students is clear and accessible and can be found in the Student Handbook [031] and the School's VLE. [<http://portal.lsst.ac>] This includes details of pastoral, financial and disability support provision, as well as additional academic support in the form of numeracy, study and communications skills. As part of the Strategic Enhancement Plan, a new Head of Student Lifecycle (Student Support) was appointed, whose role it is to coordinate the various different support functions. [032, 107] The review team felt this was a positive step; however, the impact of the appointment is not yet clear at the time of the review, as it was very recent. Therefore, overall, the review team concludes that the School has credible, robust, and evidence-based plans for ensuring that all students are supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.

295 The team reviewed samples of feedback on assessed student work and found that the feedback provided to students was comprehensive, helpful and timely. [CW1] Students confirmed in meetings with the team that they found the support provided by tutors and the broader support services, alongside formative and summative feedback, helped them to improve. They also confirmed that the written feedback on assessed work was provided within the published 3-week turnaround time, in accordance with the School's assessment regulations. [M2 – M4, M8, 039] Representatives from two of the School's awarding bodies commented positively on the quality of feedback provided to students [M5] and the team was able to confirm the quality of the feedback scrutinised in the samples of assessed work. In addition to formal written feedback on summative assessment, students were keen to highlight the outstanding support provided by academic tutors who they felt continually went above and beyond when providing positive and constructive formative feedback. [M2 – M4, M8]

296 Senior, academic, and professional support staff articulated a clear commitment to supporting students' academic and professional development in meetings with the review team, noting, for example, the provision of formative feedback and the open-door access to lecturers, and personal development planning as part of the tutorial support. [M1, M6 – M7] Staff were able to clearly outline how their individual roles contribute to a student's academic and professional development, [M1, M6 – M7] while students were very positive about the support they receive from the School. [M2 – M4, M8, 093, 025]

## **Conclusions**

297 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the review team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other reviews and remained outcomes focused. Its conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

298 The School supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. Assessed student work demonstrates that students are given comprehensive, helpful and timely written feedback, which is reinforced by formative feedback and guidance. Students were overwhelmingly positive with respect to the breadth and depth of the student support measures in place at the School agreeing that they are adequately supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes, in particular with regards to the personal academic tutor system. Academic and professional support staff fully understand their role in supporting student achievement and were able to articulate those responsibilities clearly in meetings with the team. Through its provision of support services, its development

of personal tutoring and feedback provision along with personal development planning, and the rolling out of the Strategic Enhancement Plan, the School has comprehensive, credible and robust approaches and plans in place to support the achievement of successful academic and professional outcomes. The review team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.

299 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, therefore the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.



## Annex 1

000	School Submission for Quality Standards Review
001	London Metropolitan University Collaborative Annual Quality Management Group 2019 minutes
002	Governance Handbook
003	Academic Board minutes 24.07.2019
003.1	Executive Committee Meeting 05.02.2019
003.2	Quality Enhancement Committee minutes 06.03.2019
003.3	Publications Committee minutes 12.03.2019
003.4	Programme Development and Review Group minutes 30.01.2019
003.5	LMU Exam Board Meeting
003.6	UWL Business Studies Top Up Minutes from Course Committee_03.04.2019
004	Quality Handbook 2018-2019
005	London Met External Examiner's report - BA Business 2017-18
006	LMU Collaborative Annual Quality Management Group 2018 minutes
007	UWL External Examiner's report - Business Studies 2018-19
008	UWL JAB Board Minutes 14.06.19
009	CLBS Form - BRP Resit July 19 Birmingham
010	Academic Partnership Link Tutor Annual Report 16-17
011	Quality report to LSST Academic Board
012	LMU Hospitality and Business. Minutes from Course Committee_12.10.2018
013	Business Strategy Module Jan 2019 Handbook
014	Admissions flowchart - responsibilities
015	Admissions and Marketing Committee - 24th October
016	BA4F08SS Managing Financial Resources module specifications
017	LMU FdA BA Business. Minutes from Course Committee_14.03.2018
017.1	Programme Approval and Review Group Meeting Minutes_16.04.2018
018	PDRG Minutes - 17.07.2019
019	Learning and Teaching Handbook 2018-19
020	Alperton Peer Review Report
020.1	Peer Review Report - Aston April 2019
020.2	Peer Review Report Luton campus
020.3	Alperton campus and Luton campus lesson observation summary
020.4	Birmingham campus lesson observation summary
021	Learning and Teaching Forum 5th December18 Alperton
022	HEA Contract
023	Board of Governors minutes 24.04.2019
024	Data Management Committee Minutes 15.03.19
025	NSS overview 2019
026	Staff Development Policy 2018-19
027	Campus Infrastructure Alperton
027.1	Campus Infrastructure Elephant and Castle
027.2.	Campus Infrastructure Luton
027.3.	Campus Infrastructure Birmingham
028	Student Representative Development Programme
029	Complaints log 2018-19
029.1	Appeals log 2018-19
030	Bucks New Partnership agreement
031	Student Handbook 2018-19
032	LSST Strategic Enhancement Plan - updated 09.08.2019
034	FdSc Course Specification

