

# Higher Education Review:

## Third Year Findings 2015-16



# Contents

<b>Executive summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>About Higher Education Review</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Impact and follow-up actions by providers</b>	<b>3</b>
Case study: QAA review improving the student experience	3
<b>The higher education providers reviewed</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>What students think of their higher education</b>	<b>5</b>
Accuracy of advance information	5
Assessment and feedback	5
Academic support	5
Teaching quality	5
Case study: Comprehensive approach to student feedback	5
<b>Findings on higher education institutions</b>	<b>6</b>
What's working well	6
Case study: Tackling the attainment gap	7
What could be improved	7
<b>Findings on college higher education</b>	<b>9</b>
What's working well	9
Case study: Transitioning students successfully to higher education	10
What could be improved	10
<b>Review themes</b>	<b>11</b>
Student employability	11
Digital literacy	11
Case study: A major player in the development of the local area	12
<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Background information</b>	<b>13</b>
The Quality Assurance Agency	13
The Quality Code	13
<b>Appendix 2: Providers reviewed</b>	<b>14</b>
Higher education institutions	14
Further education colleges	15
<b>Appendix 3: Amended judgements</b>	<b>17</b>

# Executive summary

From 2013 to 2016 the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) reviewed how providers of UK higher education maintained standards and quality via Higher Education Review (HER). The reports of our peer reviews inform students and others about the quality of teaching and learning at UK higher education providers.

This report analyses the findings of the 93 HERs conducted in 2015–16, the final year of HER. HER was the review method for higher education institutions (HEIs) and further education colleges (FECs) in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Introduced in 2013–14, HER uses the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the Quality Code) as the reference point for judgements.

HER has played an important role in protecting the interests of students and guarding the international reputation of UK higher education. It will continue to do so for students studying at alternative providers.

## Key findings

Overall, just over 80 per cent of providers reviewed in 2015–16 received satisfactory outcomes. Around 15 per cent of providers received one or more commendations.

HEIs performed well: a quarter received one or more commendations, a similar proportion to the 2014–15 cohort.

FECs' performance is mixed: around 30 per cent received one or more unsatisfactory judgement(s), and around 15 per cent received one or more commendation(s). Note that across the three years of HER 168 FECs have been reviewed; almost 30 per cent of this cohort received one or more unsatisfactory judgements.

In addition, 18 providers had previously unsatisfactory judgements amended following improvements to the student experience. All but one of these were FECs.

Larger colleges tend to perform better than those with fewer than 300 higher education students. Around a quarter of recommendations colleges received concerned courses that led to Pearson awards, such as Higher National Certificates and Diplomas (HNC/Ds).

HEIs are generally making better use of data to improve the student experience, but this is an area of development for FECs.

Educating students in partnership with others (such as, but not limited to, validation and franchise arrangements) remains an area of relative weakness for all providers, alongside information about higher education.

For a more thorough understanding of each HER, and the learning QAA review offers the provider in question and the higher education sector in general, see the individual review reports.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at: [www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews-and-reports](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews-and-reports).

# About Higher Education Review

From 2013 to 2016 HER assured quality and standards at publicly funded higher education providers in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. From September 2016 QAA will assure the quality of new entrants into the higher education system and verify providers' approach to their own review processes.<sup>2</sup>

HER makes judgements about four aspects of quality and standards.

For academic standards, judgements are expressed as:

- meets UK expectations
- requires improvement to meet UK expectations
- does not meet UK expectations.

For the other three areas - learning opportunities, information and enhancement - judgements are expressed as:

- commended
- meets UK expectations
- requires improvement to meet UK expectations
- does not meet UK expectations.

'Requires improvement to meet' and 'does not meet' are unsatisfactory judgements.

