Higher Education Review (Embedded Colleges) of Navitas UK Holdings Ltd

London Brunel International College

April 2016

Contents

About this review

This is a report of a Higher Education Review (Embedded Colleges) conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education at London Brunel International College. The review took place from 19 to 20 April 2016 and was conducted by a team of two reviewers, as follows:

- Dr Carol Vielba
- Mr Stuart Cannel (student reviewer).

The main purpose of the review was to investigate the higher education provided by London Brunel International College and to make judgements as to whether or not its academic standards and quality meet UK expectations. These expectations are the statements in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the Quality Code)[1] setting out what all UK higher education providers expect of themselves and of each other, and what the general public can therefore expect of them.

In Higher Education Review (Embedded Colleges) the QAA review team:

- makes judgements on
  - the setting and maintenance of academic standards
  - the quality of student learning opportunities
  - the information provided about higher education provision
  - the enhancement of student learning opportunities
- provides a commentary on the selected theme
- makes recommendations
- identifies features of good practice
- affirms action that Navitas UK is taking or plans to take.

In Higher Education Review (Embedded Colleges) there is also a check on Navitas UK's financial sustainability, management and governance (FSMG). This check has the aim of giving students reasonable confidence that they should not be at risk of being unable to complete their course as a result of financial failure of their education provider.

A summary of the findings can be found in the section starting on page 2. Explanations of the findings are given in numbered paragraphs in the section starting on page 5.

In reviewing London Brunel International College the review team has also considered a theme selected for particular focus across higher education in England and Northern Ireland. The themes for the academic year 2014-15 are Digital Literacies and Student Employability,[2] and Navitas UK is required to select, in consultation with student representatives, one of these themes to be explored through the review process.

The QAA website gives more information about QAA and its mission.[3] A dedicated section explains the method for Higher Education Review (Embedded Colleges)[4]. For an explanation of terms see the glossary at the end of this report.

---

[1] The UK Quality Code for Higher Education is published at: www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code
[2] Higher Education Review themes: www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/information-and-guidance/publication?PubID=106
[3] QAA website: www.qaa.ac.uk/about-us.
[4] www.qaa.ac.uk/en/ReviewsAndReports/Pages/Educational-Oversight-.aspx

Key findings

QAA's judgements about London Brunel International College

The QAA review team formed the following judgements about the higher education provision at London Brunel International College (LBIC).

- The maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered on behalf of Navitas and LBIC's degree-awarding body **meets** UK expectations.
- The quality of student learning opportunities is **commended**.
- The quality of the information about learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.

Good practice

The QAA review team identified the following features of **good practice** at London Brunel International College.

- The joint College and University Annual Teaching Forum, which promotes common understanding of the objectives and operations of LBIC and the exchange of good practice (Expectation B3).
- The role of the Programme Element Leaders in enhancing local ownership of curriculum quality (Expectation B3).
- The Special Recognition Awards for students, which recognise and promote core LBIC values including positive student attitudes to study and contributions to the learning environment (Expectation B4).
- The effective processes for student engagement at all levels, which ensure that the student voice is heard and responded to (Expectation B5).
- The clear and thorough approach to annual monitoring that involves a range of stakeholders at module, programme and College levels in enhancing the student learning experience (Expectations B8, B5).

Theme: Digital Literacies

London Brunel International College (LBIC) reflects the commitment represented by the Virtual Learning Strategy of Navitas UK to enhancing student learning through electronic platforms and to ensuring that students are confident in accessing learning resources and information through the LBIC VLE and Student Portal. Students are well supported to develop their skills, not least through the compulsory IT and Interactive Learning Skills and Communication module, which operates at each relevant academic level and contains an element of digital literacy skills training.

Further explanation of the key findings can be found in the handbook available on the QAA webpage explaining [Higher Education Review](#) (Embedded Colleges).

About London Brunel International College

LBIC was founded as London International College of Business and Technology in 2003 and renamed in 2013 to reflect the wider portfolio and relationship with Brunel University. It is situated on the University campus in Uxbridge. Its mission is 'to enable students to release their potential through the delivery of high quality learning opportunities that support the development of confident life-long learners in meeting and surpassing their career goals'. Its vision is to be 'the UK's most trusted partner' in delivering degree pathways at Brunel University and to be recognised as 'providing a world class learning and teaching service and experience'.

LBIC offers five subject pathways at foundation level, three at Level 4, and one subject-specific and one generic subject pre-master's programme. In 2015 there were 1,278 enrolments.

Since the last QAA review LBIC has been granted Affiliate College status and a new collaborative agreement has been signed, the provisions of which include changing the status of LBIC students to fully registered Brunel University students; instituting an annual regulatory audit on LBIC by the University; external review of all modules; and joint University-Navitas review of all modules. LBIC sees its key challenge as continuing the development of the partnership with the University in a changing external environment and ensuring that it continues to meet the requirements of both QAA and UK Visas and Immigration.

Following the Embedded Colleges review for Educational Oversight of 2012, LBIC created an action plan that responded to the recommendations for the Navitas network as a whole. Advisable recommendations were that published procedures for programme review be consistently applied and that LBIC should work with partner organisations to provide students with formal recognition of modules passed. LBIC follows the process for review agreed with the University and documented in the Collaborative Operations Manual. All LBIC students who wish to exit after successfully completing Level 4 studies will now receive a University Certificate of Higher Education, and all modules validated by the University carry appropriate credit. The one desirable recommendation was to continue to develop a more consistent approach to student engagement in quality assurance. LBIC has responded to this in line with the Navitas Action Plan, in establishing a College Enhancement Team (CET) with membership drawn from students and all categories of staff. Students are also encouraged to contribute to quality enhancement through the Student Forum and College Learning and Teaching Committee. The six features of good practice identified in the 2012 review have all been extensively built upon.

Explanation of the findings about London Brunel International College

This section explains the review findings in more detail.

Terms that may be unfamiliar to some readers have been included in a [brief glossary](#) at the end of this report. A fuller [glossary of terms](#) is available on the QAA website, and formal definitions of certain terms may be found in the operational description and handbook for the [review method](#), also on the QAA website.

Explanation of the findings about London Brunel International College

1 Judgement: The maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered on behalf of degree-awarding bodies

Expectation (A1): In order to secure threshold academic standards, degree-awarding bodies:

a) ensure that the requirements of The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland are met by:

- **positioning their qualifications at the appropriate level of the relevant framework for higher education qualifications**
- **ensuring that programme learning outcomes align with the relevant qualification descriptor in the relevant framework for higher education qualifications**
- **naming qualifications in accordance with the titling conventions specified in the frameworks for higher education qualifications**
- **awarding qualifications to mark the achievement of positively defined programme learning outcomes**

b) consider and take account of QAA's guidance on qualification characteristics

c) where they award UK credit, assign credit values and design programmes that align with the specifications of the relevant national credit framework

d) consider and take account of relevant Subject Benchmark Statements.

Quality Code, *Chapter A1: UK and European Reference Points for Academic Standards*

Findings

1.1   Academic standards for all College provision are set by the degree-awarding body, Brunel University, whose academic framework aligns with *The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* (FHEQ) and other relevant UK and European reference points. Alignment is established during programme approval and checked during annual monitoring and periodic review.

