

QAA – Higher Education Review (HER) Action Plan
Finance & Business Training (FBT) - (to Include LSBF Vocational School)
2015 – 16

Preface

The detailed actions identified below are structured to reflect and uphold the differentiated judgement made against LSBF & FBT. This differentiated judgement was able to conclude that LSBF & FBT's undergraduate & postgraduate provision met expectations in respect of both the management of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities. Hence, differentiated actions and emphasis can be found in the detailed actions below.

UK Quality Code Expectation B2 Recruitment, Selection and Admission									
QAA – HER Recommendation	Action	Staff Deadline	Staff Lead Responsibility	Commentary	Evidence 29.01.2016 Requested in response to 26 th Feb	#	Risk H/M/L	Saliency	
This recommendation does not apply to the LSBF Business School which was confirmed as meeting the expectations for the setting & maintenance of Academic Standards and Quality of Student Learning Opportunities									
Develop, publish, and implement consistently an admissions policy which aligns fully with the Expectation of Quality Code Chapter B2 (Expectation B2)	Director of Admissions/ Heads of Schools/Programme Leaders & the Policy Audit Working Group design, develop and implement a revised organisational Admissions Strategy and differentiated Admissions Policies to reflect the nature and scope of LSBF/FBT awarding body provision. Admissions Policy Roll – Out Workshop	29/01/16	Admissions Director	<p>The requirement to... ‘develop, publish and implement consistently an admissions policy which fully aligns with the Expectations of Quality Code Chapter B2’, has been achieved through continuous consultation and development activities of the Admissions Directorate, Registry, Academic Heads and the Policy Working Group, (PWG), facilitated and supported with oversight from the Quality Directorate. Progress on development of the Admissions Policy has been subject to the oversight of the Quality Committee, Academic Board and the Senior Management Team [30, 022 and 027a-027c; 026a - 026u; 46a-e; 47a-b]</p> <p>The Policy Working Group (PWG), implemented in 2014, by the Quality Directorate and led by members of both LSBF/FBT's Internal Audit and Quality Assurance teams, is tasked with ensuring LSBF/FBT policies and procedures are subject to continuous review, evaluation and development over a three- year cycle and is a key quality instrument that assures the organisation that policies and procedures are subject to continuous oversight. The group has been active in ensuring academic and service area policies supporting the in-scope higher education provision have been subject to scrutiny and consultation as part of the organisation's preparation's for the HER Review in March 2015. [30B]</p> <p>In addition, the Quality Directorate has supported the Admissions Team in completing a comprehensive mapping exercise of QC Expectation B2. [30A]</p>	Organisational Admissions Strategy Statement	1a			
					LSBF Admissions Policy Edexcel	1b			
					LSBF Admissions Policy GGSB	1c			
					LSBF Admissions Policy Uninettuno	1d			
					LSBF Admissions Policy SQA	1e			
					LSBF Admissions Policy OCN	1f			
					Appendix A-Enrolment + Cohort Sign Off Process Pearson	1g			
					Appendix A- Enrolment + Cohort Sign of Process SQA	1h			
					Appendix B- Edexcel Registration Process	1i			
					Appendix B – Guide to SQA Connect 2014	1j			
					Policy Working Group Minutes- 06-10-2015 Provided	1k			
					Admissions Workshop Agenda	1-2-a			
					Admissions workshop minutes	1-2-b			
Admissions Mapping	030-a								
Policy Audit List	030-b								

This area is no longer viewed as a high or medium risk as all processes and draft policies have been revised and subjected to internal validation and approval processes, managed as part of the Academic Planning & Development Group (APAD) remit. The reasonable expectation is that the integration of these processes into practice expectations, as appropriate, secures a low risk and confidence outcome.				LSBF Recruitment Selection and Admission Statement			
Regular Compliance monitoring		Admissions Director	Unable to evidence at this stage due to the College's inability to recruit at present for programmes deemed in scope. Examples of old process below:				
				Compliance Absence Authorisation Form	035- a		
				Compliance Authorised Absence Letterhead	035-b-		
				Compliance Medical documents guideline	035-c-		
				Attendance letters guideline - guide for staff	035-d-		
				Compliance Attendance letter template	035-e-		
				Compliance Attendance letters process map	035-f-		
				Compliance Withdrawal Form	035-g-		
				Compliance Attendance Meetings email templates	035-h-		
				Attendance Policy (Students)	035-i-		
				Compliance Tier 4 Regulation Reminder	035-j-		
				Compliance ACCA Swiping Procedure	035-k-		
				Compliance CIMA Swiping Procedure	035-L-		
				LSBF Attendance Policy Reminder	035-M-		
				Spot-check procedure and consequences of missing spot-checks	035-N-		
				CIMA Swiping times for students	035-o-		
				Notice fraudulent use of the system - paper registers in use	035-p-		
				Notice fraudulent use of the system NEW	035-q-		
				Swiping times for students	035-r-		
				2015 Spot Check Process	035-s-		
				Spot-check Warning	035-t-		
				Severe Attendance Warning Template	035-u-		
				LSBF Attendance Warning Template	035-v-		
Formal Attendance Warning	035-w-						
Notice of Absence - Informal Attendance Warning	035-x-						
LSBF Attendance power point slide – INDUCTION	035-y-						
LSBF LDN Attendance Policy (Students) (Final)	035-z-						