Separate review judgements (known as differentiated judgements) can apply to different aspects of a provider's education. For example, a university may receive a 'meets UK expectations' judgement for the learning opportunities available to undergraduate students, but a different judgement for the learning opportunities available to postgraduates.<sup>3</sup>

Students are at the heart of HER. They are full members of the review team. Students also contribute a student submission, meet the review team and work with their provider to improve their education in response to review outcomes.<sup>4</sup>

In England and Northern Ireland HER includes a thematic element, which is explored later in this report.

---

2 See [www.hefce.ac.uk/reg/QualityAssessment/](http://www.hefce.ac.uk/reg/QualityAssessment/) for further details about the revised operating model for quality assessment.

3 Differentiated judgements are considered unsatisfactory judgements in the data that follow.

4 More information on how to get involved in quality assurance and the enhancement of higher education is available at: [www.qaa.ac.uk/partners/students](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/partners/students).

# Impact and follow-up actions by providers

HER also identifies areas of good practice and makes recommendations for improvement. When judgements are unsatisfactory, providers must publish an action plan setting out how they will respond to the recommendations (and so improve academic practice and/or the student experience).

Where the judgements are unsatisfactory, the provider must satisfy the review team that it has addressed the recommendations within 12 months of the publication of the review report.

Once the review team is satisfied that remedial action has been carried out, the QAA Board decides whether a judgement can be amended to 'meets UK expectations'.

Eighteen providers had previously unsatisfactory judgements changed following remedial action by the provider (see Appendix 3 for full list). All but one of these were FECs.<sup>5</sup>

HER improves students' education and enhances academic practice. To illustrate this we have developed a number of case studies<sup>6</sup> that illustrate good practice in more detail.

## Case study: QAA review improving the student experience

### College of North West London

QAA has monitored the College of North West London for over a year as it improved weaknesses in students' education. While the College received an unsatisfactory judgement in its first HER, the QAA Board has now amended that decision to 'meets UK expectations'.

In the meantime, the College has made good progress in improving the student experience. This includes introducing a more formal structure for students' voices to be heard and acted on: QAA's review team found that provision is now made for students who are unable to attend college meetings to submit issues in advance. The College also employs a range of mechanisms to collect student feedback and has provided guidance on how student feedback should be used to improve courses.

The College now makes better use of data to monitor and improve the student experience; good practice is identified, monitored and its effectiveness evaluated. A more systematic approach to higher education staff development is also in place.

---

<sup>5</sup> The initial review findings for Peter Symonds and Stoke on Trent College are included in this report. The 16 other unsatisfactory judgements have been considered in previous HER findings reports and therefore excluded from the data and analysis considered here.

<sup>6</sup> Available at: [www.qaa.ac.uk/improving-higher-education/good-practice](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/improving-higher-education/good-practice).

# The higher education providers reviewed

This report considers the findings from the reviews of 93 higher education providers in England, Wales and Northern Ireland that were published by QAA by 5 September 2016.<sup>7</sup> This cohort comprises 32 HEIs and 61 FECs. These providers offer a diverse range of educational provision in terms of size, mission, institutional type and the curriculum offered.

The reviews provide standardised and comparable information about the quality of students' education. This enables themes and issues to be identified across the higher education sector - what the sector is doing well and where it is strong, and where the student experience needs to be improved.

Across the three years of HER there have been 227 reviews consisting of 58 HEIs, 168 FECs and one private college. This is around half of the HEIs and FECs that teach higher education students in England, Northern Ireland and Wales.<sup>8</sup>

During this period 97 per cent of HEIs received satisfactory review outcomes in all areas, and around 30 per cent received commendations. In contrast 70 per cent of FECs received satisfactory outcomes in all areas, and 12 per cent received commendations.<sup>9</sup>

---

7 The outcomes of five FECs (Gower College Swansea, Macclesfield College, South Essex College of Further and Higher Education, The City of Liverpool College and Tower Hamlets College) and one HEI (University of Plymouth) reviewed in 2015-16 are not included as their reports were published after 5 September 2016.

8 For England see the HEFCE register [www.hefce.ac.uk/reg/register/](http://www.hefce.ac.uk/reg/register/); for Wales see [www.hefcw.ac.uk/](http://www.hefcw.ac.uk/) and for Northern Ireland see [www.delni.gov.uk/](http://www.delni.gov.uk/).

