



Designated Quality Body
in England

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

Fairfield School of Business Ltd



Review Report

November 2019

Contents

Summary of findings and reasons.....	1
About this report.....	11
About Fairfield School of Business	11
How the review was conducted	12
Explanation of findings	15
S1 The provider ensures that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks	15
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	20
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	25
S4 The provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent.....	30
Q1 The provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system	35
Q2 The provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses.....	40
Q3 The provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience.....	45
Q4 The provider has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience.....	49
Q5 The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.....	54
Q6 The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students.....	58
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	62
Q9 The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes	66
Annex 1.....	70

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 School's courses are in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS's 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 School'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 School'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 believes that the School's academic regulations and policies will ensure that these standards are maintained. The review team considers that staff fully understand the School's approach to maintaining these standards and that the evidence seen demonstrates they are committed to implementing this approach. Therefore, based on its scrutiny of the evidence provided, the review team concludes that this Core practice is met.</p>

S2	The provider ensures that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.	Met	High	<p>The review team, based on the evidence presented to it, determined that the standards set for students to achieve beyond the threshold on the School's courses are reasonably comparable with those set by other UK providers. The review team considers that the standards described in the approved programme documentation and in the School's academic regulations and policies should ensure that such standards are maintained appropriately.</p> <p>Therefore, the review team concludes, based on the evidence described above, 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 and this Core practice is met.</p>
S3	Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them.	Met	High	<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 the University and Pearson have non-delegated responsibility for standards which are effectively discharged in partnership with the School, ensuring that awards are credible and secure. This is confirmed by the reports of the external examiners and the monitoring reports of the awarding partners confirming that the standards of awards delivered through the partnerships are credible and secure. Further evidence of effective operation of the respective responsibilities was derived from review of the samples of student assessed work the review team considered, which demonstrated the alignment of the assessment briefs and application of marking schemes with the learning outcomes established by the awarding</p>

				<p>partners and the implementation of their processes for approval and moderation. Review of the partnership agreements confirm that they are up to date, clear and comprehensive and the team was able to confirm that the School's academic governance structure, relevant policies and procedures, coupled with evidence of clear oversight of all key matters by the awarding partners, ensure that the partnership is monitored effectively. School staff whom the review team met were able to articulate their understanding of partnership arrangements and their respective responsibilities for academic standards, which was confirmed by the University Head of Partnerships. The observations described above are consistent with the criteria for a 'meets' judgement, therefore the review team concludes that the School meets this Core practice.</p>
S4	The provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent.	Met	High	<p>The review team concludes that the School uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent. This is because the University's regulations and guidance documents provide a clear and comprehensive framework for the use of external expertise in maintaining academic standards, and for assessment and classification processes, which are evident in the institutional approval process and in course documentation. 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 showing appropriate consideration of their feedback. The plans for maintaining academic standards in response to external examiners are robust and credible, with identification of actions, allocations of responsibility and of timelines for implementation which are reported on through the</p>

				<p>partners' monitoring processes. Staff demonstrated clear understanding of assessment and classification processes and students showed clear understanding of these processes and confirmed that they are reliable, fair and transparent. Students were also appreciative of the clarity and accessibility of assessment and classification information. Review of assessed student work enabled the team to confirm that the setting, approval and marking processes involved in assessment and classification are carried out in line with the regulations and overseen by the awarding partners. All the observations described above are consistent with the criteria for a 'meets' judgement, therefore the review team concludes that the provider meets this Core practice.</p>
Q1	The provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system.	Met	High	<p>The review team concludes that the School has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system. This is because the admissions systems are underpinned by clear policies and procedures for recruitment, selection and admission of students which are fit for purpose and ensure that admissions decisions are fair and inclusive. This judgement was arrived at by the team on the basis of review of the admissions policies and process documentation and of admissions records from all programmes, as well as meetings with academic and professional services staff and students. The School's approach to admissions appears to be consistent and robust as admissions records demonstrate that the School operates according to its policies and procedures, with no deviations. While the admissions requirements set out in course specifications reflect the awarding body's minimum entry requirements, admissions requirements in all other information made available to applicants are consistent with the School's admissions regulations and policies. Academic and professional services staff</p>

				involved in the admissions process who were met by the team demonstrated full understanding of their roles and of the admissions processes, they also confirmed that they are appropriately skilled, receiving regular training. The team reviewed the information provided and was able to confirm that information for applicants is transparent, accessible and fit for purpose; this was also confirmed through the meetings with the students. Student evaluations show that the students were very satisfied with the admissions process, which they found fair, inclusive, timely and supportive, and with the accuracy and helpfulness of information provided to them. Again, these findings were endorsed through the direct meetings with students from the different campuses. All the observations described above are consistent with the criteria for a 'meets' judgement, therefore the review team concludes that the School meets this Core practice.
Q2	The provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses.	Met	High	The review team concludes that the School designs and delivers high-quality courses. This is because relevant academic regulations, approved course documents and consideration of programme operation, along with feedback from students and external examiners, by the School's and University's deliberative committees indicate that the School has robust and credible plans to design and deliver high-quality courses. The staff met by the team understand what high-quality delivery means and are able to articulate how the internal verification processes meet that definition. Student evaluations and expressed views reflect their consideration that the courses they are studying are of high quality. These views were endorsed through direct observation of teaching activities and associated module documentation as well as review of teaching materials on the virtual learning environment through which the team was able to

				conclude that there are clarity of objectives, good planning and organisation, a sound method of approach, good delivery, appropriate content, effective use of resources and student engagement which underpin delivery of high quality courses. Approved course documents, the minutes of deliberative committees and meetings with senior staff demonstrate clarity of module plans, organisation and objectives, enabling students to meet and demonstrate the intended learning outcomes. External examiner reports confirm the high quality of the provision. As the observations outlined above are consistent with the criteria for the 'met' judgement, the review team 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	The review team concludes that the School has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience. This is because the School has robust regulations and credible plans for the recruitment, appointment and induction of appropriately qualified and skilled staff with staffing numbers being planned in line with student admissions to ensure sufficient staffing. The recruitment processes are rigorous and conducted in line with the School's policies. The School has a staff structure with sufficient posts to enable it to deliver a high-quality learning experience. The School is committed to the training and development of its academic and professional services staff to ensure that their skills are developed, enabling them to deliver a high-quality academic experience. Evidence from student views, external evaluations and teaching observations indicates that there are sufficient staff who are appropriately qualified, skilled and experienced to perform their roles effectively and to deliver a quality learning experience. Staff met by the team confirmed that they had been recruited, appointed, inducted and supported

				effectively and that these processes were in line with the School's policies. All the observations described above are consistent with the criteria for a 'meets' judgement, therefore the review team concludes that the School meets this Core practice.
Q4	The provider has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience.	Met	High	The review team concludes that the School has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience. This is because the School's strategic approach to the development of facilities and resources is both anticipatory and responsive to student needs, and, as such, the plans are credible, realistic and demonstrably linked to the delivery of successful academic and professional outcomes for the students. Staff roles are focused, and academic and professional services role-holders understand their roles and are appropriately qualified and experienced (Q3 also refers). Students were appreciative of the support available to them, commenting positively on the Personal Academic Tutor role, the availability of other support services and the approachability of staff. Student reporting through surveys and those met by the team regard the facilities, learning resources and student support services as sufficient and appropriate, confirming that they facilitate a high-quality academic experience. Teaching and learning spaces viewed by the team are appropriate, well-equipped and of good quality, with learning resources and support functions which support successful student progress, enabling a high-quality academic experience. All the observations described above are consistent with the criteria for a 'meets' judgement, therefore the review team concludes that the School meets this Core practice.

Q5	The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.	Met	High	<p>The review team concludes that the School actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience. This is because the School has a clear and effective approach and robust and credible plans to engage students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience. The challenges faced by the School in 2018-19 in ensuring full student attendance at School-level committees and the departure of the Student Union President and Coordinator have now been addressed. The School engages students in the quality of their educational experience in a number of ways, including the representative system and feedback mechanisms. Students met by the team confirmed that they feel engaged in the quality of their educational experience and that the School values their opinions, as was also reflected in the results of internal and external surveys. There are a number of examples, provided by the School and by students, of changes and improvements being made to the student learning experience as a result of student engagement and feedback. All the observations described above are consistent with the criteria for a 'meets' judgement, therefore the review team concludes that the School meets this Core practice.</p>
Q6	The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students.	Met	High	<p>The team concludes that the School has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students. This is because the School has robust, credible and definitive procedures for handling complaints and appeals. The two examples of complaints and four examples of appeals considered by the review team had been dealt with according to the School's procedures with no deviations from those procedures. In meetings held with the review team, students confirmed that the procedures were clear</p>

				and accessible and were able to explain where they could find details of how to make complaints and appeals and who to approach for support. Review of the School's handbooks, website and virtual learning environment showed that the information provision for potential and actual complainants and appellants is clear and accessible. Students did not express any concerns about the fairness, transparency or accessibility of the procedures, or their application. The meetings with both staff and students demonstrated and showed the School has credible, robust and evidence-based approaches for developing and operating fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals, which are accessible to all students. All the observations described above are consistent with the criteria for a 'meets' judgement, therefore the review team concludes that the School meets this Core practice.
Q8	Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them.	Met	High	The review team concludes that, where the School works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is of high quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them. This is because the School has robust and credible plans to ensure a high-quality academic experience for provision delivered in partnership with the University and Pearson, enabled through a clear and comprehensive regulatory framework and up-to-date agreements for the management of the partnerships. The staff from the School met by the team fully understand their respective responsibilities for the quality of the academic experience. The Head of Partnerships at the University affirmed the University's responsibilities and arrangements for oversight, and external examiners confirm that the academic experience and associated quality assurance

				mechanisms are of high quality. Students met by the team expressed high satisfaction with their experience, noting that courses are well designed, good quality and relevant to their future and these findings were further confirmed through review of internal and external survey data. All the observations described above are consistent with the criteria for a 'meets' judgement, therefore the review team concludes that the provider meets this Core practice.
Q9	The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.	Met	High	The review team concludes that the School supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. This is because the School has comprehensive, credible and robust approaches and plans in place to support the achievement of successful academic and professional outcomes. Academic and professional services staff understand and were able to fully articulate their roles in supporting students and showed commitment to supporting student achievement. Students met by the team and through their responses to surveys agree that they are well supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. Assessed student work reviewed by the team demonstrates that students are given helpful and timely written feedback, and this was also confirmed through the meetings with students who also appreciated the formative feedback and guidance that they received. All the observations described above are consistent with the criteria for a 'meets' judgement, therefore the review team concludes that the School meets this Core practice.

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 November 2019 for Fairfield School of Business Ltd.

A Quality and Standards Review (QSR) is a method of review QAA uses to provide 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 Cheryl Dunn
Institution: Blackpool and The Fylde College
Role in review team: Institutional reviewer

Name: Dr Wai Mun Lim
Institution: University of Plymouth
Role in review team: Subject reviewer Business and Management

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

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 provider's provision. Collectively, the team had experience of the management and delivery of higher education programmes from academic and professional services perspectives, included members with regulatory and investigative experience, and had at least one member able to represent the interests of students. The team included at least one senior academic leader qualified to doctoral level. Details of team members were shared with the provider prior to the review to identify and resolve any possible conflicts of interest.

About Fairfield School of Business

Fairfield School of Business (the School) was initially established in Croydon in 2006 as London Education and Training Services, mainly operating as an English language school. This activity ceased in 2012 when the School was approved as a Centre by Pearson Education Ltd and started delivering a course in HND Business, at which time it adopted the name Fairfield School of Business. The School subsequently expanded its range of provision and has been accredited by the awarding body of London Metropolitan University (the University) to deliver courses in business and in public health and social care. The School's mission is focused on widening participation with almost all the students coming from the local area and with more than 70 per cent of the student body being over 30 years old. The School is operating on two campuses in the London area (Croydon and Alperton),

however recruitment at Alperton ceased in 2018. In September 2018 the School moved to new premises in Croydon.

The School's expansion proceeded in May 2019 with the opening of a campus in Birmingham with FdA Business students transferring from the London School of Science and Technology. This has been followed by the decision to phase out the HND in Business and the relationship with Pearson, with existing students having the opportunity to transfer to the second year of the Foundation Degree in Business accredited by London Metropolitan University.

The strategic direction of the School is overseen by a Board of Governors which receives advice from the FSB Advisory Board, including independent academic and employer representatives. 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 day-to-day operational management of the School.

At the time of the QSR, the School was offering the following courses with student numbers:

Programmes	Student numbers Year 1	Student numbers Year 2
FdA Business	319	144
FdA Public Health and Social Care	21	3
BA Top-up Business Degree	35	N/A
HND Business (Business Management)	35	94

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 School does not offer a research degree programme. Therefore, the review team did not consider Q7 (where the provider offers research degrees, it delivers these in appropriate and supportive research environments).

To form its judgements about the School'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 it considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews, it utilised Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers to construct this report and detail the key pieces of evidence seen. Annex 4 expects that review teams will sample certain types of key evidence using a combination of representative sampling, risk-based sampling and randomised sampling. In this review, the review team sampled the following areas for evidence for the reasons given below.

- As there are only four courses delivered by the School, all courses were included in the evidence set.
- A random sample of 21 admission records from the 2018-19 cohorts, including both successful and unsuccessful examples, to assess whether reliable, fair and inclusive admissions decisions were made.
- A random sample of seven staff CVs and seven job descriptions in order to gain a full understanding of specific academic and support staff 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 learning experience.
- Details of two complaints and four appeals from the past academic year to test whether the School has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals.
- The course, module and student handbooks for all the courses and materials on the virtual learning environment to assess the information provided to students by the School on their programme of study and the academic and professional support available to them.
- A representative sample of 11 student surveys in order to identify student views about student engagement in the quality of their educational experience.
- A representative sample of 30 pieces of assessed student work from across all four courses and levels to test whether the work reflects the relevant sector -recognised standards and that feedback given to students is comprehensive, helpful and timely.
- The Pearson external examiner and three University external examiner reports for the courses from the previous academic year to assess the views of the external examiners on sector-recognised and comparable standards and to confirm the School's effectiveness in terms of delivering high-quality courses.
- The review team met with five senior, 12 academic and professional services staff and a representative from London Metropolitan University to confirm their understanding of the roles and responsibilities of academic and support staff, their views on the operation of the partnership, their responsibilities regarding the ongoing maintenance of standards and the future plans of the School.
- The review team met with a representative sample of eight students from the Croydon campus, including six elected student representatives and the Students' Union President, five students from Alperton and five students (virtual meeting) from the Birmingham campus, including one elected representative, to confirm the quality of their learning experience across the range of programmes and levels, their views regarding the provision of academic and pastoral support and the School's approach to student engagement.
- The review team undertook a review of the resources and facilities at Croydon and observed six classes: two FdA Level 4, two FdA Level 5, one HND Level 2 and one BA Top-up Level 6, representing the range of academic programmes delivered by the School, to confirm the quality of the facilities, resources and teaching delivery. The team also undertook virtual tours of the facilities at the Alperton and Birmingham campuses.