1.2   The review team found that the policies and processes in place for the use of national frameworks, guidance and benchmarks ensure that threshold academic standards would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.3   In order to test the procedures, the review team examined College policies and procedures for the design, approval and monitoring and review of programmes; documents created during programme approval; programme specifications; and annual monitoring reports. The review team met those responsible for implementing these procedures.

1.4   The review team found that the policies and procedures intended to ensure that provision met UK threshold standards through alignment with national frameworks were implemented effectively.

1.5   Panel reports on the approval of proposed programmes at LBIC confirm that their design and content is at an appropriate level in relation to University provision, which is itself aligned to national frameworks. Programme and module specifications refer to Subject Benchmark Statements, credit points and intended learning outcomes, which are informed by national guidance. They also refer to the level of modules and programmes using both the FHEQ and the Brunel nomenclature. Annual monitoring reports comment on the continuing appropriateness of the curriculum and intended learning outcomes. Programme Element Review templates require confirmation that published programme specifications are up to date and still valid in terms of aims, learning outcomes, content and alignment with Subject Benchmark Statements.

1.6   On the basis of the evidence provided, the review team concludes that LBIC, with the support of its parent organisation and its university partner, operates procedures that ensure that its provision aligns with the FHEQ and other national frameworks and guidance. The Expectation in the Quality Code, *Chapter A1: UK and European Reference Points for Academic Standards* is met and the risk in this area is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A2.1): In order to secure their academic standards, degree-awarding bodies establish transparent and comprehensive academic frameworks and regulations to govern how they award academic credit and qualifications.

Quality Code, *Chapter A2: Degree-Awarding Bodies' Reference Points for Academic Standards*

Findings

1.7   LBIC follows the partner University's academic framework, which forms the regulatory framework within which standards are defined and assured. These regulations have been developed and agreed upon by LBIC, the University and Navitas UK.

1.8   LBIC follows the two-stage approach that is outlined in their assessment regulations, which is agreed by both Navitas UK and the University. This ensures that all assessment marks go through an initial Module Panel before culminating in the University's Board of Examiners, which reviews the progress of each College student.

1.9   LBIC operates within the agreed processes, procedures and policies set out by the University, and agreed upon by Navitas UK, which would allow this expectation to be met.

1.10   The review team considered all appropriate and relevant evidence including Programme Element Specifications, committee minutes and assessment regulations. The team discussed LBIC's process in assessing credit with staff members and confirmed with students their understanding of the assessment regulations.

1.11   The review team found that LBIC follows the assessment regulations appropriately and the operational aspect of the award of credit is fair. The assignment briefs are discussed with students, giving them a clear understanding of what is expected and how each assessment will affect their progression pathways onto the partner University. The students whom the review team met specifically described progression pathways and were aware that some pathways require a higher pass mark.

1.12   Overall, LBIC has a transparent and comprehensive academic framework, set out by Navitas UK and agreed with the University, which is appropriately followed. Therefore, the review team concludes that the Expectation in Chapter A2.1 is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A2.2): Degree-awarding bodies maintain a definitive record of each programme and qualification that they approve (and of subsequent changes to it) which constitutes the reference point for delivery and assessment of the programme, its monitoring and review, and for the provision of records of study to students and alumni.

Quality Code, *Chapter A2: Degree-Awarding Bodies' Reference Points for Academic Standards*

Findings

1.13   LBIC uses Programme Element Specifications as the definitive source of information for each approved programme and qualification. These documents contain information around the aims, intended learning outcomes, content, assessment strategies and indicative reading of the programme of study. Module guides set out all relevant information pertaining to that respective module.

1.14   All Programme Element Specifications and module guides are reviewed during annual monitoring, where the University confirms whether the documents still remain valid.

1.15   When programmes undergo minor or major modification LBIC must follow the University's processes, which are agreed upon by all relevant parties. The Programme Element Coordinator must fill out a standardised approval form that details the modification and why it is being sought. This is then signed off by all parties, including a relevant member of staff from LBIC, University and Navitas UK.

1.16   LBIC has in place appropriate documentation, and records of subsequent changes to it would allow this expectation to be met.

1.17   The review team examined all appropriate and relevant documentation including the specifications and module guides. The team then checked with students their understanding of these documents and confirmed with staff how they are used within the delivery and development of each programme.

1.18   The review team found that students are aware of the specifications and module guides. Staff inform students at the beginning of each module what they need to do to pass and achieve specific grades. The team confirmed with students that these documents are available to download from the virtual learning environment and that there is no issue in regard to their accessibility.

1.19   The review team concludes that LBIC has in place appropriate documentation that is in line with Navitas UK's regulations and agreed by the University. Therefore, the Expectation in Chapter A2.2 is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of Risk: Low

Expectation (A3.1): Degree-awarding bodies establish and consistently implement processes for the approval of taught programmes and research degrees that ensure that academic standards are set at a level which meets the UK threshold standard for the qualification and are in accordance with their own academic frameworks and regulations.

Quality Code, *Chapter A3: Securing Academic Standards and an Outcomes-Based Approach to Academic Awards*

Findings

1.20   Academic standards for all College provision are set by the degree-awarding body, Brunel University, during formal programme approval. Approval requires that proposed provision meets UK threshold standards and that the requirements of the University's academic framework and regulations are met. Formal approval of amendments to existing courses confirms that these standards will continue to be met.

1.21   Approval of new programmes and amendments to existing course involves the College, Navitas UK and Brunel University. The processes for approval and amendment are discussed in detail in section B1 of this report.

1.22   The review team found that LBIC has policies and processes in place for programme approval which are designed to ensure that academic standards are set at a level that meets UK threshold standards and are in accordance with relevant academic frameworks and regulations. Therefore the design would meet the Expectation.

1.23   In order to assess the effectiveness of LBIC's procedures for programme approval the review team examined policy documents, templates and manuals; documents created during programme approval and amendment; and programme and module specifications.

1.24   The review team found that the policies and procedures for programme approval and amendment are implemented effectively and demonstrate clearly the incorporation of UK threshold standards and University academic regulations. During the course of design, programme and module specifications are created that detail intended learning outcomes and assessment strategies.

1.25   The example of an approval panel report seen by the review team confirmed that learning outcomes were set at an appropriate level and that the proposed programme met the University's requirements in relation to academic frameworks and regulations for the award of credit. The final approval form for a new programme, which is signed after the panel has reported by all three parties, confirms the appropriateness of the structure and content of the new programme.

1.26   Minor amendments to programmes require LBIC and the University to approve revised module specifications and to check that the learning outcomes of the revised module are at an appropriate level.