9 Data have been derived from published initial review judgements.

# What students think of their higher education

Alongside being full members of HER teams, students also contribute a student submission to the review team. Students tell us that they value:

- accurate information
- different assessment methods and consistency in feedback
- reliable and predictable academic support.

## Accuracy of advance information

Students are generally satisfied with the accuracy and quality of the information they receive before entering university, but there is some concern about hidden costs, such as additional payments for field trips, and timetabling restrictions.

## Assessment and feedback

There is strong support from students for a variety of assessment methods. However assessment is carried out, students appreciate consistency in its application across different faculties and departments. They value high quality feedback.

## Academic support

Students value reliable, consistent and fair support systems to help them become independent learners. Examples include personal tutors and high quality feedback.

## Teaching quality

Subject enthusiasm appears to be more valued by students than whether or not their tutors are trained or have formal teaching qualifications.

There also appears to be an increase in (and influence of) student-led teaching awards.

In one FEC there were complaints that lecturers were not familiar with the subjects they were teaching.

## Case study: Comprehensive approach to student feedback

### Liverpool John Moores University

The University has reviewed and enhanced its student survey processes in recent years. Student survey results are now incorporated into annual course monitoring and considered by the University.

Another recent student feedback mechanism is a module evaluation pilot. This evaluates how best to complete internal module appraisals at institutional level, where current paper-based and online module feedback tools were compared in several schools.

The trial was evaluated and reported to the institutional Learning and Teaching Development Group. Students whom the review team met, at all levels and from both home and collaborative provision, were able to give examples of how their feedback has been received and responded to. Examples include a 15-day turnaround for feedback, uploading lecturer slides to the virtual learning environment and improved teaching.

# Findings on higher education institutions

HEIs have consistently performed well in HER. This year a quarter of the 32 HEIs received one or more commendations, a similar proportion to the 2014-15 cohort.

The reviews capture a range of excellent practice that systematically improves the student experience. HEIs tend to adopt an institution-wide approach to enhancement, typified by investment in staff and a learning environment that is underpinned by a continuous review of policy and practice.

## What's working well

HEIs are particularly strong in the enhancement judgement: the majority of commendations were received in this judgement area. Liverpool John Moores University and the University of Birmingham also received commendations for learning opportunities.

Institution	Academic standards	Quality of student learning opportunities	Information	Enhancement
Liverpool Hope University	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Commended
Liverpool John Moores University	Meets UK expectations	Commended	Meets UK expectations	Commended
Plymouth College of Art	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Commended
University of Birmingham	Meets UK expectations	Commended	Meets UK expectations	Commended
University of Hull	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Commended
University of Nottingham	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Commended
University of Sunderland	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Commended
University of Winchester	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Commended

Good practice was most frequently found in the enhancement judgement, followed by the Quality Code, *Chapter B3: Learning and Teaching*; *Chapter B4: Enabling Student Development and Achievement*; and *Chapter B5: Student Engagement*.



## Case study: Tackling the attainment gap

### University of Hertfordshire

Central to the University of Hertfordshire's Student Experience Strategy is an inclusive approach to teaching. The University has made progress in closing the attainment gap between white, black and minority ethnic students - a sector-wide challenge.

The University has set an objective to reduce the attainment gap by 10 per cent.

The review team heard that this gap has been reduced by seven per cent: anonymous marking and staff development focusing on unconscious bias have all played a part. This is, however, still work in progress. The University is working with other institutions tackling similar issues, continuing to develop its mentoring schemes, and working with local employers to help inspire students and provide role models in its efforts to reduce the attainment gap.

Teaching is valued in HEIs and staff are generally incentivised to improve as teachers. Newcastle University's review, for example, found comprehensive support and career opportunities for teaching excellence. Some HEIs use teacher and supervisor awards to recognise good practice; others a commitment to equality and diversity in recruitment.