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 to it, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the School 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 utilised that matrix to ensure that the evidence it 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 FSB - London Metropolitan University Validation agreement [005]
- b Pearson AMR Report 2018 [006]
- c Pearson External examiner Report final [007]
- d Assessment Regulations and Procedures [008]
- e FSB Governance Handbook and committee structure [009, 092]
- f Academic Board minutes 06.08.19 [010]
- g London Metropolitan University Business Course Committee Meeting_20th February 2019 [011]
- h Programme Development and Review Group minutes - 7 Mar 2019 [012]
- i Quality Enhancement Committee Minutes 30th July 2019 [013]
- j Publications Committee Minutes 14.08.2019 [014]
- k Executive Committee Minutes 20.05.2019 [015]
- l Programme Development and Review Group Minutes_06.08.2019 [016]
- m Quality Assurance Report to Academic Board July 2018 [017]
- n External examiner reports, responses and programme plans [032, 033, 085, 100]
- o Programme specifications [034, 035, 036]
- p Course handbooks [041, 042, 043, 044]

q	Programme Development and Review Policy [045]
r	Approved Outcomes Report - LSST_FSB Institutional and courses Approval Oct 2019 [046]
s	FSB - London Metropolitan University Academic Quality Management Group 06/19 [052]
t	Course level agreements for the 3 London Metropolitan University courses [067, 067.1, 067.2, 067.3]
u	External examiners handbook [082]
v	London Metropolitan University academic regulation [083]
w	London Metropolitan University external examiner report – Business Studies [085]
x	Quality Handbook 2018-19 [101]
y	Meetings with Croydon students [M3]
z	Meetings with Birmingham students [M4]
aa	Meetings with Alperton students [M5]
bb	Meeting with Academic and Professional Services Staff [M5]
cc	Meeting with London Metropolitan University Head of Partnerships and Link Tutors [M6]
dd	Assessed student work [CW1]

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:

- third party endorsements as none are available for the provision on offer at the School.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

6 Sampling of the School's provision was undertaken by reviewing all four programmes delivered by the School and their associated approved programme documentation, academic regulations and the most recent set of three University external examiner reports and one Pearson external examiner report. The team reviewed a representative sample of 30 pieces of assessed work from across all levels of the programmes of study.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

7 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the School (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 School'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.

8 The review team considered the University's academic regulations [083], the School's quality handbook [101] and Assessment Regulations and Procedures [008], the course handbooks and course-level agreements setting out the course specifications [041 - 044, 067 – 067.3] 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.

9 The review team considered the Validation Agreement [005], Outcomes Report from the Institutional and Courses Approval events [046], Governance Structure [009] and deliberative committee and board meeting minutes [010, 011, 012, 013, 014, 015, 016] to

interrogate the robustness and credibility of the School's processes and plans for ensuring and maintaining sector-recognised standards.

10 The team reviewed the approved programme documentation [034, 035, 036] and the external examiners' reports [007, 032, 033, 085] to test whether the specified sector-recognised standards for the programmes are consistent with relevant national qualifications frameworks and that credit and qualifications are awarded only where those sector-recognised standards are met.

11 The team considered the external examiner reports and the School's responses [032, 033, 085]. It also looked at evidence from the Annual Monitoring Reports [052], Pearson external examiner's report [007] and the Pearson Academic Management Review Report [006] to ratify that external examiners confirm that sector-recognised standards are consistent with national qualifications frameworks, and that credit and qualifications are awarded only where those sector-recognised standards are met.

12 The team reviewed assessed student work across all the programmes to test whether the work reflects the relevant sector-recognised standards for the courses delivered by the School [CW].

13 The team met with the senior management team [M1, M7], academic and professional staff [M5] and the University's head of partnerships [M6] to test their understanding of maintaining sector-recognised standards.

What the evidence shows

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

15 The School delivers its programmes in partnership with Pearson and London Metropolitan University (the University); these two organisations having overall responsibility for the setting of sector-recognised academic standards of the awards and oversight of the programmes delivered by the School [005, 006, 067, 067.1, 067.2] in line with the national qualifications frameworks. The School's Assessment Regulations and Procedures and operational quality processes [008, 101] are clear and comprehensive in supporting the maintenance of sector-recognised academic standards. These include the specific allocations of responsibility for academic standards, which reside with the awarding body and organisation, and the responsibility for delivering programmes and conducting assessments, which lie with the School, with approval being given by the awarding body. As such, there is alignment with the validation agreement [005] and the approved programme specifications [034, 035, 036, 067-067.3], which have learning outcomes defined by the University.

16 The School's assessment processes, grading rubrics [083], marking, moderation and sampling [082] arrangements are clearly stipulated in its Assessment Regulations and Procedures document [008]. Monitoring by Pearson, through the Academic Management Review Report [006], confirms the standards of award of the programmes delivered by the School through consideration of external examiner reports, actions taken in response to previous recommendations, and the assessment structures and alignment to learning outcomes. The Annual Monitoring report confirms that the centre approval and recognition requirements are complied with fully, that the programmes have an accurate programme specification and that the assessment procedures lead to valid and reliable assessment outcomes against national standards [006]. Monitoring by the University, through its Annual Quality Management Group (AQMG) [052] confirms the standards of award of the programmes delivered by the School through consideration of external examiner reports, actions taken in response to previous recommendations, and the assessment structures and alignment to learning outcomes. The AQMG reviews all the external examiners' reports and

the individual module logs confirming that the academic standards are appropriate for the level of the programme and that they have been maintained during the previous academic year, with action having been taken to respond to comments from previous years' reports [052]. These reports confirm that the sector-recognised standards described in the definitive course documentation are consistent with relevant national qualifications frameworks.

17 The School fully complies with the University's academic regulations through which it maintains and ensures that the academic sector-recognised standards and award requirements are met [008, 017, 052, M1]. There is clear reporting through the School's deliberative committee structure, from the course committees and the Programme Development Review Group and Quality Enhancement Committee up to Academic Board, with detailed consideration of the outcomes of review processes, module logs, external examiners' reports, as well as feedback from students and staff along with the approval of the associated action plans and updates on previous action plans [006, 009, 010, 011, 012, 013, 014, 015, 016, 092, 100]. This enables the School to evidence that there are robust and credible plans for maintaining sector-recognised academic standards.

18 The School adheres to the University's regulations and guidance as set out in the validation agreement [005] and the Approved Outcomes Report [046]. The School is further guided by the course-level agreements in relation to course assessments and management of marking, feedback and classification criteria [067 – 067.3] as presented in their course specifications [034, 035, 036] and course handbooks [041, 042, 043]. Review of the courses and student assessed work confirmed that there is alignment between the learning outcomes, assessment structures, assignment briefs and applied marking criteria and that the grading of the assessed work are comparable with the marking standards from other institutions. Therefore, the team concludes that the School adheres to the expectations of the University and that sector-recognised standards are consistent with the relevant national qualifications frameworks.

19 The Pearson external examiner report confirms that there are structured assessment boards in place with a clear process for internal verification [007] where credit and qualifications are awarded only where sector-recognised standards have been met. The external examiner reports for the programmes [032, 033, 085] validated by the University likewise confirm that the sector-recognised standards of the School's provision conform to the national qualifications framework and have been met and that the 'quality assurance mechanisms used on the courses are excellent' [032].

20 Assessment briefs in the assessed student work sample [CW1] are mapped to the relevant intended learning outcomes and align with the programme specifications, and the team was able to confirm, through the review of assessed work against the assessment briefs and learning outcomes, that the marking criteria and second marking processes are applied appropriately and that credit is awarded only when the students achieve the relevant sector-recognised standards, as also ratified by the external examiners [006, 032, 033, 085].

21 Academic staff met by the team [M1, M5] displayed a full understanding of the approach to maintaining sector-recognised standards, articulating clearly the processes whereby assessments and marking criteria are drafted and approved and the processes for first marking and moderation. Courses are prepared in line with the University's course specification; where assessments are prepared by the School's academic staff these are aligned with programme learning outcomes and approved by the University [67, 67.1, 67.2, M5, M6]. The School adopts a clear internal verification process for course and assessment design involving academic teaching staff and the University's Academic Liaison Tutors [083, M5, M6].

Conclusions

22 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the School 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.

23 From the evidence seen, the review team considers that the standards set for the School's courses are in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS's 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 School's academic regulations and policies should ensure that standards are maintained appropriately.

24 The review team considers that, based on the evidence scrutinised, the standards that will be achieved by the School's students are expected to be in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS's regulatory framework. Based on this information the review team also believe that the School's academic regulations and policies should ensure that these standards are maintained. The review team considers that staff fully understand the School'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.

25 The School follows the academic regulations of the partner organisations for its programmes, which retain overall responsibility for the setting and maintenance of the sector-recognised standards of the awards. The sector-recognised standards described in definitive course documentation are consistent with the University's framework, and the FHEQ and therefore align with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks. The School provided evidence of clear and comprehensive academic regulations and frameworks in the approved course documentation and associated handbooks, supporting the maintenance of sector-recognised academic standards at the relevant level. It was further clear, from meetings with academic staff, that they fully understand and are able to articulate the approaches to the maintenance of standards. Programme monitoring and review processes, and consideration of outcomes of these processes and associated action plans through the deliberative committees, evidence that there are robust and credible plans for maintaining sector-recognised standards, which are understood by staff. External examiners confirm that those sector-recognised standards are consistent with relevant national qualifications framework and that qualifications are only awarded where the sector-recognised standards have been met. Review of assessed student work by the team further demonstrated that credit and qualifications are awarded only where the relevant sector-recognised standards have been met.

26 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

27 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.

28 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

29 The QAA review team holistically assessed the evidence presented to it, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the School 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 utilised that matrix to ensure that the evidence it 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 FSB - London Metropolitan University Validation agreement [005]
- b Pearson AMR and Monitoring Reports [006, 111]
- c Pearson external examiner Report final [007]
- d Assessment Regulations and Procedures [008]
- e FSB Governance Handbook [009]
- f Course committee minutes [011]
- g Programme Development and Review Group minutes [012, 016]
- h Quality Enhancement Committee Minutes 30th July 2019 [013]
- i Executive Committee minutes 20.05.19 [015]
- j QA Report to Academic Board July 2018 [07]
- k External examiner reports and responses [011, 032, 033, 085, 100]
- l Course Specifications [034, 035, 036]
- m Approved Outcomes Report - LSST_FSB Institutional and courses Approval Oct 2016 [046]
- n Fairfield School of Business Annual Quality Management Group June 2019 [052]
- o Course level agreements [067 – 067.3]
- p Module handbooks [068 – 068.2]
- q London Metropolitan University academic regulations [083]
- r Quality Handbook 2018-19 [101]
- s Final Continuation Transition to HE Plan [107]
- t Student assessed work [CW1]
- u Meeting with senior Staff [M1]
- v Meeting with Academic and Professional Services Staff [M5]
- w Meeting with London Metropolitan University Head of Academic Partnerships and Link Tutors [M6]

30 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:

- third party endorsements as none are available for the provision on offer at the School.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

31 Sampling of the School's provision was undertaken by reviewing all four programmes delivered by the School, including their associated approved programme documentation, academic regulations and the most recent Pearson and set of three University external examiner reports and associated action plans. The team reviewed a representative 30 pieces of assessed work from across all the programmes and levels of study.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

32 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the School (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 School's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision-making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the review team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below.

33 The review team considered the University's academic regulations [083], the School's quality handbook [101], assessment regulations and procedures [008], the approved course documentation [034, 035, 036, 041, 042, 043, 044, 067 – 067.3] and module handbooks [068, 068.1, 068.2] 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.

34 The team considered the validation agreement [005], institutional and courses approval report [046] and course-level agreements [067, 067.1, 067.2, 067.3] and plans [006, 111] to interrogate the robustness of the School's plans for maintaining comparable standards, and reviewed the School's Governance Handbook illustrating terms of reference for the established deliberative committees and boards and their minutes [009, 013, 052] to ensure plans are credible and evidence based.

35 The team reviewed the approved course documentation [034, 035, 036] to test that specified standards beyond the threshold are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.

36 The team reviewed the external examiner reports [006, 007, 032, 033, 085] and reports found in the Annual Quality Management Group Report [052] to confirm that standards beyond the threshold are comparable with those achieved in other UK providers, and that credit and qualifications are only awarded where those standards have been met.

37 The team reviewed assessed student work from all the courses to test that marks and awards given align with the marking criteria and are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers [CW1].

38 The team met with students from the different programmes and campuses to assess whether they understand what is required of them to reach standards beyond the threshold [M2, M3, M4].

39 The team met with staff involved in assessment of the programmes sampled 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 University and Pearson [Senior staff M1, Academic and Professional Services Staff M5, London Metropolitan University Head of Academic Partnerships and Link Tutors M6].

What the evidence shows

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

41 The School has a coherent and consistent institutional approach to course and assessment design, which is articulated through the approved course documentation and the School's Assessment Regulations and Procedures through which it maintains the standards set by the awarding body and organisation [005, 006, 008, 045, 067 – 067.3]. These include the processes for assessment design and approval, marking criteria and the processes for marking and moderation. The University's regulations in maintaining and setting standards for the courses are clearly expressed in the course-level and validation agreements [005, 046, 067 – 067.3]. There is a robust internal verification process of the assessments, involving their approval and mapping against the learning outcomes by an internal verifier prior to approval by the awarding body [M5, 007] and standardisation meetings including review of the assessments, marking criteria and rubrics and the moderation processes which are also confirmed by the University and Pearson [011, 016, 007, M1, M5]. These ensure that students' assessments are set, marked, moderated, and sampled in accordance with the requirements for awards and approaches to classification [082]. Through the review of these sets of documentation and the meetings with academic [M5] and senior staff [M1], the team confirmed that there are clear and comprehensive academic regulations and frameworks to support the maintenance of academic standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.

42 The School's programme development and review policy [045] stipulates the processes for maintaining comparable standards that include programme review and evaluation and internal self-assessments. Further evidence of the School's planning for maintaining comparable standards is set out in the minutes of the deliberative committee meetings, including the Programme Development and Review Group and the Quality and Enhancement Committee, with reporting to Academic Board, which consider the internal and external verification processes and external examiner feedback and the associated action plans [013, 045, 052, 100]. These processes enable the School to maintain comparable standards as set by the awarding body and organisation.

43 The School's Quality Handbook [101] includes detailed guidance regarding the assessment strategy, verification processes and the role of the external examiners. The deliberative committees consider the programme outcomes, external examiner feedback and review by the awarding body and organisation to establish action plans to address any issues, with associated updates on implementation [016, 010, 013, 006, 045, 052] through which the School establishes plans to set and maintain comparable standards that are robust and credible. Comparability of those standards to those of other providers are confirmed by the external examiners' reports [007, 032, 033, 085] and reported through to course committee and executive committee meetings [011, 015].

44 The course specifications are set by the University and these are articulated through the School's approved course documentation [034, 035, 036, 041, 042, 043] and the detailed module handbooks [068, 068.1, 068.2] for the courses. These include course structures, mapping against learning outcomes and criteria for marking, moderation and awarding, allowing the team to confirm that the specified standards beyond the threshold are reasonably comparable to those achieved in other UK providers.

45 The external examiner reports confirm that the marks awarded to students and the standards beyond the threshold for courses sampled are appropriate and comparable with those achieved in other UK providers [007, 032, 033, 085]. In the case of the awards made through the University, there is sharing of external examiners between the University and the School, allowing further confirmation of comparability [M6]. This was further endorsed through review of student assessed work by the team [CW1] which confirmed that the marking was aligned with the grading criteria and that specified learning outcomes were met. It is also confirmed in both Pearson's and the University's annual monitoring reports [006, 052, 111] that credits and qualifications are awarded only when standards are met.