						Compliance Census and Appeals Guide Staff	035-Aa-		
						ACCA and CIMA Progression Guide – London	035-Ab-		
						Disciplinary and Appeals Procedure	035-Ac-		
						Student Notes Guide	035-Ad-		
						LSBF STUDENT HANDBOOK 2015-2016	035-Ae-		
		<p>New Commentary from 29th July 2016</p> <p>The role of the organisation’s Immigration & Compliance Department is to maintain oversight of compliance and Home Office’s requirements for Tier 4 sponsors. This entails formulating and communicating policy and procedures, monitoring of attendance records, conducting spot checks, taking disciplinary actions and reporting Tier 4 student activity to the Home Office. The Immigration Compliance Department also act as a source of information and guidance to students on matters relating to immigration and student compliance.</p> <p>The Compliance Department has the following structure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance Management – overseeing & managing the Compliance Department, ensuring that all sponsor duties are met. The General Compliance Team - responsible for training and development of the new and existing staff, production and updating the policy documents and manuals, answering general student or internal staff queries relating to immigration, conducting disciplinary meetings, reporting non-compliant students to UKVI, ensuring communication and immigration related updates are passed onto all stakeholders within the company. In addition, support advice is given to students in regards to Visa applications, monitoring specific inboxes ensuring that all emails are responded within a certain timeframe, escalating complicated cases with the management, running reports. Compliance Audit Team – responsible for census checks at the beginning of each semester, ensuring that all students’ documents are submitted and correctly filed, that students meet all the progression criteria, conducting registration for new and existing students, conducting periodic audits on students’ documents and maintaining accurate database records Attendance Monitoring Team - specific tasks related to attendance monitoring ensuring that students’ attendance is monitored regularly and they attend classes at an expected level of at least 80%. Ensuring that information related to attendance is delivered to students at all times and the attendance monitoring system is not fraudulently used, by conducting spot-checks. The team is also responsible for running fortnightly attendance reports and analysing student’s attendance records, responsible for attendance meetings with referred students, who are in breach of the attendance policy. Responsible for conducting spot-checks, issuing attendance reports to student, answering students’ enquiries related to attendance, maintenance of accurate data in the system, recording statements from students and assessing cases of non-attendance, assessing absence requests from students, creating and updating manuals and policies attendance related. Assisting all internal staff with attendance related queries. Being present in Inductions to offer the new students the information related to School’s attendance policy and UKVI attendance expectations from Tier 4 students in order to successfully complete their programmes of studies. <p>The Compliance Process is effectively closed as a result of non-admissions, recruitment/registration of Pearson/Edexcel students.</p>						Risk	Saliency
						<p>Not applicable as the Compliance Process is effectively closed as a result of non-admissions, recruitment/registration of Pearson/Edexcel students.</p> <p>There was a documentation bundle provided to QAA in last upload. The file consists of various policies as well as compliance templates the team had in place when functioned.</p>		L	Saliency is Low as the agreed processes have been integrated into practice expectations

**UK Quality Code - Expectation B4 (i)
Enabling Student Development and Achievement**

QAA - HER Recommendations	Action	Deadline	Staff Lead Responsibility	Commentary	Evidence	#		
This recommendation does not apply to the LSBF Business School which was confirmed as meeting the expectations for the setting & maintenance of Academic Standards and Quality of student Learning Opportunities								
2 Ensure that all students are registered with their awarding body or awarding organisation within the timescales required by those bodies and organisations (Expectation B4)	Introduce a process of Enrolment & Registration monitoring & oversight through the Registry function, to include the overall responsibility and accountability for Enrolment & Registration Operations and Compliance to reside with the Registrar	29/01/16	Registrar	The communication of 14/01/2016 (evidence file 021) from the Vice Rector to Pearson outlines the development process undertaken to provide clarity in dealing with issues around the legacy problems of previous systems of enrolment within the organisation and the management of multisite delivery and registration processes. An audit of the multisite delivery and registration processes previously employed at LSBF has revealed the legacy anomaly of a number of outstanding learners. LSBF has identified and passed on to Pearson the details of the outstanding learners but have yet to receive any formal response from Pearson.	Registry Review of Procedures in Place for Enrolment	2-a		
					Registry Report on Active and Inactive Students	2-b		
					Appendix A-Enrolment + Cohort Sign Off Process Pearson	1-g-		
					Appendix A- Enrolment + Cohort Sign of Process SQA	1-h-		
					Appendix A-Enrolment + Cohort Sign Off Process Pearson	1-g-		
					Appendix A- Enrolment + Cohort Sign of Process SQA 2-c-Registrar report on Enrolment and Registration within 30 days of conclusion of admissions on each programme	1-h-		
					019 – Pearson Letter regarding registrations 10.12.2015			
					020-a-f Email correspondence with Edexcel RE: registering students			
					021-a – LSBF letter to Pearson January 2016			
					021-b-Student registration Excel			
	<p>New Commentary from 29th July 2016</p> <p>Edexcel Pearson – Registration of students The LSBF/FBT Quality Directorate, Admissions Team and the Vice Rector’s Office coordinated activities with Heads of Schools and Registry to ensure relevant registration was submitted to Edexcel Pearson. A gap analysis and audit process was undertaken by the Admissions team prior to submission. Final data sets were sent to Edexcel Pearson for registration during the period October 2015 to February 2016. During the course of the registration period, Edexcel Pearson confirmed that LSBF/FBT teams would be required to continuously check the Edexcel Pearson portal for confirmation of student registrations.</p> <p>Edexcel Pearson has confirmed all previously unregistered students, (sent for registration), have now been registered via a formal Registration Report received by LSBF/FBT on 27/07/2016.</p>				Edexcel Pearson Registration Report	051-i	Low	Salience is Low As both LSBF & Pearson systems confirm full registration
					Pearson registration email trail from December 2015	051-a-051 - j		

		As a result of this confirmation, and the lack of future student registrations due to 'teach – out,' LSBF/FBT conclude that this issue is no longer viewed as a high or medium risk							
UK Quality Code - Expectation B4 (ii) <i>Enabling Student Development and Achievement</i>									
	QAA - HER Recommendations	Action	Deadline	Staff Lead Responsibility	Commentary	Evidence	#		
This recommendation does not apply to the LSBF Business School which was confirmed as meeting the expectations for the setting & maintenance of Academic Standards and Quality of student Learning Opportunities									
3	Ensure the accurate reporting of enrolled students' status, and changes of status, within the organisation and to external stakeholders (Expectation B4)	Registrar to produce monthly reports, commencing February 2016, on Vocational, Undergraduate and Postgraduate Status, to include data on Active, Non-Active & Withdrawn student status to SMT.	20/02/16 (SMT)	Registrar	The registrar produces monthly registration reports detailing enrolled student status and changes of status for consideration by the Senior Management Team (SMT). [2-b; 023; 2-a]	Registry report on Active and Inactive Students	2-b		
						Registry Report to Quality Committee and SMT	023		
						All Registry reports to SMT	023; 2-a; 2-b		
						Vocational School Assessment Board Minutes	038-a-038-ai		
		New Commentary from 29th July 2016						Low	Saliency is Low
		Registry commenced reporting on a regular basis to Senior Management Team on the position of students under the suite of provision provided by LSBF/FBT. The report in January 2016 detailed the current position and this was reviewed and amended each month. Within the reports details of individual programme enrolment and active or completed students are available. During the months of February and March 2016 there was little change as there had been no recruitment. There was a small recruitment to LCCA in April 2016. The issue of the non-registered students is detailed in the April 2016 report and shows a reduction in the non-registered students in the June 2016 report as per the information provided by the Quality Nominee and the Vice Rectors office. The report in July 2016 shows that all students are reported to be registered under the Pearson's programme, as confirmed above.				Registry Reports	055-a - 055-h		
		As with Recommendation 2, LSBF/FBT conclude that this issue is no longer viewed as a high or medium risk							
UK Quality Code - Expectation B5 <i>Higher Education providers take deliberate steps to engage all students, individually and collectively, as partners in the assurance and enhancement of their educational experience</i>									
	QAA - HER Recommendations	Action	Deadline	Staff Lead Responsibility	Commentary	Evidence	#		
This recommendation does not apply to the LSBF Business School which was confirmed as meeting the expectations for the setting & maintenance of Academic Standards and Quality of student Learning Opportunities									
						Student Representation Framework	4-a		