1.27   The review team concludes that the College, with the support of its parent organisation and its university partner, operates programme approval procedures which ensure that academic standards are set at a level that meets UK threshold standards and are in accordance with relevant academic frameworks and regulations. The Expectation A3.1 in the Quality Code, *Chapter A3: Securing Academic Standards and an Outcomes-Based Approach to Academic Awards* is met and the associated risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A3.2): Degree-awarding bodies ensure that credit and qualifications are awarded only where:

- **the achievement of relevant learning outcomes (module learning outcomes in the case of credit and programme outcomes in the case of qualifications) has been demonstrated through assessment**
- **both UK threshold standards and their own academic standards have been satisfied.**

Quality Code, *Chapter A3: Securing Academic Standards and an Outcomes-Based Approach to Academic Awards*

Findings

1.28   Within the programme approval and validation process, each programme develops a list of learning outcomes that are aligned with relevant descriptors of the FHEQs. These also take account of Subject Benchmark Statements. The agreed learning outcomes are then listed within each of the Programme Element Specifications and module guides.

1.29   Assessment methods are agreed upon with the University in line with the assessment regulations, set out by Navitas UK. This enables a range of assessments to take place through formative and summative means. Students are then assessed in accordance with these agreed methods and will be informed about them at the beginning of their programme and module.

1.30   All relevant information is contained in the Collaborative Operations Manual, which sets out LBIC requirements in relation to the assessment of students. This document formally sets out the roles and responsibilities of LBIC Module Panel and the Partner University Board of Examiners within the assessment process. This is in line with Navitas UK's two-stage process.

1.31   LBIC Module Panel meets each semester to oversee the assessment of modules and confirm grades. The University Board of Examiners meets once a semester to determine whether each student has met the criteria for progression and to consider reassessment and mitigating circumstances decisions. LBIC is represented in any decisions relating to their respective programmes.

1.32   LBIC operates within the agreed processes, procedures and policies set out by the University, and agreed by Navitas UK, which would allow this expectation to be met.

1.33   The review team examined all appropriate and relevant information including the assessment regulations, Programme Element Specifications and module guides. The team then met with students to explore their understanding of the assessment procedures and met with staff to confirm whether these procedures are followed correctly.

1.34   The review team found that these procedures are being followed by all staff and that students have an appropriate level of understanding of them.

1.35   The review team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of Risk: Low

Expectation (A3.3): Degree-awarding bodies ensure that processes for the monitoring and review of programmes are implemented which explicitly address whether the UK threshold academic standards are achieved and whether the academic standards required by the individual degree-awarding body are being maintained.

Quality Code, *Chapter A3: Securing Academic Standards and an Outcomes-Based Approach to Academic Awards*

Findings

1.36　　Responsibility for the standards of programmes offered by LBIC is vested in the University and its Senate which, through its committees and the Strategic Partnership Management Board, exercises oversight of College provision. LBIC monitors its programmes to check that UK threshold standards are being met through regular reporting on academic key performance indicators (KPIs), annual monitoring and periodic review. Monitoring and review involve LBIC, Navitas UK and the University. Details of the processes in place for monitoring and review of provision are to be found later in this report in relation to Expectation B8.

1.37　　The review team found that the policies and processes in place for programme monitoring and review are designed to check whether UK threshold standards are achieved and the academic standards of the awarding body are being maintained. Therefore the design would meet the Expectation.

1.38　　In order to assess the effectiveness of LBIC's procedures for programme monitoring and review, the review team examined policy documents, templates and manuals; committee minutes; and annual and regulatory monitoring reports.

1.39　　The review team found that the policies and procedures in place for programme monitoring and review are implemented effectively and demonstrate that UK threshold standards are achieved and that the academic standards of the University are maintained. LBIC reports regularly to Navitas UK on its achievement of academic KPIs, which include pass rates, and retention, completion, and progression data, including progress once students have entered the University. Reports on student achievement are considered by the Academic Advisory Committee (AAC) and the Joint Strategic Partnership Board. LBIC Learning and Teaching Committee has a responsibility to monitor and review academic standards.

1.40　　Statistical data on student performance is analysed during the annual monitoring process for all programmes. Reports include commentary on the currency of learning outcomes, aims and objectives, content, and alignment with relevant Subject Benchmark Statements. Minor modifications arising out of annual monitoring require formal sign-off by LBIC and the University in order to check that standards are being maintained. During assessment, University moderators are asked to comment on the appropriateness of the standards of work set as well as on student performance.

1.41　　Link tutors appointed by the University are responsible for maintaining a close watch on the delivery of programmes in accordance with agreed curricula and processes, and for raising issues impacting on standards with the College. The University's Regulatory Audit ensures that all policies, processes and procedures that may impact standards are documented and operated effectively.

1.42　　The periodic review of College provision is conducted using University processes which examine, among other things, outcomes and standards. Standards are also

considered during the review of College programmes, as part of the periodic review of the University provision into which they are integrated.

1.43   LBIC maintains oversight of monitoring and review, and any issues that arise relating to standards, through the AAC and the CLTC, and necessary action is incorporated into LBIC's action plans.

1.44   The review team concludes that LBIC, with the support of its parent organisation and its University partner, operates effective monitoring and review processes which demonstrate whether UK threshold standards are achieved and the academic standards of the awarding body are maintained. The Expectation is met and the associated risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A3.4): In order to be transparent and publicly accountable, degree-awarding bodies use external and independent expertise at key stages of setting and maintaining academic standards to advise on whether:

- **UK threshold academic standards are set, delivered and achieved**
- **the academic standards of the degree-awarding body are appropriately set and maintained.**

Quality Code, *Chapter A3: Securing Academic Standards and an Outcomes-Based Approach to Academic Awards*

Findings

1.45   LBIC sees its relationship with the University as the main source of academic externality. LBIC follows the University's regulations and does not involve external examiners in Level 3, 4 or 6 of their provision except for the Navitas study skills modules, for which there is an external examiner. The rationale behind this decision is that at these levels assessment does not contribute towards degree award calculations, only to progression decisions, including progression to master's study. The University moderation is deemed to be external moderation for the major assessments. These outcomes are feed into Module Summary Reports.

1.46   Navitas UK maintains oversight of LBIC through the programme approval, annual monitoring processes and relevant committees to which LBIC reports.

1.47   LBIC operates within the agreed processes, procedures and policies set out by the University, and agreed upon by Navitas UK, which would allow this Expectation to be met.

1.48   The review team examined all appropriate and relevant documentation including LBIC's Operations Manual, Assessment Regulations and External Moderator reports. It confirmed with staff members that these processes and procedures are being followed scrupulously to allow for this expectation to be met in operation.

1.49   External moderators are used to add an additional level of external scrutiny within LBIC, provided by the University and in line with its regulations. The review team confirmed with staff how these reports are discussed within the governance structure and the significance that these have within the checking the academic standards and quality of learning within LBIC. More detail is available in this report in relation to Expectation B7.

1.50   The review team found that LBIC has sufficient external expertise at key stages of setting and maintaining academic standards. The primary method for the ongoing checking of the academic standards is through the annual monitoring process and governance structure. Therefore, the team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

The maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered on behalf of degree-awarding bodies: Summary of findings

1.51   In reaching its judgement about threshold academic standards, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook.

1.52   Processes are in place to ensure that qualifications are positioned at the appropriate level of the FHEQ, or an equivalent level 3 where appropariate, and that learning outcomes align with the qualification descriptors and take account of Subject Benchmark Statements. There are appropriate and transparent frameworks and regulations in place and these are adhered to in practice. Definitive programme records are maintained and following approval and any subsequent changes agreed in accordance with due processes. Design and approval processes involving Navitas UK and the awarding body are robust. Credit is achieved only when learning outcomes are met by students, as attested by moderators and external examiners, and programme reviews also confirm this alignment. External and independent expertise is employed at key stages to ensure the appropriate setting and maintenance of academic standards.