46 The students are clearly informed as to what is required of them to reach standards beyond the threshold on the degree programmes and to achieve merit in the HND, as these can be found in the assignment briefs attached to the assessed course work [CW1] and within module handbooks [068 – 068.1], grading criteria and classification in programme handbooks [041, 042, 043] and student handbooks [044]. The students met by the team [M2, M3, M4] were able to confirm their understanding of the marking criteria and the academic expectations for awards above threshold level, specifying the sources of information, including the course documentation and handbooks and the initial briefings provided by academic staff at the start of the modules. 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 [M2, M3, M4]. Furthermore, assessment feedback viewed by the team clearly summarised where learning outcomes have been met or not met and how improvement could be achieved [CW1]. The team was therefore able to confirm that students understand what is required to reach standards beyond threshold.

47 The teaching staff [M5] met by the team were able to articulate their understanding of the School's approach to maintaining comparable standards, as established through the internal verification processes and associated mapping to learning outcomes when preparing assessments and courses, through the application of the marking criteria and moderation processes and the confirmation of standards by the external examiners [M5]. Review of the monitoring reports and action plans confirmed that the staff effectively engage with and apply those standards [079, 100, 109, 111].

Conclusions

48 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the School 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.

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

50 Therefore, the review team concludes, based on the evidence described above, 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 and this Core practice is met.

51 The School, through its clear and comprehensive academic regulations and frameworks, and adherence to the academic regulations and frameworks of its partner organisations, 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. The School has credible and robust plans for maintaining standards that are supported by relevant regulations, guidance, internal deliberation and monitoring processes determined by the University and Pearson and which enable the development of those action plans and monitoring of their implementation. Review of the approved course documentation enabled the team to confirm that standards described beyond the threshold level are comparable with those of other UK providers. External examiners' reports also confirm that standards beyond the threshold level are reasonably comparable with those in other UK providers and that credit qualifications are awarded only where those sector-recognised standards are met. This was further endorsed by the team through the review of assessed student work from across all programmes of study that demonstrated that credit and qualifications are awarded only where relevant standards have been met. Students met by the team from the different campuses fully understood the academic expectations and articulated the source of the information, demonstrating that they understand what is required to reach standards beyond the threshold and are given the opportunity to do so. Likewise, academic staff were able to describe the processes for maintaining standards through the mapping of learning outcomes, application of marking criteria and the verification and moderation processes.

52 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.

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

53 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.

54 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

55 The QAA review team holistically assessed the evidence presented to it, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the School 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 utilised that matrix to ensure that the evidence it 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 Academic Regulations 2019-20
<https://student.londonmet.ac.uk/your-studies/student-administration/rules-and-regulations/academic-regulations>
- b London Metropolitan University Quality Manual 2019-20
www.londonmet.ac.uk/media/london-metropolitan-university/london-met-documents/professional-service-departments/quality-enhancement-unit/quality-manual/London-Met-Quality-Manual-2019-2020.pdf
- c Fairfield School of Business Assessment Regulations and Procedures [008]
- d Work based learning policy [027]
- e Tutor and student work placement handbooks [077, 077.1]
- f Sample Work Placement Agreement [080]
- g FSB governance handbook [009]
- h Institutional Memorandum of Agreement between London metropolitan University and Fairfield School of Business 1.11.16 [005]
- i Addendum to Institutional Memorandum of Agreement and Course Level Agreements [067.3]
- j Outcomes Report of London Metropolitan University Institutional Approval Event and Courses Approval Events held on 17 and 18.10.16 [046]
- k Course level agreements [067, 067.1, 067.2] between London Metropolitan University and FSB
- l Pearson Academic Management Review Report 2017-18 [006]
- m Programme Development and Review Group minutes 7/3/19 [012]
- n Programme Development and Review Group minutes 6/8/19 [016]
- o London Metropolitan University /FSB Annual Quality Meeting Group 2019 [052]
- p Pearson External Examiner Report 12.2.19 [007]
- q BA Business External Examiner Report 2017-18 [032] and 2018-19 [085]
- r FdA Business External Examiners Report 2017-18 [033]

- s Module and course action plans [79, 100, 109]
- t A sample of 30 pieces of assessed student work across different modules and levels from BA Business top-up, FdA Business and FdA Public Health and Social Care [CW1]
- u Meetings with senior [M1] and academic and professional support staff [M5] from FSB and with the Head of Partnerships from London Metropolitan University [M6] who provides overall management of the partnership agreement and relationship with the School.

56 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:

- third party endorsements as none are available for the provision on offer at the School.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

57 Sampling of the School's provision was undertaken by reviewing all four programmes delivered by the School, including their associated approved programme documentation, academic regulations and the most recent Pearson and set of three University external examiner reports. The team also reviewed a representative sample of 30 pieces of student assessed work from across the range and levels of programmes.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

58 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the [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 School'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.

59 The review team considered the University's Collaborative Academic Partnerships Policy and processes as set out in its academic regulations [<https://student.londonmet.ac.uk/your-studies/student-administration/rules-and-regulations/academic-regulations/>] together with its Quality Manual [www.londonmet.ac.uk/media/london-metropolitan-university/london-met-documents/professional-service-departments/quality-enhancement-unit/quality-manual/London-Met-Quality-Manual-2019-2020.pdf] alongside the School's assessment regulations and procedures [008, 027] and governance structure [009] to identify how the School ensures that the standards of awards are credible and secured within the partnership.

60 Partnership agreements with London Metropolitan University, course level agreements [005, 067.3, 067, 067.1, 067.2] between the University and the School and evidence of the management of the relationship with Pearson were considered to interrogate the basis for the maintenance of academic standards within the partnerships [005, 006, 012].

61 Minutes of Programme Development and Review Group meetings [012, 016], the University/School Annual Quality Meeting Group 2019 [052] and the Pearson Academic Management Review Report 2017-18 [006] were considered to confirm the operational effectiveness of the partnerships.

62 Module and course reviews and action plans [79, 100, 109] were considered to confirm the planning for maintenance of academic standards.

63 The review team examined the School's Work Placement Policy [027] and Tutor and Student Work Placement Handbooks [077, 077.1] and a sample of Work Placement Agreements [080] to assess how standards are maintained through work placements.

64 External examiner reports [007, 032, 033, 085] were reviewed to confirm that the examiners consider that the standards are credible and secure, thus confirming the effectiveness of underpinning partnership arrangements.

65 The team reviewed assessed student work from all academic programmes to test that standards of awards are credible and secure and to enable confirmation that the underpinning arrangements for the partnership are effective [CW1].

66 The team met with staff from the School [Senior staff M1, Academic and Professional Services Staff M5] and from the University [M6] to test that staff understand and discharge effectively their responsibilities to the University and that these responsibilities are operationalised effectively within the partnership.

What the evidence shows

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

68 The up-to-date partnership agreements, as set out in the Institutional Memorandum of Agreement between London Metropolitan University and Fairfield School of Business 1.11.16 [005] and the Addendum to Institutional Memorandum of Agreement and Course Level Agreements between London Metropolitan University and the School 04.03.19 [067.3], the University's regulations and policy and processes for working with collaborative partners, together with the School's own regulations and policies and governance structure [005, 008, 009, 027] provide evidence of a well-defined structure for the operation of the partnership which ensures that the standards of awards are credible and secure. These include the specific allocation of responsibility for academic standards, which resides with the awarding body [005]. Additionally, the University course-level agreements for each of the validated programmes [067, 067.1, 067.2], for example, the Course Level Agreement (CLA) between London Metropolitan University and Fairfield School of Business for delivery of the BA (Hons) Business (top-up) [067], provide further clarity on the specific terms, conditions and responsibilities of the School at individual course level. These include the specification of learning outcomes by the awarding body and confirmation of the mapping of assessments against those outcomes with approval of all assignments being given by the University [M5, M6]. Review of the above documentation and the meetings with academic staff [M5] from the School and the awarding body allowed confirmation that the partnership agreements, in terms of the institutional memoranda and the course-level agreements [005, 067 – 067.3] are clear, comprehensive, up to date and reflect the regulations and policies for the management of the partnerships.

69 The University/FSB Annual Quality Meeting Group 2019 [052] includes evidence of extensive oversight, including consideration of admissions, mitigating circumstances, appeals, complaints, consideration of a range of key data relating to the student experience, external examiner feedback and module and course monitoring reports, demonstrating effective review and management of the partnership. Review of module and course action plans [079, 079.1, 100, 109] confirmed that there are credible plans and processes for ensuring the ongoing security of standards based on consideration that includes student progression, external examiner feedback and review of the implementation of previous action plans. Similarly, the Pearson Academic Management Review Report [006] provides statements confirming extensive oversight of the partnership arrangements, including

confirmation that the approval and recognition requirements are fully complied with and that there is a good understanding of Pearson and its requirements. Routine oversight of the relationship with the University is achieved through the engagements with the Academic Liaison Tutor who visits twice a year and observes teaching delivery, with reporting through the Academic Quality Management Group [M6, 052]. The University also approves the assessments and undertakes moderation of the student assessed work [067 – 067.2, M6].

70 Minutes of the Programme Development and Review Group [012, 016] show detailed identification of action planning and updates on implementation in relation to partnership operation. These include review of the articulation agreements, which specified the academic arrangements for students to transfer from the HND to Level 5 of the Business programme, the support provided by the Academic Liaison Tutor, marking processes and programme enhancements as well as high-level planning in regards to the move from Pearson to the University.

71 The Work Placement Policy [027], tutor and student handbooks [077, 077.1] and sample Work Placement Agreement [080] demonstrate procedures for effective oversight and monitoring of placement provision. These include setting out the respective roles and responsibilities of the tutor, student and employer and appropriate risk assessment processes which are overseen by the tutors and Work Placement Unit. Students undertake the placements alongside their attendance at the School and so there is maintained contact with School staff throughout the duration of the placement [M2, M5].

72 The external examiners' reports confirm that the standards of the awards delivered through the partnerships are credible and secure and that the quality assurance mechanisms are excellent, and that the internal moderation of assessment decisions provides an excellent audit of the internal moderation process. Comparability of standards is further confirmed through the sharing of external examiners between the University and the School [007, 032, 033, 085, M6, refer also to S1 and S2].

73 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].

74 Senior [M1], academic and professional services staff [M5] the review team met were able to articulate their understanding of the partnership arrangements and their respective responsibilities for academic standards [M1, M5]. These included articulating the processes regarding the setting and approval of assessments against the learning outcomes established by the awarding partners, and the processes for marking and moderation. The continuing engagement with the University Academic Liaison Tutors, which include regular visits and teaching observations, enable the responsibilities of both the School and awarding body to be discharged effectively [M6]. The University Head of Partnerships also provided an overview of partnership arrangements, including the confirmation of the processes for ensuring standards through approval of assessments and moderation, review of student evaluations and associated action plans as well as approval of the academic staff CVs, confirming that the partnership has operated effectively for nearly three years [M6]. Confirmation of the standards of the awards was also provided through the external examiner reports and associated annual monitoring processes as described in paragraph 16 and 17.

Conclusions

75 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the School 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.

76 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 the University and Pearson have responsibility for setting standards which are effectively discharged in partnership with the School, ensuring that awards are credible and secure. This is confirmed by the reports of the external examiners and the monitoring reports of the awarding partners confirming that the standards of awards delivered through the partnerships are credible and secure. Review by the team of the samples of student assessed work enabled confirmation of the alignment of the assessment briefs and application of marking schemes with the learning outcomes established by the awarding bodies. The review also evidenced the implementation of awarding bodies' processes for approval and review of the partnership agreements confirm that they are up to date, clear and comprehensive and the team was able to confirm that the School's academic governance structure, relevant policies and procedures, coupled with evidence of clear oversight of all key matters by the awarding partners, ensure that the partnership is monitored effectively. Staff were able to articulate their understanding of partnership arrangements and their respective responsibilities for academic standards, which was confirmed by the University Head of Partnerships. All the observations described above are consistent with the criteria for a 'met' judgement, therefore the review team concludes that the School meets this Core practice.

77 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of 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

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

79 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

80 The QAA review team holistically assessed the evidence presented to it, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the School 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 utilised that matrix to ensure that the evidence it 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 Academic Regulations 2019-20
<https://student.londonmet.ac.uk/your-studies/student-administration/rules-and-regulations/academic-regulations/>
- b London Metropolitan University Quality Manual 2019-20
www.londonmet.ac.uk/media/london-metropolitan-university/london-met-documents/professional-service-departments/quality-enhancement-unit/quality-manual/London-Met-Quality-Manual-2019-2020.pdf
- c Pearson's academic regulations
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/downloads/higher-nationals-enhanced-quality-assurance-and-assessment-handbook.pdf>
- d London Metropolitan University External Examiners' Handbook 2019 [082]
- e Fairfield School of Business Assessment Regulations and Procedures [008]
- f Fairfield School of Business Programme Development and Review Policy [045]
- g FSB Quality Handbook [101]
- h Fairfield School of Business Governance Handbook [009] including the terms of reference for the Advisory Board
- i BA Business [Top up] Course Specification template [034]
- j FdA Business Course Specification template [035]
- k FdSc Public Health and Social Care course specification template [036]
- l Course handbooks [BA Business top-up 041, FdA Business 042, FdA Public Health and Social Care 043, HND Business 044]
- m Pearson External Examiner Report 12.2.19 [007]
- n BA Business External Examiner Report 2017-18 [032] and 2018-19 [085]
- o FdA Business External Examiners Report 2017-18 [033]
- p Course Action Plan 2019-20 for FD and BA Business [100]
- q Outcomes Report of London Metropolitan University Institutional Approval Event and Courses Approval Events held on 17 and 18.10.16 [046]
- r A sample of 30 pieces of assessed student work across different modules across different modules from BA Business top-up, FdA Business and FdA Public Health and Social Care [CW1]

s Meetings with staff from FSB [M1, M5] and with the Head of Partnerships from London Metropolitan University [M6] who provides overall management of the partnership agreement and relationship with the provider
t Meetings with students [M2, M3, M4]
u Virtual learning environment [VLE].

81 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:

- third party endorsements as none are available for the provision on offer at the School.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

82 Sampling of the School's provision was undertaken by reviewing all four programmes delivered by the School and their associated approved programme documentation and the most recent set of three University external examiner and the Pearson external examiner reports.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

83 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the [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 School'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.

84 The review team considered the University's academic regulations [<https://student.londonmet.ac.uk/your-studies/student-administration/rules-and-regulations/academic-regulations/>], Quality Manual [www.londonmet.ac.uk/media/london-metropolitan-university/london-met-documents/professional-service-departments/quality-enhancement-unit/quality-manual/London-Met-Quality-Manual-2019-2020.pdf], Pearson's regulations [<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/downloads/higher-nationals-enhanced-quality-assurance-and-assessment-handbook.pdf>] and the external examiners' handbook [082], together with the School's policies [008, 045], Quality Handbook [101], virtual learning environment [VLE] and the terms of reference for the Advisory Board [009] to determine how external expertise is used in maintaining academic standards, and how the School's assessment and classification processes operate.

85 Approved course documentation [034, 035, 036] along with course handbooks [041, 042, 043, 044] and the report of the University Institutional Approval Event and Courses Approval Events [046] were considered to assess the reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes.

86 The review team considered external examiner reports [007, 032, 085, 033] to identify their views about the reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes.

87 A Course Action Plan [100] was reviewed to consider the School's plans in response to comments in external examiner reports.

88 Assessed student work was reviewed by the team to evidence assessment and classification processes in operation [CW1].