A number of HEIs have begun to make better use of data to support improvements in learning and teaching. The University of Sunderland, for example, collects and analyses the responses its students give to at least five national surveys, alongside internal questionnaires and feedback.

Universities are generally good at communicating with and engaging students in their learning. Feedback opportunities include staff-student consultative committees and groups.

### What could be improved

The largest volume of recommendations focused on the Quality Code Part A: Setting and Maintaining Academic Standards; *Chapter B10: Managing Higher Education Provision with Others*; *Chapter B6: Assessment of Students and the Recognition of Prior Learning*; and Part C: Information about Higher Education Provision.

The reviews find that some providers are rethinking their partnership arrangements. While many changes are handled well and provide a useful learning experience - for example the University of Liverpool's termination of a partnership with Istanbul Bilgi University - the reviews find some elements of the Quality Code are not always followed. This can result in a poor student experience.

This concurs with the evidence from previous review cycles. Partnerships with others to deliver education - such as franchise, validation and dual awards - are an area of relative weakness for the sector. To illustrate this, both Manchester Metropolitan University and Middlesex University were required to strengthen their oversight of academic partners.

Transnational Education (TNE)<sup>10</sup> is also covered under the Quality Code, *Chapter B10*. A recent report, *The Scale and Scope of UK Higher Education Transnational Education*,<sup>11</sup> found that quality assurance is a major challenge for universities, regulators and policymakers. Issues include cultural divisions and 'partner colleges (agents) having different objectives...from the awarding UK universities (principals)'.

---

<sup>10</sup> The provision of education from institutions in one country to students in another.

<sup>11</sup> *The Scale and Scope of UK Higher Education Transnational Education* available at: [www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Pages/scale-and-scope-of-uk-he-tne.aspx](http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Pages/scale-and-scope-of-uk-he-tne.aspx)

In that context, the reviews find that several HEIs are developing new TNE partnerships. Examples include Lancaster University's partnership with the Goenka Educational Trust in New Delhi, India, and the University of Sunderland's development in Trinidad. Recommendations focus on dual degrees, for example as delivered at the Surrey International Institute, located at the Dongbei University of Finance and Economics, and oversight of formal processes for monitoring of partnerships. Additional quality assurance of TNE takes place through separate QAA TNE Reviews.<sup>12</sup>

Trustworthy and accessible information about higher education helps students make informed decisions and get the most from their time at university or college.

HEIs also received a significant volume of recommendations (around 20 per cent) about the information they give to students. The Open University, for example, received a recommendation to publish full module descriptors and the University of East Anglia was required to communicate effectively to students – particularly information about learning outcomes at the start of, and throughout, their studies.

The reviews find that other areas for development in HEIs include the breadth of subject and supervisory expertise available to research students in some institutions. This broadly concurs with reviews undertaken by QAA Scotland in 2014.<sup>13</sup>

---

12 See, for example, our review of TNE in the Caribbean, available at: [www.qaa.ac.uk/en/ReviewsAndReports/Pages/TNE-Caribbean-2014.aspx](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/ReviewsAndReports/Pages/TNE-Caribbean-2014.aspx).

13 Available at: [www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/ELIR-Thematic-Outcome-report-2014.pdf](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/ELIR-Thematic-Outcome-report-2014.pdf) (PDF, 222kb).

# Findings on college higher education

The reviews find a wide range of performance in FECs: around 30 per cent received one or more unsatisfactory judgements, while 13 per cent received commended judgements.

Recent higher education reforms have changed the policy landscape, introducing a greater degree of marketisation into the sector. While some providers thrive in this context a number of FECs are facing significant recruitment challenges. The reviews find that just under a third see competition from other institutions as a major concern.

The recent area reviews of post-16 education and training institutions have affected several FECs in our cohort: three colleges in Cheshire will merge with Warrington Collegiate by 2018 to create a new FEC for Cheshire and Warrington; and South Staffordshire College will soon merge with Walsall College. As discussed earlier, some FECs are also having to manage change as HEIs consolidate their partnership arrangements.