1.53   All seven Expectations are met with low risk. There are no recommendations, affirmations or features of good practice in this area. LBIC is meeting its obligations in relation to the requirements of Navitas and the University to safeguard standards. The review team therefore concludes that the maintenance of threshold academic standards **meets** UK expectations.

2 Judgement: The quality of student learning opportunities

Expectation (B1): Higher education providers, in discharging their responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, operate effective processes for the design, development and approval of programmes

Quality Code, *Chapter B1: Programme Design and Approval*

Findings

2.1   LBIC works with its partner University within an overall framework provided by Navitas UK and agreed with Brunel University. London Brunel International College (LBIC) is a fully integrated affiliate college of the University. The processes and procedures involved in programme development are identified in LBIC's Collaborative Operations Manual, which is available to all staff.

2.2   Both programme approval and amendment follow University processes and procedures and use University templates. Proposals to develop new programmes, called programme elements, require strategic approval from LBIC, Navitas UK and the University. Once strategic approval has been gained, LBIC and the University work together in a joint development team to develop the new provision. Final validation of the new programme follows University processes and includes an approval event involving College and University staff and external advice.

2.3   The processes used to make changes to existing programmes depend on the extent of the change being made. A risk-based approach is used. Minor changes, usually arising from annual monitoring, are approved at departmental level within the University or by the relevant board of studies. Major changes normally require full University approval.

2.4   The review team found that LBIC has appropriate policies and processes in place for the design and approval of programmes, which would meet the relevant expectation of the Quality Code.

2.5   In order to test the effectiveness of LBIC's procedures the review team examined policy documents, templates and manuals; read committee minutes and action plans ; and reviewed the documentation associated with the approval of two new programme elements, which included minor amendments to existing programmes. The review team met those responsible for, and involved in, programme design and approval.

2.6   The documents seen by the review team confirmed that LBIC implements Navitas UK's and University's policies and procedures for design, approval and amendment of programmes effectively.

2.7   New programmes and changes to existing programmes are discussed at the Academic Advisory Committee (AAC). There is a standing item on AAC agendas for the discussion of new or modified programmes, programme elements and modules. Supporting the implementation of newly approved programme elements forms part of LBIC's strategic action plan.

2.8   The examples of documentation prepared during programme development, and presented jointly for approval, included a business case and design strategy, and programme and module specifications. The approval panel gave consideration to standards and quality, commenting on structure and content; teaching, learning and assessment;

admission requirements; resources; and programme management. The panel made conditions and recommendations for changes to be made before the new provision was signed off by all parties as fit for purpose at the specified level.

2.9   The example of a minor modification to a programme seen by the review team confirmed that the process involved is thorough and implemented effectively. Minor changes approved at College level and by the relevant University programme or board of studies are notified to the University, which amends the student record system.

2.10   The University audits the implementation of the minor modification process as part of its annual regulatory audit of affiliate colleges.

2.11   The review team concludes that LBIC, in conjunction with Navitas UK and its partner University, operates effective processes for the design, approval and amendment of programmes that allow the Expectation to be met, and the associated risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B2): Recruitment, selection and admission policies and procedures adhere to the principles of fair admission. They are transparent, reliable, valid, inclusive and underpinned by appropriate organisational structures and processes. They support higher education providers in the selection of students who are able to complete their programme.

Quality Code, *Chapter B2: Recruitment, Selection and Admission*

Findings

2.12   LBIC works with the University and Provider in the recruitment of students. All agents that LBIC uses must be on Navitas UK's approved agent list. LBIC reports through the Marketing, Recruitment and Admissions Committee to the University in regard to marketing activity. All marketing material must be approved by the University's Marketing Department prior to publication.

2.13   LBIC operates under the localised recruitment and admission policy, set out by Navitas UK. This is agreed by all parties including the University. This policy lists the approved academic entry criteria and admission requirements. The University issues the Confirmation of Acceptance for Study, in accordance with the Single Visa Partnership Agreement. Since 2015 LBIC has been listed as an Embedded Integrated College within the Partner University.

2.14   LBIC has in place appropriate processes, procedures and policies that would allow this Expectation to be met.

2.15   The review team examined documents that set out LBIC's procedures and policies for the admissions of students, including relevant strategies, committee minutes and staff guidance. The team looked at examples of promotional and recruitment material and LBIC's website, talked to students about their experience of the admission process, and also heard from staff involved in recruitment and admissions.

2.16   The review team heard from students that they fully understood the admissions process and were supported throughout. The majority of students were recruited through agents both inside and outside of the UK, although a number of students applied through other routes. There were no significant surprises for any of the students upon arrival at LBIC and the course was as they expected it to be.

2.17   The students whom the review team met received appropriate information before applying to LBIC, on arrival and within the formal induction period. Students who arrived after the initial formal induction period were given all appropriate and relevant information. If students felt there was an issue around this induction period or any confusion among the information they received, they felt confident that they could simply ask for assistance from reception or senior staff members.

2.18   The review team concludes that the Expectation is met both in design and operation and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of Risk: Low

Expectation (B3): Higher education providers, working with their staff, students and other stakeholders, articulate and systematically review and enhance the provision of learning opportunities and teaching practices, so that every student is enabled to develop as an independent learner, study their chosen subject(s) in depth and enhance their capacity for analytical, critical and creative thinking.

Quality Code, *Chapter B3: Learning and Teaching*

Findings

2.19   LBIC's approach to learning and teaching is shaped by Navitas UK's overall policy frameworks and plans, and the requirements of its partner University. Policies and processes are set out in LBIC Operations Manual LBIC has a Learning and Teaching Action Plan and a Quality Improvement and Enhancement Plan (QIP), which are monitored through LBIC Learning and Teaching Committee (CLTC) and LBIC Enhancement Team (CET). The respective responsibilities of LBIC and the partner in relation to learning resources, staffing, programme delivery and assessment are set out in LBIC's Recognition and Articulation Agreement (RAA) and communicated to staff through the Collaborative Operations Manual.

2.20   The review team found that LBIC has appropriate policies and processes in place in relation to learning and teaching that would meet the relevant Expectation of the Quality Code.

2.21   In order to test the effectiveness of LBIC's policies and procedures the review team examined policy documents, manuals and action plans; committee terms of reference and minutes; materials related to teaching observations and staff development; handbooks; and student charters. The review team met staff and students to discuss matters relating to learning and teaching.

2.22   Teaching staff are appointed by LBIC. Link tutors participate in interviews and the University approves all appointments. New staff are expected to have a teaching qualification or extensive teaching experience. Less experienced staff, such as university researchers, are required to undertake the University's Graduate Learning and Teaching Academic programme. New staff receive a formal induction to LBIC and a staff handbook covering policies and procedures relevant to governance, teaching and assessment.