89 The team met with staff [M1, M5] to consider their understanding of the requirement to use external expertise and their understanding of assessment and classification processes. The team also met with the Head of Partnerships at the University [M6] regarding the management of the partnership.

90 The team met with students from Croydon [M2], Birmingham [M3] and Alperton [M4] to understand how they regard the reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes.

What the evidence shows

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

92 The University's academic regulations, Quality Manual, the external examiners' handbook [082] and the Pearson academic regulations, together provide a clear and comprehensive framework for the maintenance of standards, the use of external expertise and assessment and classification processes. This framework is applied by the School, which contextualises some of the detail within its own policies [008, 045], Quality Handbook [101] and procedures. These set out the respective responsibilities with regard to determining the programme specifications and associated learning outcomes, approving and reviewing assessments, conducting those assessments and moderation of the marking assuring the maintenance of academic standards. While the School's Programme Design and Review Policy [045] does not include reference to the use of external expertise, since the responsibility for setting academic standards is located with the awarding body, the School's Assessment Regulations and Procedures [008] set the expectation that expertise in maintaining standards from academics external to the School is incorporated into the assessment process through the approval of assessments and the moderation of marking by the University as well as review by university-appointed external examiners.

93 The Advisory Board is chaired by an independent academic adviser and the membership also includes representatives from legal and financial fields who advise the Board of Governors on the School's strategic direction [009].

94 Approved course documentation [034, 035, 036] along with course handbooks [041, 042, 043, 044] provide clear assessment strategy content, including the external scrutiny of summative assessments by the University and mapping against specified learning outcomes, together with appropriate classification information. Relevant and appropriate external expertise is evident in the University Institutional Approval Event and Courses Approval Events, which included external members from the University as well as advisers from other universities. [046]. The virtual learning environment provides clear access to relevant policies, including marking, awarding and moderation practices in addition to course and module specifications [VLE].

95 Course action plans take the form of a template provided by the University with a section specifically dedicated to external examiner feedback, where 'all proposals or issues of concern raised in external examiners' reports should be addressed'. In the case of the sample provided [100], the School acknowledges the external examiner's positive comments, including the comparability of standards and appropriate application of awarding body regulations. Similar consideration is given to the Pearson HND programmes [111 – 111.3] with associated action plans in response to external examiner feedback, which included identification of the action to be taken, identification of who was responsible for implementation and timelines for their completion. Confirmation of the actions taken was recorded through the awarding partners' monitoring reports [006, 052]. Review of these processes enabled the team to confirm that external expertise is used according to the awarding partners' regulations and that the School gives that expertise due consideration.

96 The external examiner reports [007, 032, 085, 033] confirm that standards are secure, that assessment and classification processes are reliable, fair and transparent and that feedback is supportive and 'solid'.

97 Senior [M1] and academic and professional services staff [M5] met by the review team articulated their understanding of the role of the external examiners and of the awarding partners and commented on the effective and appropriate application of awarding body assessment and classification processes, including a 'robust verification process' (S1 and S2 also refer). External expertise in the form of external examiner feedback, collaborative partner events and employer engagement particularly to enhance the student experience was cited [M1, M5]. The latter activities included quality assurance updates by the University and meetings with local employers through the Chamber of Commerce and keynote presentations by employers to the students [M1, M5, M7, M3]. While the formal partnership with the University is a validating relationship, in practice the School is provided with course specifications by the University which it delivers. The Head of Partnerships at the University [M6] confirmed that it holds responsibility for determining learning outcomes and setting standards which the School then maintains and reviews, with the University providing clear oversight.

98 Students whom the review team met 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 available in various places, including in the assignment briefs and in handbooks, as well as being presented by tutors in module induction sessions. Feedback was described as very helpful [M2, M3, M4].

Conclusions

99 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the School 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.

100 The review team concludes that the School uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent. This is because the University's regulations and guidance documents provide a clear and comprehensive framework for the use of external expertise in maintaining academic standards, and for assessment and classification processes, which are evident in the institutional approval process and in course documentation. 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 showing appropriate consideration of their feedback. The plans for maintaining academic standards in response to external examiners are robust and credible, with identification of actions, allocations of responsibility and of timelines for implementation which are reported on through the partners' monitoring processes. Staff demonstrated clear understanding of assessment and classification processes and students showed clear understanding of these processes and confirmed that they are reliable, fair and transparent. Students were also appreciative of the clarity and accessibility of assessment and classification information. Review of assessed student work enabled the team to confirm that the setting, approval and marking processes involved in assessment and classification are carried out in line with the regulations and overseen by the awarding partners. All the observations described above are consistent with the criteria for a 'met' judgement, therefore the review team concludes that the School meets this Core practice.

101 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of 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

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

103 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

104 The QAA review team holistically assessed the evidence presented to it, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the School 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 utilised that matrix to ensure that the evidence it 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 Responsibilities checklists for the awarding body and organisation [000 pp 24-28]
- b Mission and Values [001]
- c FSB – London Metropolitan University validation agreement and addendum to Institutional Memorandum of Agreement and Course Level Agreements Feb 2019 [005, 067.3]
- d Terms of Reference of the Admissions and Marketing Committee [009 p 21]
- e School Admissions Policy and associated flowchart [018, 019]
- f Course specifications BA Business top-up, FdA Business, FdA Public Health and Social Care [034, 035, 036]
- g Student Protection Plan [037]
- h Equality and Diversity Policy [093]
- i Access and Participation statement [094]
- j Statements by Director of Marketing and Admissions [059, 108]
- k Admissions process booklet [060]
- l Promotional materials - FdA Business leaflet Birmingham and Croydon, FdA Public Health and Social Care leaflet Birmingham and Croydon, BA Business top-up leaflet Croydon [060.1, 060.2, 060.3, 060.4, 060.5]
- m Admissions video [060.6]
- n FSB presentation-open-day [060.7]
- o Admissions Offer Letter and rejection email [061, 065]
- p Training for staff involved in admissions [063, 063.1, 063.2]
- q Minutes of the Admissions and Marketing Committee [064, 064.1, 064.2]
- r Admission survey [064, 064.1, 064.2]
- s Course Level Agreements for FdA Business, FdA Public Health and Social Care, BA Business top-up [067, 067.1, 067.2]
- t Student enrolment terms and conditions Sep2019 [095]
- u FSB Entry Requirements [103]
- v FSB website [<https://fsb.ac.uk>]
- w Meeting with Senior Staff [M1]
- x Meeting with Croydon Students [M2]
- y Meeting with Birmingham Students [M3]
- z Meeting with Alperton Students [M4]

- aa Meeting with academic and professional services staff [M5]
- bb Meeting with London Metropolitan University Head of Partnerships and Link Tutors [M6]

105 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:

- arrangements with recruitment agents because the School reported that they do not use recruitment agents.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

106 The team considered a random sample of 21 admissions records from the 2018-19 cohorts for FdA Business (Croydon, Alperton and Birmingham), FdA Public Health and Social Care (Croydon) and BA Business top-up (Croydon), including successful and unsuccessful exemplars, to assess whether reliable, fair and inclusive admissions decisions were made.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

107 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the [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 School'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.

108 The School's agreement with its awarding body [005, 067.3], Admissions Policy [018], Terms of Reference of the Admissions and Marketing Committee [009 p 21], Student Protection Plan [037] and meeting with senior staff [M1] to identify institutional policy relating to the recruitment selection and admission of students and the procedures for handling admissions complaints and appeals.

109 The School's Admissions Policy [018] and associated flowchart [019] and meeting with academic and support staff [M5] to identify roles and responsibilities of staff involved in the admissions process, support for applicants and how the School verifies applicants' entry qualifications.

110 The School's Mission and Values [001], Equality and Diversity Policy [093] and Access and Participation Statement [094] to identify how the School facilitates an inclusive admissions system.

111 Course-level agreements between the School and its awarding body [067, 067.1, 067.2], Terms of Reference [009 p21] and minutes of the Admissions and Marketing Committee [064, 064.1, 064.2], statement from the Director of Marketing and Admissions on the Admissions Panel [108] and meeting with the awarding body's Head of Partnerships [M6], to assess whether the School has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for ensuring that admissions systems are reliable, fair and inclusive for its higher education programmes.

112 Promotional materials: course leaflets [060.1, 060.2, 060.3, 060.4, 060.5], admissions process booklet [060], admissions video [060.6], Open day presentation [060.7], Student Enrolment Terms and Conditions Sep 2019 and the School's website

<https://fsb.ac.uk/> to test whether the information given to applicants is transparent, inclusive and fit for purpose.

113 Course Specifications for BA Business top-up, FdA Business and FdA Public Health and Social Care [034, 035, 036], promotional materials: course leaflets [060.1, 060.2, 060.3, 060.4, 060.5], admissions process booklet [060], the Schools' entry requirements [103] to test whether admissions requirements for the courses reflect the School's overall regulations and policy.

114 Admissions records offer letter [061] and rejection email [065] were reviewed to assess whether reliable, fair and inclusive admissions decisions were made for the applicants sampled.

115 The team met with senior [M1], academic and professional staff [M5] and examined evidence of training for teaching and admissions staff [063, 063.1, 063.2] to test whether staff understand their responsibilities, are appropriately skilled and supported and can articulate how the School's approach to inclusivity is manifest in the admissions process.

116 The team reviewed the admissions survey [064, 064.1, 064.2] and met with students [M2, M3, M4], to assess students' views regarding their experience of the admissions process.

117 The School confirmed [059] that it does not use recruitment agents.

What the evidence shows

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

119 The formal agreements, as set out in the Institutional Memoranda of Agreement between the School and the University [005, 67.3] confirm that the awarding body delegates responsibility to the School for the recruitment and admission of students. The School has a clear and comprehensive Admissions Policy revised in August 2019, available on its website, for the recruitment, selection and admission of students which clearly articulates how the admissions process operates and the support an applicant may expect from the School [018]. Through this Policy, the School sets out its overarching aims regarding the entry criteria, provision of information and support for students from widening participation backgrounds in making successful applications. It also defines the allocation of responsibilities to staff within the School and details the procedure for considering applications. The Student Protection Plan [037] outlines the support for applicants should recruitment to a course be suspended due to low recruitment numbers, in particular the commitment to work in conjunction with the awarding body to support those students in finding suitable places with the University or another provider.

120 Roles and responsibilities of academic and professional services staff in relation to the recruitment, selection and admission of students are defined in the Admissions Policy [018]. The academic and professional services staff met by the team were able to describe the processes and respective responsibilities in detail, including the alignment with the guidance provided through SPA (Supporting Professionalism in Admissions) [M1, M5]. Staff involved in the admissions process are appropriately skilled and receive annual training, including revision of the processes, updates on any changes in the policies and training in admissions interviews; new staff receive more detailed induction training and act as interview observers initially [063, 063.1, 063.2, M1, M5]. The School's Mission and Values [001], Equality and Diversity Policy [093] and Access and Participation statement [094] demonstrate the School's strong commitment to inclusivity and diversity which is reflected in a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system and staff were able to clearly articulate how the School's approach to inclusivity manifests itself in the admissions process [M1, M5].

121 The Admissions Policy 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 [M5]. Admissions complaints and appeals are reviewed by the Admissions and Marketing Committee [009 p21; 064, 064.1, 064.2]; no formal complaints or appeals in relation to the admissions process have been received.

122 The Admissions Policy [018] and associated flowchart [019], Admissions Process booklet [060], Course Level Agreements between the School and its awarding body [067, 067.1, 067.2], Terms of Reference [009 p21] and minutes of the Admissions and Marketing Committee [064, 064.1, 064.2] and meeting with the awarding body's Head of Partnerships [M6], demonstrate that the School evaluates its recruitment processes, including consideration of application statistics and applicant feedback, and has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for ensuring that its admissions systems are reliable, fair and inclusive for its higher education programmes. Its robust admissions system includes a consistent approach to the admissions process, which involves agreed entry criteria, a centralised admissions team responsible for the initial assessment of applications and confirmation of the entry qualifications, provision of applicant advice and guidance, an online application form and an assessment day involving a variety of tests and interviews, with all applicants being interviewed. These requirements are well defined in both the Admissions Policy [018, 019] and the Admissions Process booklet [060] and in promotional materials, all of which are accessible to applicants [060.1- 060.7]. While the Dean currently makes the final decision on applications, the revised Admissions Policy makes provision for more complex applications to be referred to the Admissions Panel [108, M1]. The awarding body's academic liaison tutors sample admission records and applications for accreditation of prior learning are approved by the awarding body [M1, M6].

123 A range of transparent, inclusive and fit-for-purpose information is made available to applicants in various accessible formats, for example to support students with dyslexia [060 - 060.7] and on the School's website, which also contains detailed information, including policies and procedures, course content and structure, financial information and student enrolment terms and conditions [095, <https://fsb.ac.uk>].

124 The course specifications for the BA Business Top-up [035], FdA Business [036] and FdA Public Health and Social Care [037] are those of the awarding body, were written at the time of the approval of the School as a partner in 2016 and stipulate the awarding body's minimum entry requirements; these course specifications are due to be reviewed this academic year [M6]. The School's current admissions requirements, approved by the awarding body, have been developed to go beyond these minimum criteria [013] and are consistently and clearly stated in information provided to applicants [060, 060.1, 060.2, 060.3, 060.4, 060.5]. These admissions requirements accurately reflect the School's overall regulations and policy.

125 Review of the sample of 21 admissions records from the 2018-19 cohorts across the three campuses allowed the team to confirm that the School has a consistent approach to handling admissions and to implementing its Admissions Policy [018, 019] with no deviations, which includes adherence to the specified minimum qualifications requirements. This was further confirmed through the meeting with academic and professional services staff involved in the admissions process who were able to articulate the School's processes and policy [M5]. The standard offer letter provides guidance to the registration process, including information regarding the induction process, details of the attendance requirements and guidance regarding finance. There is also information provided regarding complaints. The rejection letter includes details for lodging an appeal against the decision [061, 061.1]. Through these considerations, the team was able to confirm that the admissions decisions were reliable, fair and inclusive.

126 The outcomes of the School's admissions surveys [064, 064.1, 064.2], which are considered by the Admissions and Marketing Committee, show that more than 90 per cent of applicants are satisfied with the admissions process. The review team met eight students studying at the Croydon Campus, five students studying at the Alperton Campus and five students studying at the Birmingham Campus who all agreed that, in their experience, the admissions procedure is fair and transparent, that the staff were very helpful, as was the guidance they received, for example as to whether the nature of the programme was suited to their needs [M2, M3, M4]. The students confirmed that, after making initial enquiries, their experience of the admission process was the same, including that they had all been interviewed. Students also confirmed that the information they received during the admissions process was accessible, helpful and accurate and that they were informed about the complaints and appeals processes at interview. They all reported that their experience on their course had matched their expectations [M2, M3, M4].

Conclusions

127 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the School 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.

128 The review team concludes that the School has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system. This is because the admissions systems are underpinned by clear policies and procedures for recruitment, selection and admission of students which are fit for purpose and ensure that admissions decisions are fair and inclusive. This judgement was arrived at by the team on the basis of review of the admissions policies and process documentation and of admissions records from all programmes, as well as meetings with academic and professional services staff and students. The School's approach to admissions appears to be consistent and robust as admissions records demonstrate that the School operates according to its policies and procedures, with no deviations. While the admissions requirements set out in course specifications reflect the awarding body's minimum entry requirements, admissions requirements in all other information made available to applicants are consistent with the School's admissions regulations and policies. Academic and professional services staff involved in the admissions process who were met by the team demonstrated full understanding of their roles and of the admissions processes, they also confirmed that they are appropriately skilled, receiving regular training. The team reviewed the information provided and was able to confirm that information for applicants is transparent, accessible and fit for purpose; this was also confirmed through the meetings with the students. Student evaluations show that the students were very satisfied with the admissions process, which they found fair, inclusive, timely and supportive, and with the accuracy and helpfulness of information provided to them. Again, these findings were endorsed through the direct meetings with the students from the different campuses. All the observations described above are consistent with the criteria for a 'met' judgement, therefore the review team concludes that the School meets this Core practice.