## What's working well

Eight FECs (or 13 per cent of the cohort) received one or more commended judgements. These judgements are primarily for the enhancement of students' learning, although four also received commendations for the learning opportunities judgement. Runshaw College and The City of Liverpool College received commendations in both areas.

Institution	Academic standards	Quality of student learning opportunities	Information	Enhancement
Cleveland College of Art and Design	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Commended
Furness College	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Commended
Grŵp Llandrillo Menai	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Commended
Hull College	n/a	n/a	Meets UK expectations	Commended
Northbrook College Sussex	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations	Commended
Runshaw College	Meets UK expectations	Commended	Meets UK expectations	Commended
Ruskin College, Oxford	Meets UK expectations	Commended	Requires improvement	Meets UK expectations
The City of Liverpool College	Meets UK expectations	Commended	Meets UK expectations	Commended
Weston College	Meets UK expectations	Commended	Meets UK expectations	Meets UK expectations

High performing colleges ensure that their education is tailored to higher education students, make extensive use of the Quality Code, and recognise key differences from further education practice. Larger colleges tend to perform better than those with fewer than 300 higher education students. The reviews also suggest that many colleges are good at preparing students for the transition to higher education.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>14</sup> QAA research into the experience of (and best practice in supporting) students with diverse educational backgrounds is available at: [www.qaa.ac.uk/research/projects/published-research](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/research/projects/published-research).

## Case study: Transitioning students successfully to higher education

### Runshaw College

QAA's review team identified good practice in the College's approach to students' transition to higher education.

Runshaw College embarked on a long-term strategy to support transitions and develop student capacity for independence. It offers pre-enrolment and 'head start' activities to promote early engagement with the course. Tasks are subject related and flexible to allow students to engage as much or as little as they wish. They are then followed up and used by tutors as a diagnostic tool to identify students that need additional support.

The transition and independence message is also carried through in information, advice and guidance material provided to students at enrolment. Support includes a higher education newsletter, handbook and diary.

### What could be improved

The reviews find a wide range of performance in FECs. Those FECs with more systemic failings tend to lack a strategic approach to higher education. As a result they often have an insufficient awareness of, or engagement with, the Quality Code. The norms and expectations of a different regulatory framework, to which most are accustomed and geared - for example, alongside ad-hoc and informal approaches to student engagement, academic appeals and student complaints - often result in unsatisfactory learning opportunities judgements. The quality of learning and teaching is therefore mixed: some FECs offer an outstanding student experience, while other reviews find weak academic practice.

Recommendations were most frequently found in the Quality Code, Part C: Information about Higher Education; *Chapter B5: Student Engagement*; and *Chapter B8: Programme Monitoring and Review*. Some of the more significant concerns relate to weaknesses in academic governance, appeals and complaints, and students not being seen as partners in their education.

Six FECs received an unsatisfactory information judgement. To illustrate this, Tresham College received a recommendation to review and update its intranet to include reports and recommendations from external stakeholders. Website marketing material was a particular area of concern: Solihull College (for example) was advised to ensure that websites identify the awarding body for all qualifications.

While HEIs are making better use of data to improve teaching, there is evidence that FECs' capability is weaker. Review teams found instances where the information collated from annual monitoring, peer review, learning observations or external NSS data was not used to support learning and monitor performance.

Our reviews continue to find that programmes leading to HNCs and HNDs awarded by Pearson tend to be less well managed than programmes leading to awards from universities:<sup>15</sup> a quarter of recommendations received by FECs relate to Pearson qualifications. Three providers received differentiated judgements relating to their management of Pearson awards: Gateshead College, South Staffordshire College and Peter Symonds College.

<sup>15</sup> This was highlighted in the previous findings report - *Higher Education Review: Second Year Findings 2014-15*, available at: [www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/information-and-guidance/publication?PubID=2998#](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/information-and-guidance/publication?PubID=2998#).