2.23   Systems for management and peer observation of teaching are in place. Teaching observation is discussed at LBIC's Learning and Teaching Committee (CLTC). Staff reflection on feedback from observation contributes to the appraisal process. Staff have access to development opportunities at LBIC, the University and Navitas UK. Records seen by the review team indicated that staff make use of the opportunities for development that are available. Good practice workshops are held each semester and LBIC hosts an annual staff development event. Regular staff meetings take place.

2.24   LBIC and the University hold a joint Annual Forum, which brings together College and University staff and students to discuss key aspects of the student experience. The most recent forum looked at Student Transition. It was attended by more than 40 staff and students and led to enhancement of transition-focused activities. The joint College and University Annual Forum, which promotes common understanding of objectives and operation of LBIC and exchange of good practice, is **good practice**.

2.25   Programme management has been strengthened through the introduction of Programme Element Leaders. These are contracted academic staff whose role spans quality assurance, staff support, assessment, and input to student orientation and additional

academic activities. The review team heard that the role was welcomed by staff and contributed to ensuring that each pathway is effectively coordinated, prepared and delivered. The role of the Programme Element Leaders in enhancing local ownership of curriculum quality is a feature of **good practice**.

2.26   Students who met the review team spoke positively about the teaching they receive and the quality of the staff who teach them. Students receive timely and helpful feedback on their work and are able to review their progress with academic staff. College staff teaching on integrated programmes work closely with their University counterparts to ensure equivalence between modules taught at LBIC and those taught at the University.

2.27   Students have access to learning resources at both LBIC and the University. These resources include the library, computing and VLE. Students who met the review team confirmed that they find the learning resources available to them accessible and appropriate to their needs. Students receive handbooks and all teaching material and necessary information about their programme, the College and the University is available online. The College VLE is used widely in teaching. Level 4 and pre-master's students also use the University's VLE.

2.28   Students on the pre-master's programme may undertake work placements. The management of this part of the programme, and the work-based learning involved, is contracted to the University and overseen by AAC.

2.29   LBIC collects feedback on teaching through questionnaires and surveys and through matters raised by students and their representatives. End-of-module evaluations are completed, analysed by student representatives, and reflected upon by staff as part of the module review process. The College uses Navitas UK's Independent Learning Charter and its own Student Charter to define mutual obligations and expectations of the College and the students.

2.30   The review team concludes that LBIC, in conjunction with Navitas UK and its partner University, works effectively with its staff, students and other stakeholders to articulate, review and enhance the provision of learning opportunities that enable independent learning, depth of study and critical thinking. The Expectation is met and the associated risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B4): Higher education providers have in place, monitor and evaluate arrangements and resources which enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential.

Quality Code, *Chapter B4: Enabling Student Development and Achievement*

Findings

2.31   LBIC works within the framework for student support set out by Navitas UK. Enabling student development and achievement is central to LBIC's strategy and its Quality Improvement and Learning and Teaching Plan. Roles and responsibilities are set out in LBIC's Collaborative Operations Manual. College student support services are led by the Manager of Academic and Student Services. Students also have access to a full range of support services and a range of development opportunities provided by the University. Information about student services is provided in student handbooks and is available on the web.

2.32   The review team found that LBIC has appropriate policies and processes in place to monitor and evaluate arrangements and resources, which enable students to develop their potential.

2.33   In order to test the effectiveness of LBIC's policies and procedures the review team looked at policy and process documents; handbooks and manuals; student charters; and documents related to College activities. The review team discussed the availability of support services and the development of skills for higher education with both staff and students.

2.34   The review team concluded that LBIC provides a range of effective activities and support services that enable students to develop their academic and personal potential and to make a smooth transition to university studies. All students undertake an academic and professional skills module during each year of their programme. This module, which includes English language tuition, is central to the College's commitment to preparing students for successful transition to higher education and university programmes.

2.35   LBIC monitors attendance and student achievement closely. A Student in Jeopardy Programme is in place to support students who encounter difficulties or need additional support. Students who are placed in this programme include those whose attendance is unsatisfactory, those who have failed modules, and students under eighteen years of age. Students in the programme receive additional targeted support. All students receive tutorial support designed to meet their needs at particular points. A formal personal tutorial system has been piloted and will shortly be rolled out across the College. Professional staff will act as tutors meeting students twice a semester and referring students to academic or specialist staff if necessary.

2.36   LBIC makes students aware of the Navitas Independent Learning Charter. LBIC has its own Student Charter, developed in conjunction with the Student Forum and LBIC Enhancement Team, which sets out LBIC's vision and mutual expectations of LBIC and students. LBIC makes Special Recognition Awards to students. These awards recognise both academic performance and achievement and wider contributions to the learning environment. The Special Recognition Awards for students, which recognise and promote core College values including positive student attitudes to study and contributions to the learning environment, is **good practice**.

2.37   LBIC provides a broad programme of enrichment activities including sports, cultural events, employability and career skills, and visits. Students are encouraged to acquire both

academic and practical skills. Students on the pre-master's programme can undertake a six-week work placement. Students are able to act as mentors and to assist in enrolment. Voluntary activities are recorded on the student's Higher Education Achievement and Recognition record. Pre-master's students undertake a work placement module, the arrangements for which are discussed above in relation to Expectation B3 (paragraph 226).

2.38   All programmes hold progression talks, which brief students on what to expect when they progress to University programmes and familiarise them with University requirements. Transition to the University is facilitated by attendance at University events, opportunities to meet College alumni, and contact with students' future study programmes. The on-campus location of LBIC, the use of University teaching rooms and resources, and co-teaching assist students to feel part of the University from the commencement of their course. In relation to Expectation B3 (paragraph 2.24) the review team identified as good practice the joint teaching forum of LBIC and the University, which has focused on student transition.

2.39   The adequacy and efficacy of services that enable student development and achievement is monitored through measurement of, and reporting on, academic key performance indicators such as retention rates during annual monitoring and periodic review, and is discussed at College committees. LBIC uses tracer data provided by the University to monitor the success of students once they have progressed to the University. Students whom the review team met spoke positively about the ways in which the College enables them to develop and achieve.

2.40   The review team concludes that LBIC, in conjunction with Navitas UK and the University, operates effectively to enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential. The Expectation is met and the associated risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B5): Higher education providers take deliberate steps to engage all students, individually and collectively, as partners in the assurance and enhancement of their educational experience.

Quality Code, *Chapter B5: Student Engagement*

Findings

2.41   LBIC works within the framework for student engagement set out by Navitas UK and the practices adopted by the University. LBIC's approach is detailed in its Collaborative Operations Manual.

2.42   There is a system of elected student representatives, all of whom attend the LBIC Student Forum (SF), which is chaired by a student representative. There is student representation on LBIC Learning and Teaching Committee (CLTC), LBIC Enhancement Team (CET), Academic Advisory Committee (AAC), and Annual Monitoring Review Boards (AMRB). LBIC students are full members of the University's Students' Union, which provides support to College student representatives.

2.43   Students complete module evaluations and surveys, both internal and external, at key points during their studies, which feed into annual monitoring and periodic review of College provision.

2.44   The review team found that LBIC has appropriate policies and processes in place for student engagement that would enable the Expectation to be met.