129 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of 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

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

131 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

132 The QAA review team holistically assessed the evidence presented to them, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the School 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 utilised that matrix to ensure that the evidence it 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 FSB – London Metropolitan University Validation agreement [005]
- b Pearson Academic Management Review Report 2018 [006]
- c Pearson external examiner final [007]
- d Assessment Regulations and Procedures [008]
- e FSB Governance Handbook [009]
- f London Metropolitan University Business Course Committee Meeting_20th February 2019 [011]
- g Executive Committee Minutes 20.05.2019 [015]
- h Programme Development Review Group minutes [012, 016]
- i Academic Board [017]
- j FSB teaching & learning Handbook [020]
- k Learning and Teaching Forum [021]
- l External examiner reports, responses and action plans [032, 033, 085, 100, 109]
- m Course Specifications [034, 035, 036]
- n Course Handbooks [041, 042, 043, 044]
- o Programme Development and Review Policy [045]
- p Approved Outcomes Report - LSST_FSB Institutional and courses Approval Oct 2016 [046]
- q Fairfield School of Business Annual Quality Management Group June 2019 [052]
- r Module and programme evaluations [022, 056, 056.1, 056.2, 057, 057.1, 057.2, 058, 069-069.2]
- s Programme committee minutes [066, 066.1]
- t Course level agreements [067 – 067.3]
- u Module handbooks [068 – 068.2]
- v Staff appraisal records [071 – 071.3]
- w Examples of staff Continuing Professional Development workshops [073, 073.1]
- x Module action plans [079, 079.1]
- y External examiners handbook [082]
- z London Metropolitan University academic regulation [083]
- aa Quality Handbook 2018-19 [101]
- bb Student assessed work [CW1]
- cc Meeting with senior staff [M1]
- dd Meeting with Croydon Students [M2]

- ee Meeting with Birmingham Students [M3]
- ff Meeting with Alperton Students [M4]
- gg Meeting with academic and professional services staff [M5]
- hh Meeting with London Metropolitan University Head of Partnerships and Link Tutors [M6]
- ii Teaching Observations [T01 – 6]
- jj Virtual learning environment [VLE]

133 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:

- third party endorsements as none are available for the provision on offer at the School.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

134 Sampling of the School's provision was undertaken by reviewing all four programmes delivered by the School and their associated approved programme documentation and the most recent set of three University external examiner and one Pearson external examiner reports. The team reviewed a representative sample of 10 module and course evaluation surveys and the National Student Survey outcomes. The team observed six teaching sessions representing the range of academic programmes delivered by the School.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

135 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the [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 School'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.

136 The review team considered the University's academic regulations [083], the School's Quality Handbook [101], and assessment regulations and procedures [008] to identify the School's approach to designing and delivering high-quality courses.

137 The team reviewed lesson plans and teaching activities [TO1-TO6], module handbooks [068, 068.1, 068.2], programme materials posted on the virtual learning environment [VLE], identified actions and the minutes of deliberative committees [011, 012, 015, 016, 017, 052, 066, 066.1, 079, 079.1] and staff appraisals [071 – 071.3] to assess whether the School has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for delivering and designing high-quality courses.

138 The team reviewed approved course documentation [034, 035, 036, 041, 042, 043, 044] 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.

139 The team reviewed the Pearson external examiner's report [007] and the University's external examiners' reports [032, 033, 085], the Pearson Academic Management Review Report [006] and the University's Annual Quality Meeting Group report [052] to identify their views about the quality of courses sampled.

140 The team reviewed student views as expressed through the National Student Survey [022], module and course evaluations [056-056.2, 057-057.2, 058, 069-069.2] and met with students from each of the campuses [M2, M3, M4] to identify students' views about quality of the programmes and of their learning experience.

141 The team met with senior [M1], academic and professional services staff [M5] to assess how staff ensure courses are high quality.

142 The team observed six classes across the School's provision to test whether course delivery is high quality [TO1, TO2, TO3, TO4, TO5, TO6].

What the evidence shows

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

144 The School complies with the University's academic regulations for course design and assessments as set out in the validation and course-level agreements for the courses sampled [005, 067 – 067.3] and works collaboratively with the University with monitoring through its deliberative committees, including the Quality Enhancement Committee and those of the University, in particular the University's Academic Quality Management Group [011, 013, 052, M6]. The School also complies with the Pearson requirements with consideration of the programmes through the deliberative committees, including the Quality Enhancement Committee, and as confirmed through the external examiner's report [007] and the Pearson Academic Management Review Report [006], which includes confirmation of the actions on recommendations for enhancement arising from previous reports. Within its Quality Handbook [101] and Teaching and Learning Handbook [020], the School provides comprehensive guidance to academic members of staff about how to deliver high quality courses. These include guidance on assessment, on drafting lesson plans and schemes of work and the Personal Development Planning process for supporting the students' progress. These are supplemented by a variety of continuing professional development activities for learning and teaching staff, such as the Learning and Teaching Forum [021], workshops [073, 073.1] 'Lunch and Learn' sessions [M5] and teaching observations. Together, these regulations, policies and activities facilitate the delivery of high-quality courses. The School responds to recommendations in course quality feedback derived from student evaluations, staff feedback and external examiner reports [100] that are fed forward to the Academic Board [017]. The associated action plans [100, 109] and minutes of deliberative committees such as the Programme Development and Review Group [012, 016] provide clear evidence of credible, robust and evidence-based plans for designing and delivering high quality courses.

145 The School also demonstrates its commitment to delivering high-quality courses by supporting academic staff's professional development. This is achieved by building time for scholarship and development into the workload models, through the range of continuing professional development activities, including the Learning and Teaching Forum and development days [021, 073, 073.1] and sponsorship of applications for Fellowship to the Higher Education Academy [M1, M5]. There are also graded teaching observations that form part of the annual appraisal processes for academic staff with associated developmental actions [071 – 071.3] as well as peer observation of teaching.

146 The School follows the academic regulations of the University for course design and delivery [083] and ensures that the schemes of work, content and organisation, learning, teaching and assessment are high quality [041, 042, 043], as confirmed by its own observation and approval processes, and the reports of external examiners (see paragraph 147, below). Review of the approved course documentation for the courses by the team demonstrated that these clearly outline learning outcomes and curricula, schemes of work,

assessment requirements, marking criteria and classifications [034 - 036, 041 – 044, 068, 068.1, 068.2,] enabling students to meet and demonstrate the intended learning outcomes.

147 External examiners' reports confirm the high quality of the teaching, learning and assessment of the programmes delivered by the School [007, 032, 033, 085]. External examiners' suggestions are reflected at the Quality Enhancement Committees [013, 104], module and course action plans [079, 079.1, 100, 109] and actions identified through the course committees [011, 066, 066.1].

148 All staff met by the team clearly understood and articulated what high-quality courses entail by explaining the expectations of the awarding partners and their compliance with the School's internal processes from course design to assessment marking and moderation, alignment with the intended learning outcomes and staff development activities [M5]. Furthermore, the School runs Learning and Teaching Forums and participates in shared collaborative partner development workshops with the University for academic staff members to share good practice in learning and teaching [021, M1, M5, M6].

149 The team reviewed the internal and external student evaluations of teaching and course quality that generally indicate that the students regard their courses as being of high quality [022, 056, 057, 058, 111]. These observations were confirmed by the expressed views of the students met by the team from the different campuses who spoke positively of the professionalism of the academic staff and the high quality of the teaching [M2, M3, M4].

150 The review team observed six classes across the courses sampled [TO1-TO6] and was provided with the lesson plans for the specific sessions as well as the module outline structures and learning outcomes. On the basis of review of the supporting documentary evidence and the direct observations of the teaching sessions, the team was able to determine that the learning outcomes for the classes were achievable within the set teaching timeframe, with planning and organisation, effective use of resources and engaging delivery involving active student participation. The team also reviewed the associated module documentation and supporting materials posted on the virtual learning environment. This allowed the team to confirm the clarity of objectives, good planning and organisation, a sound method of approach, good delivery, appropriate content, effective use of resources and student engagement, thereby demonstrating that the School delivers high-quality courses.

Conclusions

151 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted (Annex 1) to form a holistic judgement as to whether the School 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.

152 The review team concludes that the School designs and delivers high-quality courses. This is because relevant academic regulations, approved course documents and consideration of programme operation, along with feedback from students and external examiners, by the Schools and University's deliberative committees indicate that the School has robust and credible plans to design and deliver high-quality courses. The staff met by the team understand what high-quality delivery means and are able to articulate how the internal verification processes meet that definition. Student evaluations and expressed views reflect their consideration that the courses they are studying are of high quality. These views were endorsed through direct observation of teaching activities and associated module documentation as well as review of teaching materials on the virtual learning environment

through which the team was able to conclude that there are clarity of objectives, good planning and organisation, a sound method of approach, good delivery, appropriate content, effective use of resources and student engagement which underpin delivery of high quality courses. Approved course documents, the minutes of deliberative committees and meetings with senior staff demonstrate clarity of module plans, organisation and objectives enabling students to meet and demonstrate the intended learning outcomes. External examiner reports confirm the high quality of the provision. As the observation outlined above is consistent with the criteria for a 'met' judgement, the review team concludes that the Core practice is met.

153 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.

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

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

155 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

156 The QAA review team holistically assessed the evidence presented to it, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the School 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 utilised that matrix to ensure that the evidence it 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 Pearson Academic Management Review Report 2018 [006]
- b Pearson External examiner report final [007]
- c Learning and Teaching Forum [021]
- d FSB National Student Survey 2019 Results [022]
- e External examiner reports [032, 033, 085]
- f Module and Course evaluations FdA Public Health [056 – 056.2]
- g Module and Course evaluations FdA Business [057 – 057.2]
- h London Metropolitan University Business L4 ITM Dec 2019 [058]
- i Course-level student evaluations [069 – 069.2]
- j Examples of teaching staff continuing professional development records [070 – 070.4]
- k Examples of annual staff appraisal records [071 – 071.3]
- l Documented induction process for new members of staff [072 – 072.2]
- m Examples of staff continuing professional development workshops [073, 073.1]
- n Sample of staff CVs across programmes [075 – 075.6]
- o Relevant job descriptions: Head of Assessments, Senior Assessments Officer, Head of Student Support, Head of Academic Support Centre, Work Placements and Careers Manager, Disability Officer, Lead Personal Tutor, (titles from governance handbook terms of reference), plus Head of Library/resources centres [076 – 076.7]
- p FSB Staff Recruitment and Selection Policy [090]
- q FSB Organisational Chart Aug 2019 V7 [092]
- r Quality Handbook 2018-19 [101]
- s Teaching Observations [TO1 – TO6]
- t Meeting with senior staff [M1]
- u Meeting with Croydon Students [M2]
- v Meeting with Birmingham Students [M3]
- w Meeting with Alperton Students [M4]
- x Meeting with academic and professional services staff [M5]
- y Final meeting [M7]

157 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:

- third party endorsements as none are available for the provision on offer at the School.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

158 Representative sampling of the School's provision was undertaken by undertaking teaching observations of all four programmes. The team also reviewed a representative sample of seven staff CVs and seven job descriptions.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

159 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the [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 School'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.

160 The team reviewed the School's staff recruitment and selection policy [090], organisational chart [092], staff appraisal [071], induction processes [072 – 072.2], continuing professional development records [070 – 070.4] and staff development plans found in the Quality Handbook [101] to identify how the School recruits, appoints, inducts and supports staff and plans [M7] to ensure there are sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience.

161 The team reviewed staff CVs [075 – 075.6] and job descriptions [076 – 076.7] and met with the University Head of Partnerships [M6] to confirm that the staff were recruited according to the School's policies and procedures.

162 The team reviewed staff continuing professional development records [070 – 070.4], staff appraisal records [071 – 071.3], job descriptions [076 – 076.7], CVs [075 – 075.6] and met with staff [M1, M5] to test that staff are appropriately qualified and skilled and supported by staff development to perform their roles effectively.

163 The team reviewed internal and external student evaluations [022, 056 – 056.2, 057 – 057.2, 069 – 069.2] and met with students [M2, M3, M4] to identify students' views about the sufficiency of staff provision, their qualifications and relevant skills.

164 The team met with academic and professional services staff [M5] to test that staff are appropriately qualified and skilled.

165 The team conducted teaching observations of six classes [TO1-TO6] to test whether the academic staff deliver a high-quality learning experience.

What the evidence shows

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

167 The School has a robust staff recruitment and selection policy and approaches [090] that set out the scope, principles and procedures to ensure that qualified and skilled staff are recruited, and that staffing is based on admissions numbers [M7]. Applications for

academic staff posts are assessed and reviewed in accordance with the person specification; shortlisted applicants are interviewed and undertake a micro-teaching exercise [090, M1, M5]. The School conducts an established induction checklist process for new members of staff, including mentoring [072, 072.1, M5], and ensures that staff remain skilled through developmental activities (see paragraph 168) and by sponsoring applications for Fellowships to the Higher Education Academy [M5]. 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.

168 The external examiners report positively on the quality of teaching by the staff [007, 032, 033, 085], for example: 'The programme is delivered by a positive and committed team which is well-managed and administered. The team consists of fully qualified, experience and capable staff...' [007]. The School actively supports the development of its staff through a range of activities, including an allocation of time in the workload model of all teaching staff for scholarship and personal development, 'Lunch & Learn' sessions, staff development workshops and seminars, a Learning and Teaching Forum, collaborative partnership workshops with the University and scheduled peer and lesson observations [M1, M5, 021, 073, 073.1]. 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 a credible, robust and evidence-based ongoing plan to ensure it has sufficient qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality learning experience.

169 The School's staff organisation structure [092] displays the range of posts that are in place sufficient to deliver a high-quality learning experience. The teaching, professional services and support staff met by the review team confirmed their participation in development activities, similarly affirming that there is sufficient staffing to ensure delivery of a quality learning experience [M5]. The team also heard from a new member of staff who observed that the recruitment and appointment process was rigorous but supportive, in line with the recruitment policies, and that mentoring was in place as well as an induction programme [M5, 072, 072.1, 090].

170 Student evaluations and surveys [022, 056, 057, 058, 069] generally confirm that students agree or strongly agree that staff are enthusiastic and skilled and that they deliver high-quality teaching (see also Q2 paragraph 149). Students whom the review team met endorsed these views, being highly complimentary in their comments about the staff, in particular their view that there are sufficient staff who are well qualified and with the relevant experience to enable them to deliver a high-quality academic experience [M2, M3, M4].

171 The CVs of seven existing members of staff [075 - 075.6] and the job descriptions [076 - 076.6] demonstrate that staff are appropriately qualified and skilled to perform their roles effectively. The School's approach to staff recruitment and selection with clear job descriptions for both academic and professional services staff [076 - 076.7] demonstrate the School's commitment to ensuring that staff are recruited according to its stipulated policies and procedures [090], which include interviews and teaching observations as well as review of academic qualifications. The Head of Partnerships from the University also confirmed that the University approves all the CVs of the academic teaching staff each year [M6].