# Review themes

The themes of student employability and digital literacy were considered by review teams. Welsh providers focused on the internationalisation agenda.

## Student employability

The majority of providers chose the student employability theme.

Universities and colleges have consistently shown a strategic commitment to (and investment in) students' employability. In 2015–16 around a third of good practice related to developing students' employability, relationships with employers and the world of work. There are many examples of vocationally relevant programmes that have benefited from employers being actively involved in the development and delivery of the curriculum.

Good practice by providers indicates that two complementary approaches to student employability are utilised, as follows.

- Firstly, embedding employability in the curriculum: providers develop programmes that meet the needs of industry and ensure that skills to enhance employability, for example, communication and critical thinking, are embedded in their courses.
- Secondly, working with employers. Work placements, paid internships, guest speaker arrangements and interviews are among the examples. The majority have developed employability strategies or employability features as part of their strategic plans.

An overview of employability practice is explored in more detail in our recent report *Employer Engagement: Emerging Practice from QAA Reviews*.<sup>16</sup>

## Digital literacy

Around a tenth of institutions chose the digital literacy theme. Responses tend to highlight physical initiatives such as digital facilities and equipment, for example a new virtual learning environment (Xaverian College), or building a new digital suite (Mid Cheshire College).

Others focused on supporting staff and students in the use of new and innovative media and techniques within the classroom (UCL), or online through distance learning. The Open University has developed a digital and information literacy framework that supports online communities. Recommendations include better use of social media and ensuring that legacy material is effectively archived.

---

<sup>16</sup> *Employer Engagement: Emerging Practice from QAA Reviews*, available at: [www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/Employer-Engagement-Report.pdf](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/Employer-Engagement-Report.pdf) (PDF, 222kb).

## Case study: A major player in the development of the local area

### Furness College

Furness College received a commendation for the enhancement of student learning opportunities.

The College has a partnership arrangement with BAE Systems, a global defence, aerospace and security company. The College has in place a specific Business and Employer Support Team, which handles the overall account management for BAE, including apprentices, higher education and commercial business. A member of College staff spends time on site at BAE, and BAE has also recruited a manager who is permanently based at the College. This demonstrates the value each organisation places on the contract and the importance of supporting students' learning.

The College has also used local, national and bespoke data to develop an economic growth plan in partnership with employers and the local council.

## Conclusions

The third year of HER marks the end of cyclical review in England and Northern Ireland for HEIs and FECs.<sup>17</sup> Around half the providers in England, Northern Ireland and Wales have undergone HER in its three years of operation: 227 reviews consisting of 58 HEIs, 168 FECs and one private college.

In contrast to previous QAA review methods, HER has provided a common review method for all types of providers - whether university, college or alternative provider - thereby offering a level playing field to assess quality and standards.

HEIs have consistently performed well in HER: only two of the 58 HEIs reviewed since 2013 have received an unsatisfactory judgement; and over a quarter of HEIs have received one or more commendations. Over the same time period around 30 per cent of FECs have consistently received one or more unsatisfactory judgements, and 12 per cent have received one or more commendations across the same time period.

Given this finding we have supported and developed college higher education. We are (for example) working with the Association of Colleges to embed a culture of scholarship in FECs. Our *College Higher Education Toolkit* aims to build colleges' understanding of and engagement with the Quality Code.<sup>18</sup>

Alongside weaknesses, the reviews also highlight the excellent education and an outstanding student experience that is available across the sector (and not just in HEIs).

Our reviews have achieved this by sharing best practice; embedding students in their learning so that systematic improvements are made to their education; improving poor practice where weaknesses are found; and helping providers test and benchmark their quality processes.

---

17 The Higher Education Funding Council for Wales is consulting on the detail of the external quality review that will be required under the Quality Assurance Framework for Wales: [www.hefcw.ac.uk/documents/publications/circulars/circulars\\_2016/W16%2036HE%20Consultation%20on%20external%20assurance%20of%20quality%20regulated%20institutions.pdf](http://www.hefcw.ac.uk/documents/publications/circulars/circulars_2016/W16%2036HE%20Consultation%20on%20external%20assurance%20of%20quality%20regulated%20institutions.pdf) (PDF, 181KB).