2.45   In order to test the effectiveness of LBIC's policies and procedures the review team looked at policies and manuals; committee terms of reference and minutes; reports; training materials and handbooks; and published materials. The review team discussed student engagement with staff and students

2.46   The review team concluded that LBIC provides a range of opportunities for student engagement that are effective in allowing the student voice to be heard at all levels. The review team also concluded that LBIC responds effectively to student views and endeavours to ensure that students are aware of the contribution that they make.

2.47   Training is provided for student representatives by LBIC's Student Services in partnership with the University's Students' Union. Representatives receive a handbook, which was recently commended by the University's Regulatory Audit. Representatives receive a certificate acknowledging their contribution.

2.48   Student views are sought formally, through questionnaires and surveys, and informally through interaction with staff at all levels throughout a student's period of study. Students and alumni are invited to the LBIC/University Joint Annual Forum.

2.49   Student representatives are involved in the annual monitoring process. The representatives for each class distribute module evaluation forms to fellow students during an allotted class period. Representatives are responsible for analysing and summarising the completed forms. The summaries feed into the annual monitoring process. Student representatives attend the AMRBs, which review modules within a discipline area. These boards identify areas of good practice, areas for enhancement, and requirements for minor modifications. The role of students in this process contributes to the good practice in relation to annual monitoring discussed further in relation to Expectation B8.

2.50   Students whom the review team met stated that they are able to contribute to discussions and to decisions affecting their studies and the student experience. They stated

that LBIC listens to their views and takes appropriate action in response. Students also stated that LBIC responds to issues raised in module feedback and student surveys as well as in forums and committees. LBIC produces You Said, We Did posters and minutes from the SF, CET and CLTC are uploaded to the VLE for all students to read.

2.51   Staff and students whom the review team met gave examples of changes that had resulted from student inputs. Marking deadlines and improved pre-arrival information were cited by students as enhancements that resulted from issues they had raised. The effective processes for student engagement at all levels, which ensure the student voice is heard and responded to, is **good practice**.

2.52   The review team concludes that LBIC takes deliberate steps in conjunction with its student body to promote a range of opportunities for students to engage in quality assurance and enhancement. The Expectation is met and the associated risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B6): Higher education providers operate equitable, valid and reliable processes of assessment, including for the recognition of prior learning, which enable every student to demonstrate the extent to which they have achieved the intended learning outcomes for the credit or qualification being sought.

Quality Code, *Chapter B6: Assessment of Students and the Recognition of Prior Learning*

Findings

2.53   LBIC operates under Navitas UK's Quality Manual, which sets out in detail the governance framework for establishing and managing the partnership between LBIC and the partner University in relation to assessment. LBIC has localised assessment regulations derived from Navitas UK's assessment regulations and agreed upon by the University. All relevant processes, procedures and policies are captured within LBIC's Operational Manual, which is updated on an annual basis.

2.54   LBIC includes all relevant assessment material within their Programme Element Specifications and the module guides. These are made available to students at the beginning of each module and are available to view on the virtual learning environment.

2.55   LBIC uses appropriate anti-plagiarism software at key stages of the assessment schedule and provides training material for staff on how to use and analyse results generated.

2.56   LBIC has in place appropriate processes, procedures and policies that would allow this Expectation to be met.

2.57   The review team examined all relevant and appropriate documentation including policies, minutes from assessment boards and guidance material for staff. The team met students to discuss their experience and confirmed with relevant staff that they input to the assessment procedures.

2.58   The students whom the review team met understood how LBIC uses plagiarism-detection software and why. Furthermore, students are able themselves to submit work through the software, although LBIC does not use it to provide feedback. The review team found that LBIC uses this software inconsistently across its provision.

2.59   The review team found that students receive feedback in a timely manner, in accordance with Navitas UK's 10 working days policy. Feedback is provided to students through a number of different methods, including written, verbal and electronic. Students are satisfied with the quality of feedback in relation to their academic and professional development.

2.60   The review team found that LBIC follows the formal two-stage assessment process in which credit is agreed upon and awarded to each student. This is in line with Navitas UK's regulations, but localised and agreed by the University. LBIC Module Panel meets each semester to oversee the assessment of modules and confirm grades. The University Examination Board meets once a semester to determine whether each student has met the criteria for progression. Both of these boards have full terms of reference and membership within LBIC assessment regulations.

2.61   LBIC works within its agreed assessment procedures set out by Navitas UK and agreed with the University. The review team concludes that the Expectation B6 is met both in design and operation and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of Risk: Low

Expectation (B7): Higher education providers make scrupulous use of external examiners.

Quality Code, *Chapter B7: External Examining*

Findings

2.62 LBIC follows the University's regulations and does not involve external examiners in Level 3, 4 or 6 of their provision, except for the study skills modules. The rationale behind this decision is that assessment at these levels does not contribute towards degree award calculations, only to progression decisions. The University conducts moderation for the major assessments to allow for external scrutiny of the process. The outcomes pf this externality feeds into LBIC's module summary reports, approval of assessment tasks, the deliberation of the Boards of Examiners and the annual monitoring review.

2.63 The ILSC module is moderated by Navitas UK through its assessment regulations (see Navitas UK's report for more information).

2.64 LBIC follows the appropriate processes, procedures and policies agreed by Navitas UK and University and this would allow this Expectation to be met.

2.65 The review team examined all appropriate and relevant documentation including external moderator reports and external examiner reports for the ILSC module. The team talked to students about their knowledge of these reports and confirmed with relevant staff how they contribute to this process and how they use these reports for enhancement purposes.

2.66 The review team found that external module review is undertaken by a relevant University staff member and in a manner normally required of a standard external examiner. At Level 4 the University module leaders or internal moderators undertake the role. For all other levels the University Department Tutor will establish with the Head of Department about who will perform this external role. Furthermore, the team found that staff are confident that the process in place allows for sufficient externality and that the arrangement is always professionally conducted, allowing for thorough moderation. The review team found that the external moderation is fair and that the module summary reports contain the relevant information outlined by both the internal and external moderation, along with student feedback and additional data.

2.67 LBIC clearly operates within Navitas UK and University's assessment regulations relating to the allocation and use of external examiners. The review team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of Risk: Low

Expectation (B8): Higher education providers, in discharging their responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, operate effective, regular and systematic processes for monitoring and for review of programmes.

Quality Code, *Chapter B8: Programme Monitoring and Review*

Findings

2.68   LBIC works with the University within an overall framework provided by Navitas UK, to undertake regular monitoring and review of its programmes.

2.69   Annual monitoring is conducted using a multi-stage University process, which is set out in LBIC's Collaborative Operations Manual. The leader of each module completes an annual review template that feeds into programme monitoring, which in turn feeds into College annual monitoring. The outcome of the process is a series of actions and recognition of good practice. These are reported to LBIC Learning and Teaching Committee (CLTC) and to Navitas UK. The process is overseen at College level by the Academic Advisory Committee (AAC) and at University level by the University Quality Assurance Committee (UQAC) on behalf of Senate. LBIC also produces an external-facing Annual Report, largely for the general public.