172 The review team observed six classes across the four programmes [TO1-TO6]. 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 virtual learning environment. These observations support the view that academic staff deliver appropriate and high-quality learning experience (see also Q2, paragraph 145).

Conclusions

173 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the School 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.

174 The review team concludes that the School has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience. This is because the School has robust regulations and credible plans for the recruitment, appointment and induction of appropriately qualified and skilled staff with staffing numbers being planned in line with student admissions to ensure sufficient staffing. The recruitment processes are rigorous and conducted in line with the School's policies. The School has a staff structure with sufficient posts to enable it to deliver a high-quality learning experience. The School is committed to the training and development of its academic and professional services staff to ensure that their skills are developed, enabling them to deliver a high-quality academic experience. Evidence from student views, external evaluations and teaching observations indicates that there are sufficient staff who are appropriately qualified, skilled and experienced to perform their roles effectively and to deliver a quality learning experience. Staff met by the team confirmed that they had been recruited, appointed, inducted and supported effectively and that these processes were in line with the School's policies. All the observations described above are consistent with the criteria for a 'met' judgement, therefore the review team concludes that the School meets this Core practice.

175 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

176 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.

177 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

178 The QAA review team holistically assessed the evidence presented to it, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the School 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 utilised that matrix to ensure that the evidence it 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 FSB Business and Strategic Plan September 2018- August 2021 [086.1]
- b Board of Governors minutes April 2019 [086]
- c Executive Committee minutes 20.5.19 [015]
- d Programme Development and Review Group minutes 7. 3. 19 [012]
- e Student Support and Welfare Committee minutes 18.1.19 [088.1]
- f Fairfield School of Business Teaching and Learning Handbook [020]
- g Croydon Campus A4 floor plan [024] and Birmingham approved floor plan [025]
- h FSB Student Handbook 2019-20 [054]
- i Personal Academic Tutoring note [050] and Personal Academic Tutoring Policy [051]
- j Equality and diversity policy [093]
- k Student support and disability policy [028]
- l Access and Participation statement [094]
- m National Student Survey 2019 Results [022]
- n Module evaluation data [056, 057, 058]
- o FSB organisational chart [092]
- p Job descriptions of staff employed in relevant functions:
- q Academic Support Coordinator [076]
- r Careers and Work Placement Manager [076.1]
- s Head Librarian [076.2]
- t Head of Examinations [076.3]
- u Head of Student Support [076.4]
- v SEN Officer [076.6]
- w Meeting with senior staff [M1]
- x Meeting with Croydon Students [M2]
- y Meeting with Birmingham Students [M3]
- z Meeting with Alperton Students [M4]
- aa Meeting with academic and professional services staff [M5]

- bb Meeting with London Metropolitan University Head of Partnerships and Link Tutors [M6]
- cc Direct assessment of facilities, learning resources, including the library and virtual learning environment, and support services on site and Skype tours of the School's campuses in Alperton and Birmingham [LR1]

179 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:

- third party endorsements as none are available for the provision on offer at the School.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

180 Sampling of the School's provision was undertaken by reviewing all four programmes delivered by the School and their associated programme documentation and the most recent set of three University external examiner reports and one Pearson external examiner report and associated action plans. There was random sampling of three module evaluation surveys. The team also undertook a review of the facilities and learning resources on site and also a virtual tour of the other campuses.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

181 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the [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 School'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.

182 Relevant strategies [086.1] for facilities, learning resources and student support services provision, together with key discussions in a Board of Governors meeting [086], an Executive Committee meeting [015] a Programme Development and Review Group [012] and a Student Support and Welfare Committee [088.1] were examined to identify how facilities, learning resources and student support services are monitored and contribute to delivering a high-quality academic experience.

183 The team reviewed the developmental and business plans for ensuring sufficient and appropriate facilities [024, 025], learning resources [086.1] and student support services that are credible and robust. This also included the new Personal Academic Tutoring approach [050, 051] that is being developed to further enhance the support, retention and success of the students.

184 Relevant policies [028, 093], the Access and Participation statement [094], the FSB Student Handbook [054] and FSB Teaching and Learning Handbook [020] were reviewed to identify how the School's approach enables accessibility, inclusion and support for students to facilitate a high-quality student experience.

185 The review team examined documentary comments from students in module evaluation surveys [056, 057, 058] and additionally asked the students it met [M2, M3, M4] about their views on the sufficiency and quality of the facilities, learning resources and student support services available to them.

186 The School's organisational chart [092] and the job descriptions [076, 76.1, 76.2, 76.3, 76.4, 76.6] 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.

187 The views of staff whom the team met [senior staff M1, academic and professional services staff M5] and key role descriptions [076, 76.1, 76.2, 76.3, 76.4, 76.6] 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.

188 A direct examination by the team of learning resources, including classrooms, computer rooms, the virtual learning environment, libraries, student social spaces and student support areas, was undertaken to evaluate their potential to contribute to a high-quality academic experience [LR1]. This also included virtual tours of the two campuses the team could not visit in person.

What the evidence shows

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

190 The School's strategies and plans [086.1] for facilities, learning resources and student support services are 'to provide a supportive and inspiring student experience that is inclusive, seeks to reduce barriers to learning and equips students with the knowledge and skills they need to progress into further study or employment'. Key discussions by deliberative committees at different levels, from the Board of Governors [086] to the Executive [015] and through to module reviews [056, 057, 058] showed effective consideration of provision of facilities, learning resources and student support services to underpin the delivery of a high-quality academic experience. The plans for ensuring sufficient and appropriate facilities [024, 025, M7], learning resources [086.1], staffing and student support services are based on evaluations of projected student numbers and associated funding models and are credible and robust.

191 Planning for the new Personal Academic Tutoring approach [050, 051] in particular is being developed to make a significant contribution to the retention and success of students [M5] and was viewed very positively by all students the team met from across the different campuses, reflecting the consistent approach to support [M2, M3, M4]. The team was informed that an initial impact evaluation will take place at the end of the calendar year [M5].

192 Relevant policies for student support and equality and diversity [028, 093], the Access and Participation statement [094], the FSB Student Handbook [054] and FSB Teaching and Learning Handbook [020] include clear guidance and expectations around inclusivity, equality and diversity, personal development planning, safeguarding and employability skills and the pastoral and academic support provision in order to facilitate a high-quality learning experience for all students.

193 Comments from students in module evaluation surveys [056, 057, 058] suggest that students regard the facilities supporting learning positively. Students have expressed satisfaction with IT resources, library resources and considered that course-specific facilities supported their learning well and that they had received good advice and guidance in relation to their course. These views were confirmed in meetings with the team [M2, M3, M4] and the students also noted the easy access to IT equipment, to the well designed and accessible virtual learning environment, and in the main to library resources. The School evaluates the student feedback as part of the ongoing review processes and identifies action plans to improve the student experience with monitoring of implementation [100]. Students were appreciative of the support available to them, commenting positively on the Personal

Academic Tutor role, the availability of other support services and the approachability of staff [M2, M3, M4].

194 Job descriptions of key support staff, including the Head of Assessments, Head of Student Support, Head of the Academic Support Centre, Disability Officer and the Head of Library [076, 76.1, 76.2, 76.3, 76.4, 76.6] demonstrate that staff roles are appropriately focused in order to deliver a high-quality student experience. The School's organisation chart suggests that appropriate structures and resources are made available, and staff that the team met [M1, M5] were able to demonstrate their understanding of their role and responsibilities, and their contribution to supporting a high-quality student 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 access to PCs [M5, LR1].

195 A direct assessment by the team of physical facilities and resources revealed appropriate and well-equipped teaching facilities, including comprehensive provision of IT, projection and display arrangements; and break-out spaces and student support areas which appeared adequate for the number of students, currently totalling about 650 [LR1]. The School operates a virtual learning environment which contains all the programme information for students and course materials are uploaded in advance of teaching sessions [M2, M5]. Observations by the team of the virtual learning environment confirmed that it is well structured and supports course delivery with appropriate teaching materials, guidance on module structures and links to further resources. There is a physical library at each of the School's campuses. These are small; however, students are also able to access online texts and resources and use the University's library and a package of online resources [M2, M6]. The students met by the team expressed their satisfaction with the access to the library resources [M2, M3, M4].

Conclusions

196 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the School 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.

197 The review team concludes that the School has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience. This is because the School's strategic approach to the development of facilities and resources is both anticipatory and responsive to student needs, and, as such, the plans are credible, realistic and demonstrably linked to the delivery of successful academic and professional outcomes for the students. Staff roles are focused, and academic and professional services role-holders understand their roles and are appropriately qualified and experienced (Q3 also refers). Students were appreciative of the support available to them, commenting positively on the Personal Academic Tutor role, the availability of other support services and the approachability of staff. Student reporting through surveys and those met by the team regard the facilities, learning resources and student support services as sufficient and appropriate, confirming that they facilitate a high-quality academic experience. Teaching and learning spaces viewed by the team are appropriate, well-equipped and of good quality, with learning resources and support functions which support successful student progress, enabling a high-quality academic experience. All the observations described above are consistent with the criteria for a 'met' judgement, therefore the review team concludes that the School meets this Core practice.

198 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of 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

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

200 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

201 The QAA review team holistically assessed the evidence presented to it, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the School 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 utilised that matrix to ensure that the evidence it 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 Responsibilities checklists for the awarding body and organisation [000 pp24-28]
- b FSB – London Metropolitan University validation agreement and addendum to Institutional Memorandum of Agreement and Course Level Agreements Feb 2019 [005, 067.3]
- c FSB Governance Handbook [009]
- d Student Union Committee Terms of Reference [009 p51]
- e Course Committees Terms of Reference [009 p46]
- f Minutes of Academic Board 20/08/2019 [010]
- g Minutes of Course Committee Meetings [011, 040, 066, 066.1]
- h National Student Survey 2019 Results [022]
- i Student Representative Development Programme [026]
- j Student Engagement Policy [038]
- k Examples of changes as a result of student engagement [039]
- l 2019/20 Course Handbooks for BA Business Top-Up, FdA Business, FdA Publics Health and Social Care, HND Business [041, 042, 043, 044]
- m FSB Student Handbook [054]
- n Module evaluations [056, 056.1, 056.2, 057, 057.1, 057.2, 058, 069, 069.1, 069.2].
- o Principal's statement about Student Union [062]
- p Course Level Agreements for FdA Business, FdA Public Health and Social Care, BA Business top up [067, 067.1, 067.2]
- q Module Action Plans [079, 079.1, 109]
- r Student Union Constitution [097]
- s London Metropolitan University Business Course Action Plan [100]
- t Quality Handbook 2018-19 [101]
- u Module Monitoring and Review reports (MMRs) [111, 111.1, 111.2].
- v Meeting with senior staff [M1]
- w Meeting with Croydon Students [M2]
- x Meeting with Birmingham Students [M3]
- y Meeting with Alperton Students [M4]
- z Meeting with academic and professional services staff [M5]

How any samples of evidence were constructed

202 Representative samples of 11 module and course evaluations and resulting action plans, module monitoring and review reports and minutes of course committees were considered from the four courses offered at the School, namely BA Business top-up, FdA Business, FdA Public Health and Social Care and HND Business, to identify student views about student engagement in the quality of their educational experience.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

203 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the [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 School'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.

204 The School's agreement with its awarding body [005, 067.3], Governance Handbook [009], Student Union Committee Terms of Reference [009 p51], Minutes of Academic Board [010], Student Engagement Policy [038], Student Union Constitution [097] and Principal's statement about the Student Union [062] to identify how the School actively engages students in the quality of their educational experience.

205 Quality Handbook 2018-19 [101], Course Handbooks [041, 042, 043, 044], FSB Student Handbook [054], Terms of Reference [009 p46], minutes of Course Committees [011, 040, 066, 066.1], and the Student representatives development programme [026] to assess whether the School has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for engaging students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.

206 Examples of changes made as a result of student engagement [039], module [079, 079.1] and course action plans [100] showing how the School has changed or improved provision as a result of student engagement, which illustrate the impact of its approach.

207 Module and course evaluation surveys [056, 056.1, 056.2, 057, 057.1, 057.2, 058, 069, 069.1, 069.2], module monitoring and review reports [111, 111.1, 111.2], and the Student Testimonials Video [091] to identify students' views about student engagement in the quality of their educational experience.

208 Student Meetings [Croydon students M2, Birmingham students M3, Alperton students M4] to assess whether students consider they are engaged in the quality of their educational experience.

What the evidence shows

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

210 The awarding body and organisation delegate responsibility to the School for student engagement [000 pp24-28]. The agreement with the awarding body requires the School to adopt student feedback mechanisms as set out in course-level agreements, and share feedback with the University [005 p14, 067. 067.1, 067.2]. 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 [038]. This includes the Student Union [097] supported by a Student Union Coordinator; a Student Union Committee [009 p51] comprising student representatives and the Student Union officers; student representation on a wide range of committees at School level, including the Quality

Enhancement Board and Academic Board [009, M2] as well as on course committees [009 p46] and internal and external surveys that culminate in action plans [022, 056, 056.1, 056.2, 057, 057.1, 057.2, 058, 069, 069.1, 069.2, 079, 079.1]. While the approach has been generally effective, the School has found ensuring student attendance at School-level committee meetings and the operation of the Student Union Committee during 2018-19 challenging, mainly due to the departure of the Student Union President and Student Union coordinator during that academic year [062]. The School has recently taken effective steps to address this issue, including the election of a new Student Union President [M2] and appointment of a new Student Union Coordinator [M1, M2, M5], both of whom are working on re-activating the Student Union Committee. Students are also attending and actively participating in School-level committee meetings such as Academic Board [M1, M2, 010].

211 The arrangements for engaging students in the quality of their educational experience are clearly set out in the School's Quality Handbook [100], course handbooks [041, 042, 043, 044] and its student handbook [054]. Course committees are in place for all courses; these meet on a termly basis and are attended by student representatives and staff, with actions being recorded and reported on at the next meeting [009 p46, 011, 040, 066, 066.1]. A new student representatives' development programme is in place, aimed at ensuring that student representatives are equipped to carry out their roles effectively [026]. This programme includes guidance on the roles and responsibilities of the representatives and modes of operation. Representatives met by the team confirmed that they had received training and articulated their understanding of their roles and reported that their views were taken seriously by the School, stating that they provided feedback to the School's committees, including the course committees, Quality Enhancement Committee (QEC) and Academic Board [M2]. These observations confirm that the School has robust, credible and evidence-based plans for engaging students individually and collectively in the quality of their educational experience.

212 The review team was provided with evidence of examples of change being made as a result of student engagement. These included the move to their new building, expansion of library space, rescheduling of academic support workshops, more use of mock examinations, reduction of the number of assessments per module and the installation of new vending machines [M1, M5, 039, 079, 079.1, 100]. Students [M2, M3, M5] also provided examples of changes which the School has made as a result of their feedback, including adjusted assignment hand-in dates. The representatives reported that they informed their peers of the outcomes of the meetings during the breaks in teaching sessions [M2]. The team also noted that the School published 'You said... We did' posters that were placed in communal areas.

213 The review team met with eight students from the Croydon Campus, five from the Alperton Campus and five from the Birmingham Campus. These students [M2, M3, M4] confirmed that the School engages with them in the quality of their educational experience; this was also reflected in views expressed through internal surveys [056, 056.1, 056.2, 057, 057.1, 057.2, 058, 069, 069.1, 069.2, 111, 111.1, 111.2] and the student testimonial video [091]. The students reported that all staff are very approachable, that they are encouraged to provide feedback and the School is very responsive.