035	PS Health and Social Care FdA Course Specification 2017
036	BA (Hons) Business Studies Course Specification 16-17
037 – 037.5	One module handbook from each level for each of courses
038 – 038.9	Most recent external examiner reports for all courses
039	Assessment regulations and assessment framework including grading/classification rubrics (LSST and all partners)
040 – 040.2	Academic Partnership Link Tutor reports for UWL provision
041	Evidence of staff development workshop on 'Understanding and using levelness'
042	Programme Development and Review Policy
043	Lesson observation policy
044	Student Work Placement Handbook 2019-20
044.1	Staff Work Placement Handbook 2019-20
045 – 045.15	Assessment board minutes for all awarding bodies
046	Principal's Statement Procedure for purchasing core texts and resources for approved LSST courses
047 – 047.7	Academic staff job descriptions
048	Details of Continuing Professional Development workshops 2018-19
049	Student Support and Disability Policy
050 – 050.2	Appeals logs for 2016-17 and 2017-18
050.2 – 050.3	Complaints logs for 2016-17 and 2017-18
051 – 051.5	Examples of moderation reports
052 – 052.9	Course handbooks for all programmes
053 – 053.2	Details of awarding body development workshops
054	Student Support and Welfare Committee Minutes 07.05.19
055 – 055.7	Evidence of Student Support Initiatives
056	Personal Tutor Committee TOR and Minutes 07.02.19
057	Academic Support Centre Panel Terms of Reference and Minutes 19.12.19
058	LSST Responses Approval Panel Report
059 – 59.01	Current Partnership agreements for London Metropolitan University (LMU), and the University of West London (UWL)
060 – 060.2	Evidence of staff development training relating to teaching, learning and assessment by campus Deans
061	Learning and Teaching Minutes 24th July 2019
062	Academic Appeals Policy
063	Student Complaints Policy
064	Personal Academic Tutorial Policy
065 – 065.7	QEC and Academic Board minutes 2018-19
066	Equality and Diversity Policy
067	Student Engagement Policy
068	Principal's Statement Details of how access to resources are introduced
069	Student Support Services Operational Plan

070 – 070.1	Staff Continuing Professional Development records
071 – 071.9	Examples of module evaluations 2019
072 – 072.1	UWL Minutes of Academic Partnership Annual Review 2016-17
073 – 073.5	BNU Module handbooks and Assignments
074 – 074.4	UWL Course handbooks and assignments
075 – 075.4	FdA Business Course specification and assignments
076	LSST Academic Qualifications HEA PGCE and PhD, Oct 19
077 – 077.14	Plans and strategy for move from Alperton to Wembley including student information
078 – 078.1	Executive Committee minutes 19.03.19
079 – 079.3	Evidence of verification of assessments between LSST and LMU
080	BNU Annual Course Report for Health - 2018-19
080.1	LMU FdSc Computing Course-Action-Plan 19.08.2019
081	Courses that have Work Placements
082 – 082.10	Admissions Panel Minutes
083	Admission Process-booklet-V6
084	Staff Recruitment and Selection Policy
085	LSST Student Engagement Strategy 2019-20
086	Practice Based Public Health and Health Promotion-Jan19-MES
087	Placement Learning 2-Sep18-MES
088	LSST - Validation Agreement_10008362
089	PS Health and Social Science BSc Jan-2018
090 – 090.2	EE Responses 2018-19
091 – 091.7	Work Placement Agreements
092 – 092.19	Staff CVs
093	Student Submission Report
094	LSST Organisational Chart 2019
095	BNU New Partnership agreement Sept 2019
095.1	LMU addendum LSST MOU
095.2	LMU LSST – validation agreement 10008362
095.3 – 095.12	LMU LSST CLAs
095.13 – 095.14	UWL Extension of Collaboration Agreement
095.15	UWL LSST Franchise agreement – Elephant and Castle
095.16	Validation Agreement – 17July 2017 – including Luton and Birmingham
096	LSST Student Union Constitution
096.1	Student Union Chart
097 – 097.3	Appeals – 4 examples

098 – 098.4	Complaints – 5 examples
099	Updated Student Complaints log
100	WBL Module Handbook 2018-19
101	BNU LSST Annual Monitoring Plan 2019
102	Quality Enhancement Framework Nov 2019
103	LSST Additional documents listing 02.12.19
104	LMU Business Course Committee Nov 2019
105 – 105.2	Staff Appraisals
106	LMU – LSST Institutional Approval Conditions
106.1	LSST UWL Response to conditions and recommendations
107	LSST Strategic Enhancement Plan
108	MB BNU Annual Monitoring Statement
109-109.1	Visits Reports
110 – 110.3	LMU Course and Module Action Plans
112	LSST Operations Manual
113	Operations Panel Meeting
114	QEC Minutes 25Nov 2019
115	Executive Committee Minutes 29Nov 2019
116 – 116.3	Placement Health and Safety risk assessment
118	Executive Committee Minutes 13Oct 2019
119	Executive Committee Minutes 12Sept 2019
120	Email from LMU – work placements
121	Final HE Transition and Continuation Plan
122	LSST Risk Management Plan
123	Email from Employer confirming placement
124	Registry Committee Minutes 10July 2019
125	LSST additional documents list
126	WBL database
126.1	WBL database
M1	Senior Staff Meeting
M2	Alperton Students Meeting
M3	Luton Students Meeting
M4	E and C Students Meeting
M5	Link Tutors Meeting
M6	Teaching and Professional Services Staff (Alperton)
M7	Teaching and Professional Services Staff (Birmingham)
M8	Birmingham Students Meeting
M9	Final Meeting
LR1	Learning Resources/Facilities – Alperton, E and C
LR2	Learning Resources/Facilities – Birmingham
CW1	Student Assessed Work – 97 items
TO1 – TO10	Teaching Observations

**QAA2763 - R10961 - May 23**

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

Tel: 01452 557050  
Web: [www.qaa.ac.uk](http://www.qaa.ac.uk)