2.70   Periodic reviews of LBIC and its programmes are conducted using University procedures on a five year cycle. LBIC is reviewed as an entity together with the Recognition and Articulation Agreement (RAA) between LBIC and the University. LBIC's programmes are further reviewed during periodic Academic Programme Reviews of the University programmes into which they are integrated.

2.71   The review team found that LBIC has appropriate policies and processes in place for the monitoring and review of its programmes in order to maintain standards and enhance the quality of learning opportunities. Therefore, the Expectation would be met.

2.72   In order to test the effectiveness of LBIC's procedures the review team examined policy documents and manuals and read exemplar documents related to annual monitoring and regulatory audit including templates, reports, minutes of meetings, and committee minutes. The review team met those responsible for and involved in annual monitoring and periodic review.

2.73   The evidence seen by the review team confirmed that LBIC implements both Navitas UK's and the University's policies and procedures for the monitoring and periodic review of programmes effectively. Module reviews include commentary on student performance, student feedback, changes made on the basis of past commentary, and issues identified by the teaching team and external commentators. The reviews identify modifications to design and delivery and other actions needed, as well as instances of good practice. Programme Element Reviews include a detailed statistical analysis of student data for current students and, using tracer data, those who have progressed to the University. The reviews also identify instances of enhancement and good practice to be shared as well as listing proposed changes. The review formally confirms the continuing validity of programme element aims, learning outcomes and content.

2.74   Programme element reviews within a subject area are discussed at an Annual Monitoring Review meeting chaired by LBIC Principal and attended by academic staff and student representatives. This meeting reviews module and programme element reviews and identifies actions to be taken forward and instances of good practice from across all levels of College provision in a discipline area.

2.75   A report is compiled from all programme element reviews in the Affiliate College Evaluation Report, noting where issues have been identified; areas where LBIC management needs to take action or where University action is needed; good practice; and enhancement activity. This report is discussed by AAC together with a composite action plan and submitted to the UQAC. The University's Pro Vice-Chancellor (Quality Assurance and Enhancement) presents the report, together with a commentary, to Senate. In a final stage, the documentation produced by LBIC Annual Monitoring review is sent to a University-appointed external reviewer for comment.

2.76   LBIC organises staff development sessions to brief staff on the process of annual monitoring. The clear and thorough approach to annual monitoring that involves a range of stakeholders at module, programme and College levels in enhancing the student learning experience is **good practice**.

2.77   LBIC produces an Annual Report which presents detailed statistical analysis of student data and summarises College developments and events over the past year. LBIC reports data on a regular basis throughout the year to Navitas UK in relation to a set of cross-College academic KPIs.

2.78   The University conducts an annual Regulatory Audit of LBIC using a panel of senior academic and professional staff and including a student representative. The process involves University scrutiny of policies, processes and information provided to staff and students, and practices; it focuses on promoting and enhancing good practice. The recommendations resulting from the audit which require action by LBIC feed into an action plan.

2.79   The periodic review of College procedures is conducted using Brunel University processes and procedures. LBIC as a whole is reviewed on a five-year cycle under the University's Collaborative Quality Audit and Review process. The next such review will take place next year. LBIC's provision is also included in the University's periodic review of provision undertaken on a subject level.

2.80   The review team concludes that LBIC, in conjunction with its partner University, operates effective processes for the monitoring and review of its provision that allow the Expectation to be met and the associated risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B9): Higher education providers have procedures for handling academic appeals and student complaints about the quality of learning opportunities; these procedures are fair, accessible and timely, and enable enhancement.

Quality Code, *Chapter B9: Academic Appeals and Student Complaints*

Findings

2.81   LBIC follows the University's processes and procedures in relation to the acknowledgement and resolution of a student complaint and academic appeal. These processes are outlined within the Student Academic Handbook, providing information on how to formally lodge an academic appeal or complaint, highlighting what happens at each stage and how long the process may take.

2.82   The review team found that LBIC is currently reviewing its academic appeals procedure through the governance process.

2.83   LBIC follows the agreed processes, procedures and policies outlined by the University and agreed by Navitas UK, which would allowing this Expectation to be met.

2.84   The review team looked at documentary evidence including the policy documents and committee meetings. The team then met students to discuss these processes and their understanding of them, and with relevant staff to discuss how they inform students.

2.85   The review team found that students were aware of the informal and formal processes used by that LBIC. Furthermore, the students whom the team met were able to describe in full each step of the process, including the possibility of taking a complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator if a satisfactory resolution had not been obtained.

2.86   The review team confirmed with staff their understanding of the complaints and appeals procedure. Due to an influx of appeals in a previous semester, the process had been reviewed to allow for a check within LBIC before an appeal was brought through the partner University's process.

2.87   Overall, the review team concludes that LBIC has fair, effective and timely procedures for handling student academic appeals and complaints. The current level of appeals and complaints are low but the process is place to ensure they are effectively resolved is robust. Therefore, the review team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of Risk: Low

The quality of student learning opportunities: summary of findings

2.88   In reaching its judgement about the quality of student learning opportunities, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook.

2.89   There were no recommendations or affirmations and the review team identified six features of good practice in this area: two related to Expectations B3 and B5 and one each to B4 and B8.

2.90   There is also evidence of LBIC's commitment to the continuous enhancement of student learning opportunities, together with a clear focus on managing student needs and a widespread engagement of students which is supported.

2.91   The review team therefore concludes that the quality of student learning opportunities is **commended**.

3 Judgement: The quality of the information about learning opportunities

Expectation (C): UK higher education providers produce information for their intended audiences about the higher education they offer that is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy.

Quality Code, Part C: Information about Higher Education Provision

Findings

3.1 LBIC has in place a formal procedure for the approval of marketing and recruitment information. The Director of Marketing and Admissions submits the material for review to LBIC Senior Management Team. These documents are then sent to the University Partnership and Collaborations Manager, who will formally approve the documents. Once a formal sign-off has occurred by the University, the material may be used for marketing and recruitment. This information is discussed between LBIC and the University within relevant committees such as the Marketing, Recruitment and Admission Advisory Committee and Joint Strategic Partnership.

3.2 Course-related material is reviewed through a number of mechanisms. The Director of Academic and Support Services is responsible for documents such as the Student and Academic Handbook. Programme Element Specifications are reviewed as part of the annual monitoring process. LBIC Director maintains control over the alteration of these documents, with approval needed by Navitas UK and partner University. LBIC Director is ultimately responsible for the set of College policies and procedures that are derived from Navitas UK. These are closely aligned to the Quality Code. These documents can be amended if necessary through the Academic Advisory Committee. Any changes are noted in LBIC Operational Manual.

3.3 All student results are exported from LBIC to the University student information system, with the data being extracted for the relevant Board of Examiners. Students can access their official results through the University system. LBIC does not make awards at any exit point in the educational continuum. The University may issue a Confirmation of Attainment to a student who has met the progression requirements but decides not to progress to complete an award.

3.4 LBIC has in place appropriate processes, procedures and policies that would allow this Expectation to be met.

3.5 The review team examined all appropriate and relevant documentation. The team then asked students about all information received before and after applying to LBIC and confirmed with relevant staff that this information is made accessible to all parties and is appropriate. Students have access to LBIC's and the University's virtual learning environments and found that accessing two separate systems posed no issues.