Conclusions

214 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the School 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.

215 The review team concludes that the School actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience. This is because the School has a clear and effective approach and robust and credible plans to engage students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience. The challenges faced by the School in 2018-19 in ensuring full student attendance at School-level committees and the departure of the Student Union President and Coordinator have now been addressed. The School engages students in the quality of their educational experience in a number of ways, including the representative system and feedback mechanisms. Students met by the team confirmed that they feel engaged in the quality of their educational experience and that the School values their opinions, as was also reflected in the results of internal and external surveys. There are a number of examples, provided by the School and by students, of changes and improvements being made to the student learning experience as a result of student engagement and feedback. All the observations described above are consistent with the criteria for a 'met' judgement, therefore the review team concludes that the School meets this Core practice.

216 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of 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

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

218 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

219 The QAA review team holistically assessed the evidence presented to it, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the School 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 utilised that matrix to ensure that the evidence it 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 Checklists of responsibilities for awarding body and organisation [000 pp24-28]
- b FSB – London Metropolitan University validation agreement and addendum to Institutional Memorandum of Agreement and Course Level Agreements Feb 2019 [005, 067.3]
- c FSB Governance Handbook [009]
- d Terms of Reference of Student Complaints Panel [009 p44]
- e Terms of Reference of Appeals Panel [009 p40]
- f Terms of Reference of Registry Committee [009 p38]
- g Appeals Policy and Procedure [098]
- h Student Complaints Policy [099]
- i 2019/20 Course Handbooks for BA Business Top-Up, FdA Business, FdA Publics Health and Social Care, HND Business [041, 042, 043, 044]
- j Appeals Log [048]
- k Complaints Log [049]
- l Examples of individual appeals [053, 053.1, 053.3, 053.5]
- m Examples of individual complaints [053.2, 053.4]
- n FSB Student Handbook [054]
- o Minutes of Complaints Panel [087]
- p Minutes of Registry Committee August 2019 [102]
- q Minutes of Appeals Panel [102.1]
- r Minutes of QEC Nov 19 [104]
- s School website [<https://fsb.ac.uk/>]
- t Meeting with senior staff [M1]
- u Meeting with Croydon Students [M2]
- v Meeting with Birmingham Students [M3]
- w Meeting with Alperton Students [M4]
- x Meeting with academic and professional services staff [M5]
- y Meeting with London Metropolitan University Head of Partnerships and Link Tutors [M6]

How any samples of evidence were constructed

220 Details of all complaints and appeals from the past three years were reviewed by the team to test whether the School has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

221 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the [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 School'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.

222 The checklists of responsibilities for the awarding body and organisation [000 pp24-28], the School's agreement with its awarding body [005, 067.3], Governance Handbook [009], Student Complaints Policy [099], Terms of Reference of the Complaints Panel [009 p44], Appeals Policy and Procedures [098], Terms of Reference of the Appeals Panel [009 p40], meeting with the awarding body's Head of Partnerships [M6], to identify the School's processes for handling complaints and appeals and to confirm that these processes are fair and transparent.

223 Student Complaints Policy [099], Appeals Policy and Procedures [098], Minutes of the Complaints Panel [087], Minutes of the Appeals Panel [102.1], Course Handbooks [041, 042, 043, 044], the Student Handbook [054] and meeting with senior staff [M1] to assess whether the School 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.

224 The review team also considered Course Handbooks [041, 042, 043, 044], the Student Handbook [054], the School's website [<https://fsb.ac.uk/>] and virtual learning environment to assess whether information for potential and actual complainants and appellants is clear and accessible.

225 The review team considered the Complaints Log [049] and the Appeals Log [048] to identify levels of complaints and appeals overall and by course or type, which may identify issues for further investigation, and the minutes of Registry Committee [102] and QEC [103] to confirm the consideration of complaints and appeals at School level. The review team reviewed all complaints [053, 053.1, 053.3, 053.5] and the appeals [053.2, 053.4] to test that the complaints and appeals sampled were dealt with in a fair, transparent and timely manner.

226 Student Meetings [Croydon students M2, Birmingham students M3, Alperton students M4] were used to identify students' views about the clarity and accessibility of the School's complaints and appeals procedures.

What the evidence shows

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

228 The formal agreements between the School and the University and Pearson [005, 067.3] and the checklists of responsibilities for the awarding body and organisation [000 pp24-28] confirm that both the University and Pearson delegate responsibility to the School for complaints and appeals. In the case of the University, responsibility is initially delegated

to the School for handling complaints [005, 067.3]. In the event there is no resolution the case is forwarded to the University [M6]. The University also requires that the School has its own appeals policy and procedures which are in line with its guidelines [M6]. Should a student be dissatisfied with the outcome of an appeal lodged with the School they have the right to a review by the University or Pearson and ultimately the Office of the Independent Adjudicator [000 pp24-26, M6].

229 Student complaints for both Pearson and University provision are dealt with in accordance with the School's Student Complaints Policy [099], which clearly defines scope, procedure, stages and timescales. Appeals are likewise dealt with in accordance with the School's Appeals Policy and Procedure [098]. The scope of the policy is clearly defined and covers appeals against decisions made in relation to the outcomes of a number of School procedures which a student feels to be incorrect or discriminatory, as well as academic appeals on specified procedural grounds. Information provided for complainants and appellants is clear: the Complaints Policy and the Appeals Policy are accessible on the School's website [[https://fsb.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/76072983 student complaints policy.pdf](https://fsb.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/76072983_student_complaints_policy.pdf), [https://fsb.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/76072983 appeals policy and procedure.pdf](https://fsb.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/76072983_appeals_policy_and_procedure.pdf)], virtual learning environment [<http://portal.fairfield.ac/>] and are signposted in course handbooks [041, 042, 043, 044] and the Student Handbook [054].

230 The School endeavours to resolve complaints informally wherever possible [099, M1]. Where this is not possible students may submit formal complaints on a standard template through the Registry [M1]. Formal complaints are dealt with by the Complaints Panel [087]. Appeals may also be submitted on a standard template through the Registry [098]; appeals are dealt with by the Appeals Panel [102.1]. The team concluded that the School's procedures for handling fair complaints and appeals are definitive, fair and transparent.

231 The School has a system for logging and monitoring formal complaints [049] and for logging and monitoring appeals [048]. Informal complaints that are resolved locally are not recorded. The School's complaints log shows that over the past three years only two formal complaints had been received, one of which had been rejected and the other investigated and resolved [049, 087]. The School's appeals log shows six appeals in the same period, two of which were deemed admissible and were resolved [048, 102.1]. The review team identified no issues for further investigation. Complaints and appeals are monitored through the Registry Committee [102] and reported to QEC [104].

232 The review team was able to scrutinise two individual complaints [053.2, 053.4] and four appeals [053, 053.1, 053.3, 053.5] that had been received during 2018-19, to test that complaints and appeals sampled were dealt with in a fair, transparent and timely manner. The review team found that these had been dealt with according to the School's procedures in a fair and transparent manner with a timely outcome. The team concluded that, through implementation of the described processes, the School has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals and delivers timely outcomes.

233 Students met by the team confirmed that the complaints and appeals procedures were clear and accessible, and that they knew where to find the relevant policies and who to ask if they needed support, in particular their Personal Academic Tutor and the Student Support Services [M2, M3, M4].

Conclusions

234 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the School 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.

235 The team concludes that the School has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals, which are accessible to all students. This is because the School has robust, credible and definitive procedures for handling complaints and appeals. The two examples of complaints and four examples of appeals considered by the review team had been dealt with according to the School's procedures with no deviations from those procedures. In meetings held with the review team, students confirmed that the procedures were clear and accessible and were able to explain where they could find details of how to make complaints and appeals and who to approach for support. Review of the School's handbooks, website and virtual learning environment showed that the information provision for potential and actual complainants and appellants is clear and accessible. Students did not express any concerns about the fairness, transparency or accessibility of the procedures, or their application. The meetings with both staff and students demonstrated and showed the School has credible, robust and evidence-based approaches for developing and operating fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students. All the observations described above are consistent with the criteria for a 'met' judgement, therefore the review team concludes that the School meets this Core practice.

236 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of 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

237 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.

238 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

239 The QAA review team holistically assessed the evidence presented to it, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the School 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 utilised that matrix to ensure that the evidence it 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 Academic Regulations 2019-20
<https://student.londonmet.ac.uk/your-studies/student-administration/rules-and-regulations/academic-regulations/>
- b London Metropolitan University Quality Manual 2019-20
- c www.londonmet.ac.uk/media/london-metropolitan-university/london-met-documents/professional-service-departments/quality-enhancement-unit/quality-manual/London-Met-Quality-Manual-2019-2020.pdf
- d Fairfield School of Business Governance Handbook [009] including the terms of reference for the Quality Enhancement Committee
- e Transition to higher education and continuation plan 2019-20 [107]
- f Quality Enhancement Committee minutes 12.11.19 [104] and 30.7.19 [013]
- g Work-based learning policy [027]
- h Tutor and student work placement handbooks [077, 077.1]
- i Sample Work Placement Agreement [080]
- j Example employer Work Placement Risk Assessment [080.1]
- k Institutional Memorandum of Agreement between London Metropolitan University and Fairfield School of Business 1.11.16 [005]
- l Addendum to Institutional Memorandum of Agreement and Course Level Agreements [067.3]
- m Outcomes Report of London Metropolitan University Institutional Approval Event and Courses Approval Events held on 17/18.10.16 [046]
- n Pearson Academic Management Review Report 2017-18 [006]
- o Programme Development and Review Group minutes 7/3/19 [012] and 6/8/19 [016]
- p London Metropolitan University/FSB Annual Quality Meeting Group 2019 [052]
- q FdA Business Course Specification template [035]
- r FdSc Public Health and Social Care course specification template [036]
- s Pearson External Examiner Report 12.2.19 [007]
- t BA Business External Examiner Report 2017-18 [032] and 2018-19 [085]

u	FdA Business External Examiners Report 2017-18 [033]
v	National Student Survey 2019 Results [022]
w	Module evaluation data [056, 057, 058]
x	Meeting with senior staff [M1]
y	Meeting with Croydon Students [M2]
z	Meeting with Birmingham Students [M3]
aa	Meeting with Alperton Students [M4]
bb	Meeting with academic and professional services staff [M5]
cc	Meeting with London Metropolitan University Head of Partnerships and Link Tutors [M6]

240 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:

- third party endorsements as none are available for the provision on offer at the School.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

241 Sampling of the School's provision was undertaken by reviewing all four programmes delivered by the School, including their associated approved programme documentation and the most recent set of three University external examiner reports and one Pearson external examiner report and associated action plans.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

242 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the [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 School'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.

243 Awarding body academic regulations [<https://student.londonmet.ac.uk/your-studies/student-administration/rules-and-regulations/academic-regulations/>], partnership agreements [005] and institutional and course approval events [046] were scrutinised to consider whether there exists a framework for the management of partnerships to ensure that the academic experience is of high quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them.

244 The terms of reference [009] and minutes of relevant committees [012, 016] including the Quality Enhancement Committee [104, 013], the Transition to Higher Education and Continuation Plan 2019-20 [107] and reports including the Pearson Academic Management Review Report [006] and the University/FSB Annual Quality Meeting Group report [052] to confirm that the School has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for delivering a high-quality experience in partnership.

245 Course specifications [035, 035], work placement policy [027] and associated documents [077, 077.1, 080, 080.1] to assess the credibility and robustness of plans and procedures for delivering a high-quality experience on placement.

246 External examiner reports [007, 032, 033, 085] to test that the courses delivered through the partnerships are considered to be of high quality, thus confirming the effectiveness of the underpinning arrangements.

247 Meetings with students [M2, M3, M4] and documentary comments from students in module evaluation surveys [056, 056.1, 056.2, 057, 057.1, 057.2, 058, 069, 069.1, 069.2] to assess their views about the quality of courses delivered in partnership.

248 Meetings with senior [M1], academic and professional services staff [M5] to test whether they understand and discharge their responsibilities effectively.

249 Meeting with the Head of Partnerships from the University [M6] to test that the awarding body is meeting its responsibilities.

What the evidence shows

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

251 The team reviewed the University's academic regulations, which are clear and comprehensive, and the detailed and up-to-date partnership agreements [005, 067.3]. These include statements regarding the nature of the validation relationship, in particular the location of ultimate responsibility for the quality and standards of the courses with the University, with each validated course being subject to a course-level agreement concluded between the School and the University and signed off by the relevant faculty dean from the University. Furthermore, that the courses delivered by the School through the partnership are governed by the University's Academic Regulations. The team also reviewed the reports of the institutional and course approval events [046] and the minutes of the committees and partnership that monitor the compliance with the regulatory frameworks and the quality of the provision [006, 052]. Together these sets of documentary evidence enabled confirmation that there is a robust framework for the operation of the partnership, enabling a high-quality academic experience to be facilitated.

252 The School operationalises that framework through its committee structure [009, 012, 016, 104, 013], where key reports and data are considered, including the Quality Enhancement Committee and Academic Board. The collaborative Annual Quality Meeting Group [052], chaired by the University, provides an annual, detailed review and oversight of the partnership and identifies clear plans and implementation timelines for evidence-based and credible improvements, where appropriate, which are underpinned by interim visits by the Academic Liaison Tutor [M6]. Similarly, the Pearson Academic Management Review Report [006] provides an annual consideration of key areas of the partnership, including the School's organisation and management, assessment, resources and delivery. The School's Transition to Higher Education and Continuation Plan 2019-20 [107], considered by the Quality Enhancement Committee, evidences a considered and strategic approach to the academic experience with particular regard to key matters, including student engagement, attendance and retention.

253 The course specifications [035, 035], work placement policy [027] and associated documents for the management of placements [077, 077.1, 080, 080.1] ensure that plans for delivering a high-quality experience on placement are credible and robust. Senior and academic staff whom the review team met confirmed the centrality of a tripartite agreement between the employer, the student and the School to the quality of the process, setting out the respective responsibilities of the student, the employer and the School [080]. Students are supported by the Work Placement Unit in identifying suitable placement opportunities; in their subsequent applications for places, for example through support for CV writing; and can access support during the placement [027]. During their placement period, the students remain in regular contact with their Personal Academic Tutor [077.1, M2, M5]. Students reported positively to the team regarding the benefits of their workplace experience and the support provided [M2, M4].

254 External examiner reports [007, 032, 033, 085] confirm that the courses and student academic experience delivered by the School through the partnerships with the awarding partners are considered to be of high quality. They further endorse the quality of the quality assurance mechanisms in place, thus confirming the effectiveness of the underpinning arrangements.

255 The students the review team met [M2, M3, M4] spoke positively about their experiences and said that courses were well designed, good quality and relevant to their future goals. Documentary comments from students in module and course evaluation surveys [056, 056.1, 056.2, 057, 057.1, 057.2, 058, 069, 069.1, 069.2] similarly confirmed that overall satisfaction was high.

256 Those staff whom the team met [senior staff M1, academic and professional services staff M5] were able to articulate their understanding of partnership arrangements and their responsibilities to the University and Pearson, with the Head of Partnerships at the University [M6] providing additional clarity around some of their key mechanisms in place to ensure a high quality student experience, such as their annual review of the School's staff CVs and the undertaking of teaching observations and site visits by the University Academic Liaison Tutors.

Conclusions

257 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the School 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.