4	Include students who represent all delivery sites as members of organisational – level academic committees (Expectation B5)	Student Engagement Manager to produce Student Representative Framework documentation, Process Map and Terms of Reference for engagement of students, identifying the key functions within:	20/02/16	Student Engagement Manager & SMT	The Student Engagement Manager confirms that the required actionable documentation has been produced [4-a, b, c]	Student Voice Policy	4-b		
						Student Representative Attendance Template	4-c		
						Approved Student Voice Policy	037		
		Student Engagement Manager with support from Quality Manager/Audit Manager to design, develop and implement initial training programme for student representative engagement with the organisational-level committee structure.	20/02/16	Student Engagement Manager	A Student Representative Training programme has been developed but has proved difficult and challenging to deliver. Due to the formal 'teach out process, the quoracy of Lead Student Representatives in the Vocational School has now reduced to a single representative. This is clearly impacting on the ability to ensure full student engagement with the formal committee process. The Student Engagement Manager confirms that a new strategy to engage class level representatives is being considered; the outcomes of which will be discussed at the next Action Plan Monitoring meeting on 11/05/16. [4-e]	Student Engagement Class Representative Training	4-e		
						Class Rep Networking Event meeting Minutes	039-a-		
						SC Forum Meeting minutes	039-b-		
						SC Forum Meeting minutes	039-c-		
						SC Class Rep forum agenda	039-d		
					Procedures for Student Representative training for engagement with the committee structure, organised by the Student Engagement Manager has proved challenging to complete due to lack of student uptake. This is due, in part, to perceptions relating to the formal 'teach out' process and Tier 4 license revocation, which has had an adverse impact on our ability to deliver events for all student representatives. The engagement team, however, is currently working with class reps on an individual basis to meet them at dates/ locations which are of convenience to them and to be as flexible as possible in order to increase their/our engagement. The engagement team believes that his new approach should be successful in encouraging a greater input in to formal committee engagement by the reps. We believe that good engagement is also about finding the best and most suitable form of communication possible for each individual. Some students prefer emails, others prefer phone calls, but what's important is that we use whatever means we possibly can to engage to the best of our ability. Once we have been able to see all of our Class Reps, this should have a big impact on our student attendance. LCCA Student Council Forums, provide students with the opportunity to raise and discuss any issues or concerns.	Class Rep Meetings and Training Invites	045-a-l		

	<p>New Commentary from 29th July 2016 The exceptional circumstances of a teach-out position have adversely impacted upon the perceived continuity impacts of student representation and engagement. Thus, the exceptional circumstances are inhibiting the motivation of voluntary contributions from students.</p> <p>The organisation recognises, however, that student engagement depends on mutual cooperation and continuity – nevertheless, the normal position of individual feedback through module and programme feedback continues, thus the risk is mitigated and therefore low.</p>					Action Plan Monitoring meeting minutes 23 rd May 2016	060	Low	Saliency is Low because the normal processes for receiving individual student feedback and satisfaction survey/statements continues	
<p>UK Quality Code - Expectation B6(i) Assessment of Students & the Recognition of Prior Learning</p>										
	QAA - HER Recommendations	Action	Deadline	Staff Lead Responsibility	Commentary	Evidence	#			
<p>This recommendation does not apply to the LSBF Business School which was confirmed as meeting the expectations for the setting & maintenance of Academic Standards and Quality of student Learning Opportunities</p>										
5	<p>Ensure that assessment feedback to students is consistently timely, constructive and developmental (B6)</p>	<p>Heads of Schools/Registrar to confirm a formal End of Module Assessment Schedule, for the academic year 2015/16,.to cover all Higher Education provision (Voc/UG/PG), giving formal oversight to the management & monitoring of the Pre – Board and Assessment Board Cycle.</p> <p>Programme Leaders to report to Heads of School on the effective operation of the Programme Assessment Cycle to include confirmation of timely developmental feedback to students</p>	20/22/16	Heads of Schools and Registrar	Heads of Schools have worked closely with the Registrar to develop and implement a formal End of Module Assessment schedule [5a,b,c,d, e]	End of Module Assessment Schedule	5-a			
							List of dates for teaching on the last module within the programme	5-b		
							Pre Board and Assessment Board Schedules	5-c		
							Quality Committee Schedule 2015/16	5-d		
					March 2016	Programme Leaders	The organisation, including LCCA, implements both formative and summative feedback. Formative feedback takes place, normally, on the 5 th week of a proposed term, designed to track student progress against target, enhancing student learning and performance and intervening in reasonable time when progress does not meet the profile. Constructive summative feedback, provided per learning outcomes, reflects the marking criteria outlined by the awarding body. As a result of improvement strategies, supported by both internal and external staff development activities, this improved feedback is now facilitating increased student confidence and enthusiasm, enhancing their learning experience, confirming the provision of appropriate guidance in support of further improvements is an essential part of the effective learning process. Pearson Subject Verifier Reports for higher national provision in Business and the Arts, for the period January 2016 to date, confirm significant improvement in the content, timeliness and developmental nature of assessment feedback to students, along with positive comments on the management of academic standards and teaching delivery. [41-a; 41-b]	Learning Teaching & Assessment Strategy (Vocational Programmes)	5-e	