3.6 The review team confirmed that LBIC has access to tracer data provided by the University. This data is used for charting the programme progression and award outcomes of students. This information is formally part of the annual review of the LBIC provision by the University, in which it is discussed at the Academic Advisory Board and Joint Strategic Partnership Management Board. The review team found this to be an effective method by which to track students' progression from LBIC to the point of graduation.

3.7 The review team confirmed with students that they had appropriate access to information prior to entry and while studying at LBIC. This information was formally outlined

in the Student Academic Handbook or Course Handbook. The Student Academic Handbook contains information on items such as absence, lateness, mitigating circumstances, examinations, progression and appeals, and complaints. The Course Handbook contains all course-related material. The review team confirmed that these were robust documents giving all appropriate information.

3.8   The review team found that the University uses a Higher Education Achievement Record (HEAR) to capture all relevant information from students, and where students volunteer at LBIC and receive certification, this can be uploaded to their HEAR page. The team learned that not all aspects of student engagement are currently captured by the system but that LBIC and University are working together to incorporate the recognition of student representatives in the HEAR.

3.9   LBIC, in conjunction with Navitas UK and the University, has effective quality assurance policies in place to ensure the accuracy of information about its higher education provision. Therefore, the review team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of Risk: Low

The quality of the information about learning opportunities: Summary of findings

3.10   In reaching its judgement about the quality of information about learning opportunities, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook.

3.11   The Expectation is met, with low risk, and there are no recommendations or affirmations. The information provided by LBIC for all its intended audiences, including prospective students, current students and alumni, and for quality assurance purposes is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy.

3.12   The review team therefore concludes that the quality of information about learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.

4 Commentary: The enhancement of student learning opportunities

Expectation (Enhancement): Deliberate steps are being taken at provider level to improve the quality of students' learning opportunities.

Findings

4.1 LBIC has developed its approach to enhancement within the framework set out by Navitas UK. LBIC subscribes to Navitas UK's strategic aims and commitment to continuous improvement and enhancement. It has also implemented the required structural framework for enhancement, including the establishment of a College Enhancement Team (CET) and Student Forum (SF), which feed into the wider governance structure.

4.2 The work of the CET is central to LBIC's approach to enhancement, and is concerned with operational matters, the curriculum and learning and teaching. Priorities are set within these broad areas. In the operational area there has been a focus on pre-arrival, accommodation and student communications. Issues concerning the curriculum are identified through the SF, Module Panels and the annual monitoring process. For example, following on from student feedback a new student handbook was developed. In the teaching and learning area, priority has been given to peer review and reflection, including the development of the academic staff self-reflection process. This process not only contributes to self-development but also identifies good practice to be shared and issues to be addressed by Programme and College management. Current projects in the teaching and learning area include the embedding of the new personal tutor system.

4.3 LBIC publishes a combined Quality Improvement Plan and Learning and Teaching Plan, which is monitored by LBIC Learning and Teaching Committee (CLTC), reflecting the areas and priorities noted above.

4.4 The Joint Annual Forum, which is discussed in further detail in relation to Expectation B3, and noted as good practice, contributes a joint College and University approach to enhancement. A key aspect of the forum is the involvement of students, who are able to shape the definition of issues on the basis of experience and propose possible solutions.

4.5 Best practice is identified in the minutes of Annual Monitoring meetings and feeds into a section of LBIC's Affiliate College Evaluation Report, recording enhancement activities and exceptional practice to be shared with the University and other Navitas colleges.

5   Commentary on the Theme: Digital Literacies

Findings

5.1   LBIC operates under Navitas UK's newly developed Virtual Learning Environment Strategy. This Strategy has several targeted aims, including ensuring that all students have access and interaction with appropriate learning materials and that staff and students are provided with appropriate information and training to support their use of the virtual learning environment.

5.2   LBIC actively promotes the use of the Student Portal by providing students with access to their personal profile, timetable, attendance record, results and payment records. This provides students with a front-facing news feed that relays current information based around key events, policies and procedures that may affect them. Students are required to access this information regularly so that they can improve their wider digital literacy skills.

5.3   Additionally, all students undertake the Interactive Learning Skills and Communication module. This expands on the ICT module and gives students experience around the relevant software packages.

5.4   Overall, students are prepared effectively for their respective progression pathways within the University regarding their digital literacy skills. The review team found no obvious failing by LBIC in this preparation although the corresponding report on Navitas UK suggests that digital literacy could be further embedded in the curriculum.

Glossary

This glossary is a quick-reference guide to terms in this report that may be unfamiliar to some readers. Definitions of key operational terms are also given on pages 24-27 of the
Higher Education Review (Embedded Colleges) handbook

If you require formal definitions of other terms please refer to the section on assuring standards and quality: www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality

User-friendly explanations of a wide range of terms can be found in the longer **Glossary** on the QAA website: www.qaa.ac.uk/Pages/GlossaryEN.aspx

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

Award
A qualification, or academic credit, conferred in formal recognition that a student has achieved the intended **learning outcomes** and passed the assessments required to meet the academic standards set for a **programme** or unit of study.

Blended learning
Learning delivered by a number of different methods, usually including face-to-face and e-learning (see **technology enhanced or enabled learning**).

Credit(s)
A means of quantifying and recognising learning, used by most institutions that provide higher education **programmes of study**, expressed as numbers of credits at a specific level.

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

Distance learning
A course of study that does not involve face-to-face contact between students and tutors but instead uses technology such as the internet, intranets, broadcast media, CD-ROM and video, or traditional methods of correspondence - learning 'at a distance'.
See also **blended learning**.

Dual award or double award
The granting of separate awards (and certificates) for the same **programme** by two **degree-awarding bodies** who have jointly delivered the programme of study leading to them. See also **multiple award**.

e-learning
See technology enhanced or enabled learning.

Embedded college
Colleges, often operating as part of a network, that are embedded on or near the campuses of two or more UK higher education institutions (HEI) and that primarily provide preparatory programmes for higher education

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

Expectations
Statements in the **Quality Code** that set out what all UK higher education providers expect of themselves and each other, and what the general public can therefore expect of them.

Flexible and distributed learning
A programme or module that does not require the student to attend classes or events at particular times and locations.
See also **distance learning**.

Framework
A published formal structure. See also **framework for higher education qualifications**.

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

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

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

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

Operational definition
A formal definition of a term, establishing exactly what QAA means when using it in reviews and reports.

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

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

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

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

Reference points
Statements and other publications that establish criteria against which performance can
be measured.

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

Technology enhanced or enabled learning (or **e-learning**)
Learning that is delivered or supported through the use of technology.

Threshold academic standard
The minimum acceptable level of achievement that a student has to demonstrate to be
eligible for an academic **award**. Threshold academic standards are set out in the national
frameworks and **Subject Benchmark Statements**.

Virtual learning environment (VLE)
An intranet or password-only interactive website (also referred to as a platform or user
interface) giving access to **learning opportunities** electronically. These might include such
resources as course handbooks, information and reading lists; blogs, message boards and
forums; recorded lectures; and/or facilities for online seminars (webinars).

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