258 The review team concludes that, where the School works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them. This is because the School has robust and credible plans to ensure a high-quality academic experience for provision delivered in partnership with the University and Pearson, enabled through a clear and comprehensive regulatory framework and up-to-date agreements for the management of the partnerships. The staff from the School met by the team fully understand their respective responsibilities for the quality of the academic experience. The Head of Partnerships at the University affirmed the University's responsibilities and arrangements for oversight, and external examiners confirm that the academic experience and associated quality assurance mechanisms are of high quality. Students met by the team expressed high satisfaction with their experience, noting that courses are well designed, good quality and relevant to their future and these findings were further confirmed through review of internal and external survey data. All the observations described above are consistent with the criteria for a 'met' judgement, therefore the review team concludes that the School meets this Core practice.

259 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of 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

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

261 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

262 The QAA review team holistically assessed the evidence presented to it, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the School 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 utilised that matrix to ensure that the evidence it 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 Checklists of responsibilities for awarding body and organisation [000 pp24-28]
- b FSB – London Metropolitan University validation agreement and addendum to Institutional Memorandum of Agreement and Course Level Agreements Feb 2019 [005, 067.3]
- c Assessment Regulations and Procedures [008]
- d FSB Governance Handbook [009]
- e Terms of Reference and Minutes of Course Committees [009 p46, 011, 040, 066, 066.1]
- f Terms of Reference and Minutes of Student Support and Welfare Committee [009 p50, 088, 088.1]
- g National Student Survey 2019 Results [022]
- h Student Support and Disability Policy [028]
- i Reasonable Adjustments Policy [029]
- j Pregnant Students and Students with very Young Children Policy [030]
- k External examiner reports [032, 033, 085]
- l 2019/20 Course Handbooks for BA Business Top-Up, FdA Business, FdA Publics Health and Social Care, HND Business and FSB Student handbook [041, 042, 043, 044, 054]
- m Personal Tutor Responsibilities [050] and Personal Academic Tutoring Policy [051]
- n Module evaluations [056, 056.1, 056.2, 057, 057.1, 057.2, 058, 069, 069.1, 069.2]
- o Course-level agreements for FdA Business, FdA Public Health and Social Care, BA Business top up [067, 067.1, 067.2]
- p Evidence of staff training/development [073, 073.1]
- q Job descriptions for support staff including the Academic Support Coordinator, Careers and Work Placement Manager, Head of Student Support, SEN Officer [076, 076.1, 076.4, 076.6]
- r Student testimonials video [091]
- s Equality and Diversity Policy [093]
- t Access and Participation Statement [094]
- u Student Induction Policy [096]
- v Module Monitoring and Review Reports [111, 111.1, 111.2].
- w Meeting with senior staff [M1]

- x Meeting with Croydon Students [M2]
- y Meeting with Birmingham Students [M3]
- z Meeting with Alperton Students [M4]
- aa Meeting with academic and professional services staff [M5]
- bb FSB virtual learning environment [<http://portal.fairfield.ac/>]

How any samples of evidence were constructed

263 Sampling of the School's provision was undertaken by reviewing all four programmes delivered by the School, including their associated approved programme documentation and the most recent set of three University external examiner reports and one Pearson external examiner report and associated action plans. The team reviewed a representative sample of 30 pieces of assessed work from across all levels of the programmes of study. The team also reviewed a representative sample of job descriptions of the key support staff.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

264 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the [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 School'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.

265 The School's agreement with its awarding body [005, 067.3], Course-level agreements [067, 067.1, 067.2], Governance Handbook [009], Terms of Reference for the Student Support and Welfare Committee [009 p50], Minutes of the Student Support and Welfare Committee [088, 088.1], Student Support and Disability Policy [028], Reasonable Adjustments Policy [029], Pregnant Students and Students with very young Children Policy [030], Equality and Diversity Policy [093], Access and Participation Statement [094], senior staff meeting [M1], meeting with academic and professional services staff [M5], student meetings [M2, M3, M4], to identify the School's approach to student support, including how it identifies and monitors the needs of individual students.

266 Course Handbooks [041, 042, 043, 044], the School's Student Handbook [054], Personal Tutoring responsibilities [050], Personal Academic Tutoring Handbook [051], Student Induction Policy [096], the Schools virtual learning environment [<http://portal.fairfield.ac/>] 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.

267 Module and course evaluations [056, 056.1, 056.2, 057, 057.1, 057.2, 058, 069, 069.1, 069.2], module monitoring and review reports [111, 111.1, 111.2], terms of reference and minutes of course committees [009 p46, 011, 040, 066, 066.1], and the student testimonials video [091] to identify students' views about student support mechanisms.

268 Assessed Student Work, external examiner reports [032, 033, 085] and Assessment Regulations and Procedures [008] to test whether students are given comprehensive, helpful and timely feedback.

269 Meetings with senior staff [M1] academic and professional support staff [M5], job descriptions [076, 076.1, 076.4, 076.6] and evidence of staff training/development [073, 073.1] to test whether staff understand their responsibilities and are appropriately skilled and supported.

270 Student meetings [M2, M3, M4] to assess students' views about student support mechanisms and to assess whether students who have made particular use of student support services regard those services as accessible and effective.

What the evidence shows

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

272 The University and Pearson delegate responsibility to the School for the provision of student support services. The School's approach to student support is set out in its Student Support and Disability Policy [028], available on its website [<http://portal.fairfield.ac/>], which clearly specifies how each student is supported both pastorally and academically and how the needs of individual students are identified and monitored, including the provision of reasonable adjustments for study [029, 030]. The School has a strong commitment to diversity and inclusivity which is demonstrated in its policies and approach to student support [028, 029, 093, 094]. The Student Support and Welfare Committee, reporting to Quality Enhancement Committee and Academic Board, is responsible for taking an institutional overview of the support provided and identifying opportunities for enhancing the services offered [009 p50, 088, 088.1]. These processes and approaches enabled the team to identify the ways in which the School supports individual students.

273 The new Personal Academic Tutoring System, which has a particular focus on improving student attendance and supporting students to achieve successful academic outcomes, provides students with effective academic support and personal development planning with target setting, backed up by a timetabled tutorial system [M1, M2, M3, M4, 050, 051]. Academic and professional services staff and students spoke positively about the new personal tutoring system and its impact, particularly with regard to personal development planning [M2, M3, M4, M5]. Students confirmed in meetings with the review team that the Student Support team provides the main point of contact for non-academic support, including careers advice and, along with the Work Placement Unit, providing guidance and support in relation to finding and applying for work placement opportunities which directly contribute to students successfully achieving professional outcomes [M2, M3, M4]. Clear and accessible information on the personal tutoring system and other academic and non-academic support available to students is detailed in course handbooks and the School's student handbook provided to students during induction and on the School's virtual learning environment [041, 042, 043, 044, 054, 096, <http://portal.fairfield.ac/>]. The team was therefore able to conclude that the School has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for ensuring that all students are supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.

274 Samples of feedback on student assessed work and comments from students in meetings [M2, M3, M4] confirmed that all students are given helpful and timely written feedback on their assessed work within a 15-day turnaround time, which is in accordance with the School's assessment procedures [M1, M5, 008]. The team judged that the feedback provided on assessed work identifies where students perform well and where they can improve. External examiner reports comment positively on the quality of feedback provided and that feedback is helpful [032, 033, 085]. In addition to formal written feedback, students stated that positive and constructive formative feedback is also provided by academic staff that enables them to improve the quality of their work [M2, M3, M4].

275 Senior staff and academic and professional services staff demonstrated in their meetings with the review team that there is a clear commitment to supporting students through their courses of study and that a strong and effective framework of academic and non-academic student support is in place, in particular through the work of the Personal Academic Tutor roles [M1, M5, 076, 076.1, 076.4, 076.6]. All staff were able to articulate

clearly how their role contributes to student outcomes, including students with specialist learning support needs. All staff met by the team fully understood and were able to articulate their responsibilities, receive training and are appropriately skilled and supported [M1, M5, 073, 073.1, 076, 076.1, 076.4, 076.6].

276 Students agree that they are adequately supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. The testimonials included in the student testimonial video [091], the positive outcomes from module evaluations [056, 056.1, 056.2, 057, 057.1, 057.2, 058, 069, 069.1, 069.2], module monitoring and review reports [111, 111.1, 111.2] demonstrate that students value and benefit from the support provided and this was reflected in the views expressed by students in meetings with the review team [M2, M3, M4]. Students regarded all services provided as accessible and effective [M2, M3, M4]. Course committee meetings [009 p46, 011, 040, 066, 066.1] demonstrate a high level of responsiveness by the School to gather and act on student views in relation to the support provided. Overall, students were entirely positive about the support provided by the School.

Conclusions

277 As described above, the review team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a holistic judgement as to whether the School 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.

278 The review team concludes that the School supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. This is because the School has comprehensive, credible and robust approaches and plans in place to support the achievement of successful academic and professional outcomes. Academic and professional services staff understand and were able to fully articulate their roles in supporting students and showed commitment to supporting student achievement. Students met by the team and through their responses to surveys agree that they are well supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. Assessed student work reviewed by the team demonstrates that students are given helpful and timely written feedback, and this was also confirmed through the meetings with students who also appreciated the formative feedback and guidance that they received. All the observations described above are consistent with the criteria for a 'met' judgement, therefore the review team concludes that the School meets this Core practice.

279 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of the evidence and criteria described in Annex 4 and 5. Therefore, the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

Annex 1

Ref No	Item Name
000	FSB QSR Provider Submission September 2019
001	Mission and Values
02	Demographics of Students
03	Picture of graduation
03.1	Picture of graduation
04	Confirmation KM Education Ambassador
05	FSB - the University Validation agreement
06	Pearson AMR Report 2018
07	Pearson External examiner report final
08	Assessment Regulations and Procedures
09	FSB Governance Handbook
10	Academic Board minutes 06.08.19
11	The University Business Course Committee Meeting_20th February 2019
012	PDRG minutes - 7 Mar 2019
13	QEC Minutes 30th July 2019
14	Publications Committee Minutes 14.08.2019
15	Executive Committee Minutes 20.05.2019
16	Programme Development and Review Group Minutes_06.08.2019
017	QA Report to Academic Board July 2018
18	Admissions Policy
19	Admissions Flow chart
20	FSB Teaching & Learning Handbook
21	Learning and Teaching Forum 06.06.18
22	FSB National Student Survey 2019 Results
23	Interior Croydon campus photo
24	Croydon Campus A4 floor plan
25	Birmingham approved floor plan
26	Student Representative Development Programme
027	Work-based Learning Policy
28	Student Support and Disability Policy
29	Reasonable Adjustments Policy
30	Pregnant Students and Students with Very Young Children Policy
031	List of additional evidence
032	External examiner reports and responses FdA Business
033	External examiner reports and responses BA Top-up
034	FSB Business Top up - Course Specification
35	FSB FdA Business Course Specification.docx
36	FSB FdA Public Health and Social Care course specification
037	FSB Student Protection Plan
38	Student Engagement Policy
39	Changes as a result of student engagement
40	The University Business Programme Committee Meeting_22 July 2019
041	Course Handbook BA Top-up in Business
42	Course Handbook FdA in Business 19 20
43	Course Handbooks FdA Health and Social Care
044	HND Handbook 2019-20
45	Programme Development and Review Policy
46	Approved Outcomes Report - LSST_FSB Institutional and courses Approval Oct 2016
47	FSB Governance chart Version 2.3
48	Appeals log 2018-19
49	Complaints log 2018-19

50	Personal Tutor responsibilities
51	Personal Academic Tutoring Policy
52	Fairfield School of Business AQMG June 2019
053 – 053.5	Examples of complaints and appeals
54	FSB Student Handbook 2019-2020
55	Principals Statement about QEC
56 – 056.2	Samples of module and course evaluations FdA Public Health
057 – 057.2	Samples of module and course evaluations FdA Business
058	The University Business L4 ITM Dec 2019
059	Director of Marketing and Admissions Statement
060	Admissions process booklet
060.1 – 060.7	Admissions flyers
061 – 060.1	An applicant offer letter and a rejection letter.
062	Principal's Statement about Student Union
063 – 063.3	Training for staff involved in the admissions process
064 – 064.2	Admissions and Marketing Committee February 2019
065	Applicant rejection email
066 – 066.1	Programme Committee minutes
067 – 067.3	Course level agreements for the three University courses
068 – 068.2	Examples of module handbooks
069 – 069.2	Samples of course-level student evaluations
070 – 070.4	Examples of teaching staff continuing professional development records
071 – 071.3	Examples of annual staff appraisal records
072 – 072.2	Documented induction process for new members of staff
073 – 073.1	Examples of staff continuing professional development workshops
074	Plan diagram PHSC
75 – 075.6	Sample of staff CVs across programmes
76 – 076.7	Sample of relevant job descriptions: Head of Assessments, senior Assessments Officer, Head of Student Support, Head of Academic Support Centre, Work Placements and Careers Manager, Disability Officer, Lead Personal Tutor, (titles from governance handbook terms of reference), plus Head of Library/resources centres
77	Student Work Placement Handbook 2019-20
77.1	Staff Work Placement Handbook 2019-20
78	Re-Admissions Panel 20 Sept 19
79 – 079.1	Module action plans
80	Work placement agreement
80.1	Work placement risk assessment
80.2	Statement from work placement tutor
081-081.1	Letter to FSB work placement employer
082	External examiners handbook
83	The University academic regulation
84	FSB QA report to Academic Board 7/2018
85	The University external examiner report – Business Studies
086	Board of Governors 24/4/2019
086.1	FSB Business & Strategic Plan 2018-21
087	Complaints Panel 28/02/19
088 – 088.1	Student Support Committee Minutes 2018-19
089	List of additional evidence post TPM
90	FSB Staff Recruitment and Selection Policy
91	FSB Student Submission Video – student testimonials
092	FSB Organisational Chart Aug 2019 V7
93	Equality & Diversity Policy
94	Access & Participation Statement
95	FSB Student Enrolment Terms and Conditions SEP 2019

96	Student Induction Policy
97	Student Union Constitution
98	Appeals Policy & Procedure
99	Student Complaints Policy
100	The University Business Course – Action Plan
101	Quality Handbook 2018-19
101.1	Draft Quality Handbook 2019-20
102	Registry Committee minutes August 2019
102.1	Appeals Panel July 2019
103	FSB Entry requirements (the University)
104	FSB QEC Minutes Nov 19
105	FEB Executive Committee 18/09/19
105.1	Publications Committee report to EC 12/09/19
106	FSB Executive Committee 31/10/19
106.1	Publications Committee report to Exec 29/10/19
107	Final Continuation Transition to HE Plan
108	Director of Marketing & Admissions statement on Admissions Panel
109	The University MFR module action
110	FSB SAR Template 2019-20
110.1	Appendix to SAR WPU report 11/19
111 – 111.2	Module Monitoring and Review Reports 2019
M1	Meeting with senior staff
M2	Meeting with Croydon students
M3	Meeting with Birmingham students
M4	Meeting with Alperton students
M5	Meeting with academic and professional services staff
M6	Meeting with London Metropolitan University Head of Partnerships and Link Tutors
M7	Final Meeting
TO1	FdA Business (YR2)
TO2	FdA Public Health and Social Care (YR2)
TO3	FdA Business (YR 1)
TO4	HND Business (YR 2)
TO5	BA Business (Top-up)
TO6	FdA Public Health and Social Care (YR1)
CW1	Sample of coursework submissions – 30 items across the range of programmes and levels
VLE	Virtual learning environment

QAA2787 - R10962 - Aug 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