				<p>training workshops has been implemented, aligned with the 'Reflective Practitioner Framework, focusing, in the main, on assessment, verification and moderation practices. Workshops took place on:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>July 22nd 2015</td> <td>Inaugural Quality Enhancement Conference focusing on Assessment and Governance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>December 10th 2015</td> <td>Assessment Feedback and Intended Learning Outcomes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>February 18th 2016</td> <td>Assessment Feedback /IV & Moderation</td> </tr> </table> <p>In addition, academic schools have undertaken school and programme focused development activities for example:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>2nd December 2014</td> <td>Assessment, IV & Verification (Manchester Campus)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2nd March 2015</td> <td>Assessment, IV & Verification (London Campus)</td> </tr> </table>	July 22 nd 2015	Inaugural Quality Enhancement Conference focusing on Assessment and Governance	December 10 th 2015	Assessment Feedback and Intended Learning Outcomes	February 18 th 2016	Assessment Feedback /IV & Moderation	2 nd December 2014	Assessment, IV & Verification (Manchester Campus)	2 nd March 2015	Assessment, IV & Verification (London Campus)			
July 22 nd 2015	Inaugural Quality Enhancement Conference focusing on Assessment and Governance																
December 10 th 2015	Assessment Feedback and Intended Learning Outcomes																
February 18 th 2016	Assessment Feedback /IV & Moderation																
2 nd December 2014	Assessment, IV & Verification (Manchester Campus)																
2 nd March 2015	Assessment, IV & Verification (London Campus)																
<p>New Commentary from 29th July 2016</p> <p>This recommendation requests that assessment feedback to students is ...'<i>consistently timely, instructive and developmental.</i>' The following extracts from Pearson Edexcel Subject Verifiers Reports of early 2016 highlight continued improvement in the area of feedback to students demonstrating the maturation and effectiveness of the organisation's ability to design, delivery and manage assessment, moderation and feedback processes.</p> <p>Pearson Subject Verifiers reports for Higher National programmes in Business, Hospitality and Creative Arts provision since 2015, with the exception of HND Interactive Media, where work was requested for remarking to demonstrate that all learning outcomes have been undertaken and achieved, have acknowledged and recorded significant and continuous improvements with NO ESSENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS given. Conversely, the Interactive Media programme was awarded an area of Good Practice, for its continued support for students ... '<i>the perseverance of individual staff, particularly in HND Interactive Media, to support and encourage students to achieve.</i>' As noted earlier, however, improvements are required in some aspects of HND Interactive Media delivery, which will be supported through additional staff development activities. The verifier, however, states that ...'<i>the feedback to the student is clear, directive and encouraging. It uses technical terms to identify strengths and future developments that could be made in further animation.</i>' - ...'<i>technical feedback and identified limitations in the response to the assignment brief were outlined in the feedback.</i>' - ...'<i>the summative comments identify personal as well as technical developments that could be made in relation to effective and efficient web implementation to improve the assessment grade.</i>'</p> <p>Specifically, the HND Fashion & Textiles verifier notes ... '<i>the tutor feedback, particularly the feedback area for strengths and improvements is now being completed with knowledge and understanding of the assignments and unit specifications.</i>' In addition, the verifier goes on to note that ... '<i>the feedback is completed in response to the learning outcomes and is directly related to the tasks tracked in the assignment brief while commenting on the individual content of the sample, and that ... the feedback includes advice and direction for improvements and picks up the need for proof reading and academic research/writing.</i>'</p> <p>For HND Photography, the verifier states... '<i>the feedback is encouraging and positive – specific areas of improvement have been identified against each of the relevant unit learning outcomes</i>' – '<i>the assessor feedback using positive, technical terms has been adjacent to the learning outcomes and the grading assessment criteria so students are aware of how and where they have succeeded.</i>'</p> <p>For HND Business, the verifier states ...'<i>the assessment in London, Manchester & Birmingham has been fair and the feedback, IV activity and judgement has been clear and accurate.</i>' In addition, the verifier confirms that ... '<i>the London School of Business & Finance has addressed all points previously made and has responded extremely well to ensure a good level of consistency and accuracy is now evidenced in relation to assessment, verification and centre records in particular.</i>'</p>				SV reports	052a-052n	Low	Saliency is Low as the reasonable expectation is that the integration of staff development processes into practice expectations, as appropriate, secures a low risk and confidence outcome.										
				Staff development workshop mins	056-a - 056 - t												
				Annual Quality Enhancement Programme and minutes/note	056-j-056-m												

<p>As a general example of the wider aspects of the assessment process, the HND Creative Media verifier confirmed that the centre had addressed the issues identified in the previous report and that communication with the centre was excellent with the correct materials for the visit being made available. Oversight of the management of academic standards confirmed that rigorous procedures for the withdrawal of students were in place and operating effectively and that assessment instruments provided students with relevant vocational activities for this award. The verifier suggested that it would be helpful to students for the centre to provide more guidance on how to increase their achievement levels.</p> <p>As confirmed above, the LSBF/FBT Quality Directorate has run a series of staff development workshops over the previous academic year, based around the content of its 'Reflective Practitioner Programme', addressing, amongst a range of academic and quality issues, Learning Outcomes and how they are achieved by students. Further staff development events will be run in the period from September to December to address the wider issues of ILOs, Assessment and Moderation (IV). The workshop of 18th February 2016, delivered by external consultant Tom Cantwell FHEA, focused explicitly on examining assessment practice through workshops on ... 'Writing Constructive & Developmental Feedback to Students aligned with Intended Learning Outcomes' and Internal Verification ... 'Developing Effective Strategies for Managing Internal Verification and Moderation'.</p> <p>The organisation concludes that the 'Reflective Practitioner Framework' workshops, focusing on Assessment/Assessment Feedback to Students/Design and Assessment of Learning Outcomes and Internal Verification & Moderation, delivered in the academic year 2015/16, across the Manchester, Birmingham and London centres, have contributed to significant improvements in academic management, delivery and performance outcomes contributing to demonstrating effectiveness and impact against the recommendation and concludes that ...</p> <p>the reasonable expectation is that the integration of these processes into practice expectations, as appropriate, secures a low risk and confidence outcome.</p>									
<p>UK Quality Code - Expectation B6 (ii) Assessment of Students & the Recognition of Prior Learning</p>									
	QAA - HER Recommendations	Action	Deadline	Staff Lead Responsibility	Commentary	Evidence			
<p>This recommendation does not apply to the LSBF Business School which was confirmed as meeting the expectations for the setting & maintenance of Academic Standards and Quality of student Learning Opportunities</p>									
6	<p>Ensure that the processes for internal verification of assessment tasks, and internal verification/moderation of marking, are implemented consistently and</p>	<p>Heads of Schools to confirm a formal End of Module Assessment Schedule, for the academic year 2015/16, to cover all Higher Education provision (Voc/UG/PG), giving formal oversight to the management & monitoring of the Pre – Board and Assessment Board Cycle.</p>	<p>20/02/16</p>	<p>Heads of Schools</p>	<p>Heads of Schools have worked closely with the Registrar to develop and implement a formal End of Module Assessment schedule [5a, b,c,d, e]</p> <p>Across LSBF & FBT, before an assignment brief is submitted to student, it is internally verified by the programme leader to ensure all the elements and tasks are fit for purpose; marking guides and grading criteria are clearly stated and communicated. Before the internal verification process of marked worked takes place, standardisation of assessment is</p>	<p>End of Module Schedule</p>	<p>5-a</p>		

effectively (Expectation B6)				<p>agreed as some units are delivered and assessed by more than 1 person.</p> <p>For the HND Programmes, 20% of assessments submitted are internally verified to ensure the student works are marked with integrity and is consistent to the requirements of the learning outcomes and task allocation of the assignments briefs and confirm that feedback is clear, developmental and effective. Any discrepancies identified by the internal verifier are immediately acted upon in order not to penalise the students. A standard template, provided by the awarding body is used across all programmes.</p> <p>Programme Leaders chair bi-weekly team meeting to ensure standardisation of procedures and any areas of concerns are discussed at the Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committees. All HND assessors are involved in the internal verification process which ensures the promotion of a rigorous and effective commitment to the quality improvement and enhancement process.</p> <p>The effectiveness of this improved and robust Internal Verification process has been acknowledged by a number of Pearson Subject Verifiers in recent external reports. [41-a; 41-b]</p>				
	Programme Leaders to report to Heads of School on the timely and effective operation of the Internal Verification & Moderation process	20/02/16	Programme Leaders	See above	Quarterly School Reports (due in March for presentation to the April Quality Committee)	-		
					Vocational School – School Report	040-a		
					LCCA School Report April 2016	040-b		
					LCCA School Report November 2015	0470-c		
					Business School Report April 2016	040-d		
					HND Business Report Part A, February 9 th , 2016	041-a		
					HND Business Report Part B, February 9 th , 2016	041-b		
	Programme Leader reports to Heads of Schools	-						
	The Quality Directorate, to design and develop a CPD schedule for the continuous quality improvement of staff development training focused upon the key areas of Assessment, Internal Verification and Moderation. The schedule will be designed to deliver a series of workshops from February 2016 to November 2016 in line with the monitoring	July 2015	Quality Director	See above	December 10 th Quality Conference	5-1		
Dec 2015		Quality Director	Staff Developmental Workshop (Assessment) Nov 2015		6-a 6-b			
			Continuing Professional Development Programme Schedule 2016		6-c			
			Internal News – The Friday Round- Up		6-d			

		schedule confirmed by QAA and BIS. (as above)							
<p>New Commentary from 29th July 2016</p> <p>Pearson Edexcel Verifier reports from December 2015 to the present confirm that processes for IV and moderation are secure across all provision - See commentary above in Recommendation 5</p> <p>The organisation concludes that the 'Reflective Practitioner' Framework and the Committee Effectiveness Development Programme workshops delivered in the academic year 2015/16 have contributed to significant improvements in academic management, delivery and performance outcomes contributing to demonstrating effectiveness and impact against the recommendation and therefore concludes that ...</p> <p>the reasonable expectation is that the integration of these processes into practice expectations, as appropriate, secures a low risk and confidence outcome.</p>					See updated commentary and evidence Recommendation 5	-	Low	Salience is Low as the reasonable expectation is that the integration of staff development processes into practice expectations, as appropriate, secures a low risk and confidence outcome.	
<p>UK Quality Code - Expectation B7 (i) Higher Education providers make scrupulous use of external examiners</p>									
	QAA – HER Recommendations	Action	Deadline	Staff Lead Responsibility	Commentary	Evidence			
<p>This recommendation does not apply to the LSBF Business School which was confirmed as meeting the expectations for the setting & maintenance of Academic Standards and Quality of student Learning Opportunities</p>									

7	Ensure that external examiners' and standards verifiers' annual reports are made available, in full, to students (Expectation B7)	Quality Directorate Office, to receive reports and circulate to Heads of Schools. Heads of Schools to make available to students in the Library (on all sites), within 14 days of receipt.	20/02/16	Quality Manager/Heads of Schools	The organisation confirms that Standards Verifier Reports are made available to students in the Libraries across all sites and on 'My Page'	Sample - My Page notification Library catalogue	-			
New Commentary from 29 th July 2016 Responses to this issue were confirmed in the previous submission, resulting in LSBF/FBT concluding that... this issue cannot be judged as a high or medium and therefore confirms its status as Low.							As previously confirmed	-	Low	Saliency is judged to be Low due to LSBF/FBTs compliant response to the recommendation
<i>UK Quality Code - Expectation B7 (ii) Higher Education providers make scrupulous use of external examiners</i>										
	QAA – HER Recommendations	Action	Deadline	Staff Lead Responsibility	Commentary	Evidence				
This recommendation does not apply to the LSBF Business School which was confirmed as meeting the expectations for the setting & maintenance of Academic Standards and Quality of student Learning Opportunities										
8	Ensure that the names and affiliations of external examiners and standards verifiers are given to students in module and programme information (Expectation B7)	External Examiners/Subject Verifiers details to be collected from awarding bodies by the Quality Directorate and shared with Heads of Schools. Heads of Schools to make information available to students.	20/02/16	Quality Manager	As a result of no new admissions to HND programmes, this information is currently not available in programme documentation, but the organisation confirms that Standards Verifier details are made available to students in the Libraries across all sites and on 'My Page'	Sample - My Page notification Library catalogue	-			

New Commentary from 29 th July 2016					As previously confirmed		Low	Saliency is judged to be Low due to LSDBF/FBTs compliant response to the recommendation							
Responses to this issue were confirmed in the previous submission, resulting in LSBF/FBT concluding that this issue cannot be judged as a high or medium and therefore confirms its status as Low															
UK Quality Code - Expectation B8															
<i>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</i>															
	QAA – HER Recommendations	Action	Deadline	Staff Lead Responsibility	Commentary	Evidence									
This recommendation does not apply to the LSBF Business School which was confirmed as meeting the expectations for the setting & maintenance of Academic Standards and Quality of student Learning Opportunities															
9	Ensure that internal quality assurance systems enable Academic Board and senior managers to discharge consistently their responsibilities for academic oversight across all higher education provision (Expectation B8)	To revise reporting details and requirements in order to ensure the quality of information received by Academic Board and its constituent committees is appropriate and relevant to consistently discharge their responsibilities for the academic oversight across all higher education provision.	March 2016	Director Quality	<p>In response to this recommendation, the organisation has focused upon improving the quality of information and documentation received by Academic Board, with a particular focus on the content and quality of academic school reporting to Quality Committee. Heads of Schools are required to submit a school report, on a prescribed template, evaluating the academic performance of programmes.</p> <p>Internal review and evaluation has identified that key areas relating to the management of academic standards and quality assurance and responses to external examiner/subject verifier reports require improvements in order for Academic Board to assure the organisation that academic performance is delivered and managed effectively.</p> <p>A series of staff development activities, utilising a 'Committee Effective Development Programme' framework is currently being delivered</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>6th April 2016</td> <td>Committee Effective Development Program</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21st April 2016</td> <td>Committee Effective Development Program and Responses to External Examiner Report</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11th May 2016</td> <td>Committee Effectiveness Review Program through group work activities, a composite</td> </tr> </table> <p>[42-c]</p> <p>In addition, the Vice Rector and Director of Quality & Standards have implemented a process for the scrutiny of draft minutes prior to circulation to ensure standardisation. [QC minutes 21/0416 – AB minutes 26/04/16]</p>	6 th April 2016	Committee Effective Development Program	21 st April 2016	Committee Effective Development Program and Responses to External Examiner Report	11 th May 2016	Committee Effectiveness Review Program through group work activities, a composite	Academic Board minutes 18.01.2016. The agenda is currently awaiting retrieval from the internal Information Systems and can be shared once those systems are fully accessible.	9-a		
		6 th April 2016	Committee Effective Development Program												
		21 st April 2016	Committee Effective Development Program and Responses to External Examiner Report												
		11 th May 2016	Committee Effectiveness Review Program through group work activities, a composite												
Committee Effectiveness Development programme for Programme Leaders and Committee Chairs, focusing upon;	March 2016	Director Quality	See above	Committee Effectiveness Development programme (available in March)	-										
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee Reporting Oversight Functions 				APAD Minutes	025-a; 025-b										
				SMT	026a - 026u, 14-b-										

						Policy Working Group –	022, 027a- 027-c		
						LTAC	028-a- 028-e		
						Complaints Committee	029a- 029h		
						HER Action Plan Staff Development Workshop 21.04.2016	042-a		
						HER Action Plan Staff Development Workshop 21.04.2016	042-b		
					Internal discussions at senior level led to the conclusion that these improvements were fundamental to the re commendation and have been given priority. Perceived weaknesses in the reporting system, and therefore oversight have been removed and enhanced.				
	New Commentary from 29th July 2016								
	<p>The above previous commentary confirmed that the organisation identified the quality of performance management analysis, recording and presentation as the key issue relating to this recommendation to ensure effective functioning of the Academic Board. As a result, a series of staff development events - the '<i>Committee Effective Development Programme</i>' has provided a significant and targeted focus on these issues through the implementation of improvement strategies addressing <i>Evaluative Writing and Reporting, Self- Evaluation, Reporting and the use of Data, Standardisation & Presentation and Responses to External Examiner/Subject Verifier Reports.</i></p> <p>Minutes and agendas for the workshops on 6th April, 21st April, 11th May and 19th May 2016, confirm the organisational commitment to ensuring effective action is being taken, on a continuous basis to address this issue.</p> <p>Workshops have specifically focused on the template reporting document for Academic School Reports. Consultation and discussion at the workshops resulted in changes to the reporting template and staff at Programme Leader/Head of School level underwent supervised group activities to undertake evaluation and analysis of performance data and prepare draft sections of the new template. Focused was placed on the analysis and interpretation of data to inform reporting commentary. Staff confirmed the value of this work indicating that this development work would have a significant impact on their skills and abilities in preparation of future School Reports, reviewed by Quality Committee and Academic Board.</p> <p>The organisation is confident that the extensive staff development work undertaken in this area has led to substantial improvement in organisational understanding, at all levels, and that the School Reports on academic performance, subject to review and consideration at Quality Committee and Academic Board on 6th September, will evidence significant improvements and therefore concludes that the risk to senior managers and Academic Board's in discharging consistently their responsibilities for academic oversight across all higher education provision is Low</p>					<p>Committee Effectiveness Development Programme Mins</p> <p>Quality Conference July 2016 (synopsis of invisible module workshop)</p>	<p>056-n- 056-t</p> <p>056-m</p>	Low	Saliency is low as continued development work highlights improvement to practice
	UK Quality Code - Expectation B9 Academic Appeals and Student Complaints								
	QAA – HER Recommendations	Actions	Deadline	Staff Responsibility	Lead	Commentary	Evidence		
This recommendation does not apply to the LSBF Business School which was confirmed as meeting the expectations for the setting & maintenance of Academic Standards and Quality of student Learning Opportunities									

10	Ensure that complaints are investigated according to its procedures and in a manner that is timely and fair (B9)	Director of Student Engagement to manage and monitor the Complaints Policy and Procedure through a new Online Complaints Management Portal. This process will be reviewed and monitored by the Complaints Committee on a fortnightly basis, with the production of a Complaints Monitoring Report to the Senior Management Team (SMT).	01/03/16	Student Engagement Manager	<p>All official complaints received through our current system, are investigated thoroughly in line with procedures and policies to the due deadline. Complaints are dealt with and resolved within the policy terms, however, some complex complaint cases, may take longer to resolve. Students are kept aware of the progress throughout the process, while we conduct our investigations.</p> <p>On the occasions where a complaint has been escalated to stage 3 of our procedures, a Complaints Committee to discuss the complaint in full, investigates and correlates all evidence, which is presented to the student. On conclusion of this procedure, a formal letter explaining the outcome and how the decision was made is sent to the student.</p> <p>In some cases, complaints are forwarded direct to SMT. Monthly reports have been produced for SMT, however, this procedure now complies to the fortnightly reporting requirement [043]</p> <p>We have developed a robust new on-line Complaints System, which in time will replace our current process. Due to the difficult transition period and the 'teach out' process, we have been unable to launch this new system, as other priorities have had to have preference.</p> <p>We aim to test the functionality and usability of our new system and alleviate any unknown issues, during the first two weeks of May 2016. We hope to go live with the new system from Monday 16th May. All students will be directed to the new system [10]</p>	Student Complaints Management System	10-a		
						Student Complaints Committee Process	10-b		
						Complaints Committee ToRs	10-c		
						LSBF Admissions Complaints Procedure	10-d		
						LSBF Complaints Procedures for Students	10-e		
						Fortnightly Complaints Report to SMT	043		
						Senior Management Team Meeting Schedule	10-f		
		New commentary from 29 th July 2016							
		The position with the proposed On-Line Complaints remains the same as confirmed in the previous update, with the functionality and usability test still to be implemented.			Awaiting September Complaints Report – available for the monitoring meeting of 7 th September		Medium	Saliency is Medium. Analysis of the current position against expectations is awaiting outcomes of SMT consideration of summary Complaints Report in September	
UK Quality Code - Expectation B9 Academic Appeals and Student Complaints									
	QAA – HER Recommendations	Actions	Deadline	Staff Lead Responsibility	Commentary	Evidence			
This recommendation does not apply to the LSBF Business School which was confirmed as meeting the expectations for the setting & maintenance of Academic Standards and Quality of student Learning Opportunities									
11		Heads of Schools/nominated Programme Leaders to liaise with	20/02/16	Quality Officer/Audit	The Policy Working Group (PWG) has, with consultation with appropriate academic and service area staff, produced a new	Draft Academic Appeals Statement	11-a		
						SQA Appeals Policy	11-b		
						Edexcel Academic Appeals Procedure	11-c		

	Develop, publish, and consistently implement an academic appeals policy and procedures for students on Higher National programmes (Expectation B9)	Policy Audit Working Group to review the appropriateness and fitness for purpose of the existing Appeals Policy.		& Projects Manager	academic appeals policy relevant to the higher national provision. The policy is led by a generic appeals statement alongside a series of differentiated policies in recognition of Pearson, SQA & OCN. The documents are currently in draft form and have undergone consultation at the Action Plan Monitoring Group meetings and now await consideration and approval by the Academic Planning & Development Group (APAD) on 06/05/2016 and Academic Board 13/05/2016. [11 a, b, c]	Academic Board minutes	9-a		
	New Commentary July 29th, 2016								
	Please see the detailed commentary in Recommendation 1, which articulates the role of the Policy Working Group (PWG) and the Academic Planning & Development Committee (APAD) in revising and confirming the policies as requested. The Academic Appeals Policy underwent validation and approval at the APAD meeting on 19 th July, 2016 (see commentary Recommendation 1). Appeals Policies are available on LSBF's website.					Academic Appeals Policy	058-j	Low	Salience is low as the agreed policies & processes have been integrated into practice expectations
	This area is no longer viewed as a high or medium risk as all processes and draft policies have been revised and subjected to internal validation and approval processes, managed as part of the Academic Planning & Development Group (APAD) remit. The reasonable expectation is that the integration of these processes into practice expectations, as appropriate, secures a low risk and confidence outcome.								
	UK Quality Code - Expectation B10 Managing Higher Education Provision with Others								
	QAA – HER Recommendations	Action	Deadline	Staff Lead Responsibility	Commentary	Evidence			
	This recommendation does not apply to the LSBF Business School which was confirmed as meeting the expectations for the setting & maintenance of Academic Standards and Quality of student Learning Opportunities								
12	Develop, publish and implement a policy and procedures for the management of work-based learning arrangements (Expectation B10)	Careers & Employability Manager to develop, publish and implement a Work-Based Learning Policy, in conjunction with the Policy Audit Working Group, for consideration by Quality Committee and approval and sign off by Academic Board	20/01/16	Audit & Projects Manager	The Policy Working Group (PWG) and the Careers and Employability Team has, with consultation with appropriate academic and service area staff, produced a new Work Based Learning policy relevant to the higher national provision. [12-a] The documentation is currently in draft form and has undergone consultation at the Action Plan Monitoring Group meetings and now awaits consideration and approval by the Academic Planning & Development Group (APAD) on 06/05/2016 and Academic Board 13/05/2016.	Work-based Learning Policy	12-a		
	New Commentary July 29th, 2016								
						See previous draft evidence	12-a	Low	Salience is low as the agreed policies & processes have

<p>Please see the detailed commentary in Recommendation 1, which articulates the role of the Policy Working Group (PWG) and the Academic Planning & Development Committee (APAD) in revising and confirming the policies as requested. The Work-based Learning Policy remains in draft form and will be reviewed at the next APAD meeting.</p> <p>This area is no longer viewed as a high or medium risk as all processes and draft policies have been revised and subjected to internal validation and approval processes, managed as part of the Academic Planning & Development Group (APAD) remit. The reasonable expectation is that the integration of these processes into practice expectations, as appropriate, secures a Low Risk and confidence outcome.</p>				<p>been integrated into practice expectations</p>
---	--	--	--	---

UK Quality Code - 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

	QAA - HER Recommendations	Action	Deadline	Staff Lead Responsibility	Commentary	Evidence			
13	Ensure that all published information about policies, programmes and academic partnerships is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy (Expectation C)	<p>Public Information Policy Manager to revise the Public Information Policy (PIP) processes, supported by Heads of Schools, to include prescriptions on the disclosure and content of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic School and Programme level information, Partnership and awarding body information. 	29/01/16	Head of Brand & Marketing	<p>The revised Public Information Policy (PIP), documentation that recently underwent evaluation has been distributed to key stake holders for updates to academic and service area policy and procedures contributions. The document has been reviewed and proposed changes have been made to evolve the internal PIP. [13-a]</p> <p>This policy adopted by the Marketing teams governs all materials for both online and offline channels, from both a design and content viewpoint (current content updates) and new content for programmes, course structures, news and information relating to each of the group's brands. Any new marketing communications materials (including but not exclusive to; websites, landing pages, e-shots, brochures, factsheets, banners, pop-up stands, exhibition stands, outdoor media and promotional merchandise) that are created. Any changes to marketing communications across all channels and the creation of new marketing communications are all logged in a central spreadsheet by the relevant teams with a unique job number, job description, sign-off from the relevant academic person (where applicable) and where necessary partners when the brand is using their logo or corporate identity.</p> <p>Each and every brand item is then signed off by the HOB&M (with the exception of LCCA where they have delegated responsibility to sign-off, in line with the overall PIP).</p> <p>The process, however, also relies upon information from Academics, School Heads and other areas of the business to inform changes/amendments or out of date information through the formalised briefing process, as previously stated.</p>	<p>Public Information Policy (To be presented to APAD February 10th, 2016 for formal approval)</p> <p>Email Evidence – QAA/FBT Website Updated</p>	13-a	018	

					<p>The policy currently undergoes an annual evaluation process by the Head of Brand and Marketing, in order for the organisation to assure itself of the accuracy and completeness of the PIP. A follow up evaluation in July will provide final confirmation of the PIP and related documentation, with an update report submitted for consideration and approval by the Academic Planning and Development Committee (APAD) on Wednesday 6th July. APAD will formally submit an overview report of the PIP for consideration and approval by Academic Board on 13/05/16</p> <p>The Annual Quality Enhancement Conference on Thursday 7th July 2016 will include a 'roll out' of the revised PIP with confirmation of appropriate staff development training prior to formal release and implementation.</p>						
<p>New commentary from 29th July 2016</p> <p>The Public Information Policy (PIP) has undergone review, evaluation and development, led by the Head of Brand and Marketing, the Academic Quality Manager and supported by the Policy Working Group (PWG). Throughout this process amendments and revisions have been continually updated resulting in the draft document being presented to the Academic Planning and Development Committee (APAD) on 11th July, 2016. Further review concluded that additional amendments were required to Part 3 paragraph 13 and Part 4 information for existing students. It was agreed that due to the extent of these amendments that the policy would undergo further consultation and review at the forthcoming APAD meeting in August 17th.</p> <p>The revision process of the PIP continues, however, evaluation and oversight is secure, which will result in the document being fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy. In addition, website issues have been addressed, and therefore LSBF/FBT conclude that the risk is Low.</p>					Draft Policy as before	13-a	Low	Saliency is Low as evaluation processes are secure			
<p>UK Quality Code - Expectation Enhancement <i>Deliberate steps are being taken at provider level to improve the quality of students' learning opportunities</i></p>											
	QAA – HER Recommendations	Action	Deadline	Staff Lead Responsibility	Commentary	Evidence					
14	Develop and implement a strategy for the enhancement of student learning opportunities in order to ensure that it is deliberate and systematic; and embed this strategy at all levels of the College (Enhancement)	The development and approval of an organisational driven strategy for enhancement, which can then be disseminated to all staff and students and structured to pervade delivery and reflection upon learning activities and learning outcomes	Dec 2015	Vice Rector	<p>A Strategic Enhancement Plan, promoting the enhancement of teaching & learning through employability, captures the organisation's commitment to improving the student learning experience and is driven by the aim of providing opportunities for individual development to support employment. [14-a]</p> <p>Central to this commitment is the process of identifying and reflecting upon learning experiences and national expectations in the area of curriculum delivery, employability and employer awareness. The plan is constituted of five 'expectations' which address programme design and delivery, externality in the curriculum, career management & self-evaluation, alumni development and understanding the global dimension.</p>	<p>Strategic Enhancement Plan</p> <p>SMT Minutes</p> <p>Enhancement Workshop Feb 18th LSBF Assessment Workshop A Alignment</p> <p>Enhancement Workshop Feb 18th Assessment Workshop B Verification</p> <p>Enhancement Workshop Attendees</p>	14-a	14-b	044-a	044-b	044-c

					The plan has undergone dual consultation in the organisation, through academic development activities and the Senior Management Team (SMT) chaired by the Rector. The plan has undergone formal consideration at the Quality Committee and approval by Academic Board.				
		To ensure that the Strategic Enhancement Plan is embedded in the organisation's behaviours and development, particularly the Teaching & Learning activities	20/02/16	Senior Management Team	The Learning, Teaching & Assessment Committee (LTAC), has been tasked with the operational and implementation activities of the expectations against the prescribed indicators in each expectation. LTAC has recently appointed a new Chair, who has recently undergone briefing by the Vice Rector and Director of Quality & Standards, confirming that LTAC will implement a meeting schedule for early development activities to be explored for discussion and 'roll out' at the Annual Quality Enhancement Conference on Thursday July 7 th 2016 and considered by the Quality Committee and Academic Board on 13 th July 2016	Board of Governance minutes available July 2016	-		
	<p>New commentary from 29th July 2016 - Strategies for the Enhancement of Student Learning Opportunities</p> <p>Following on from the above commentary, the second LSBF/FBT Annual Quality Enhancement Conference took place on the 12th July 2016 at St Patrick's College Holborn London. The conference theme of '<i>Student Enhancement through Employability</i>' was, once again, supported by Dr Ian Tunbridge OBE (Former Deputy VC Thames Valley University) and Tom Cantwell FHEA, (QAA Higher Education Reviewer), exploring a range of enhancement strategies in support of addressing the <i>Student Employability</i> agenda and outlining the future context of the higher education landscape– in addition, higher education consultant, Caroline Guirr, completed the external support team, jointly delivering aspects of the workshop – '<i>The Invisible Module,</i>' and facilitating the break-out sessions, along with the LSBF/FBT Director of Quality & Standards and Quality Directorate Officers.</p> <p>Importantly, the conference was attended by a wide range of academic delivery staff, academic managers, service area staff and senior managers, demonstrating organisational commitment to progressing the 'Enhancement' agenda. Dr Tunbridge's keynote address, '<i>Competition & Choice in Higher Education,</i>' however, brought into sharp focus the issues facing the Alternative/ Private Provider sector – current NSS outcomes confirm consistently lower performance measured against teaching quality, assessment, academic support, organisation & management, learning resources, personal development and overall satisfaction.</p> <p>Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee (LTAC)</p> <p>Two Learning Teaching and Assessment Committee (LTAC) meetings took place on 8th and 22nd June respectively with the LTAC chair presenting an update to the work of the committee at the Annual Quality Enhancement Conference on 12th July, 2016. The following schedule for further LTAC meetings was agreed from September to December including 27.09.16, 25.10.16, 22.11.16 and 14.12.16.</p> <p>The Chair of LTAC, Syed Muhammad, in attendance at the LSBF/FBT Annual Quality Enhancement Conference on July 12th gave an overview presentation of the progress the group has made in addressing the precepts within the Strategic Enhancement Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic enhancement plan was shared with attendees and explained by the head of quality • A template around the strategic enhancement themes was developed to capture and identify activities already taking place and identify any gaps to enhance learning and teaching through employability • The template was shared with colleagues for discussion on the 22nd June in LTAC meeting • LTAC discussed the strategic enhancement plan and template in detail, received good comments and contribution from colleagues during the meeting • Colleagues to use the template and develop and make any suggestions but also identify employability enhancing activities • LTAC decided to choose employee lead in each school for the implementation of strategic enhancement plan 					<p>Annual Quality Enhancement Conference Programme</p> <p>Annual Quality Enhancement Conference notes/minutes</p>	<p>056-k</p> <p>056-l</p>	Medium	Salience is Medium contingent on current and short term future outputs

- Vocations school nominated Lee Yi as an employee lead
- LCCA and Business school will confirm their employee lead

Evidence Outcomes 29th July, 2016

The following activities currently used to enhance teaching and learning through employability were identified

Employability activities (Internal)

- Subject focussed modules
- Practical Work
- PDP
- Careers Centre activities, workshops
- Careers interviews for students
- Careers Fairs

Employability activities (External)

- Employability skills part of module design (curriculum benchmark statements and employer requirements)
- Guest speakers from industry
- Industry experts involved with the delivery
- internships
- Collaboration with employers in curriculum design

It is acknowledged that the work of the LTAC Committee, its effectiveness and impact, in addressing the five precepts within the Strategic Enhancement Plan will only become apparent as the organisation moves into the Autumn period from September through to December. The Quality Directorate, continues to support the work of LTAC, updating the Senior Management Team, on a fortnightly basis, on progress with both the Action Plan and Strategic Enhancement Plan.

The Annual Quality Enhancement Conference, a key and deliberate organisational initiative confirms the commitment to continuously improving and enhancing the student experience through the provision of appropriate resources ensuring relevant external input from high level, practicing professionals. This input, along with the previously documented focused staff development programme, covering key sector strategies and current academic practice is recognised by students, academic staff and managers as a key enhancement to the currency of the design and delivery of provision and support for students.

The organisation is, however, realistic in its current evaluation of the Medium saliency of risk attributed to this area, but is confident that its significant and deliberate collective efforts, going forward, will ensure that enhancement practices are secure and consequently of a low risk nature.