18 QAA *College Higher Education Toolkit: Engaging with the UK Quality Code for Higher Education*, available at: [www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/College-Higher-Education-Toolkit-0515.pdf](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/College-Higher-Education-Toolkit-0515.pdf) (PDF, 222kb).

# Appendix 1: Background information

## The Quality Assurance Agency

The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) is the independent agency dedicated to safeguarding standards and improving the quality of UK higher education wherever it is delivered around the world. We act in the public interest for the benefit of students and support universities and colleges in providing the best possible student learning experience. We publish reports on higher education providers, the Quality Code, and other guidance.

## The Quality Code

QAA maintains and publishes the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the Quality Code). It ensures that higher education is comparable and consistent at a threshold level across the UK.

QAA review teams use the Quality Code as a benchmark for judging whether a higher education provider meets UK expectations for the core elements of the review.

A judgement that a provider 'does not meet' or 'requires improvement to meet' UK expectations for academic standards (for example) means that the provider is deemed to have failed the review.

# Appendix 2: Providers reviewed

## Higher education institutions

- 1 Aberystwyth University
- 2 Bishop Grosseteste University
- 3 Brunel University London
- 4 King's College London
- 5 Lancaster University
- 6 Liverpool Hope University
- 7 Liverpool John Moores University
- 8 Manchester Metropolitan University
- 9 Middlesex University
- 10 Open University
- 11 Plymouth College of Art
- 12 Queen's University Belfast
- 13 Teesside University
- 14 University College London
- 15 University of Birmingham
- 16 University of Bristol
- 17 University of Derby
- 18 University of Durham
- 19 University of East Anglia
- 20 University of Hertfordshire
- 21 University of Hull
- 22 University of Leicester
- 23 University of Liverpool
- 24 University of Newcastle upon Tyne
- 25 University of Northampton
- 26 University of Nottingham
- 27 University of Oxford
- 28 University of Sunderland
- 29 University of Surrey
- 30 University of the West of England, Bristol
- 31 University of Wales: Trinity St David
- 32 University of Winchester



## Further education colleges

- 1 Activate Learning
- 2 Barnfield College
- 3 Bath College
- 4 Bedford College
- 5 Bexhill College
- 6 Birmingham Metropolitan College
- 7 Bishop Auckland College
- 8 Bury College
- 9 Central Bedfordshire College
- 10 Cirencester College
- 11 City College Brighton and Hove
- 12 Cleveland College of Art and Design
- 13 Furness College
- 14 Gateshead College
- 15 Grantham College
- 16 Grŵp Llandrillo Menai
- 17 Halesowen College
- 18 Harrow College
- 19 Hull College
- 20 Leeds City College Group
- 21 Leicester College
- 22 Mid-Cheshire College of Further Education
- 23 Milton Keynes College
- 24 Moulton College
- 25 Neath Port Talbot College
- 26 New College Stamford
- 27 Newbury College
- 28 Newcastle-under-Lyme College
- 29 Newham College of Further Education
- 30 North Shropshire College
- 31 North Warwickshire and Hinckley College
- 32 Northampton College
- 33 Northbrook College Sussex
- 34 Northern College
- 35 Peter Symmonds College
- 36 Plumpton College

- 37 Preston College trading as Prestons College
- 38 Richmond Adult Community College
- 39 Runshaw College
- 40 Ruskin College, Oxford
- 41 Seevic College
- 42 Solihull College
- 43 South Cheshire College
- 44 South Staffordshire College
- 45 Southport College
- 46 St Mary's College Blackburn
- 47 Stafford College
- 48 Stoke on Trent College
- 49 Sunderland College
- 50 Tresham College
- 51 Truro and Penwith College
- 52 Wakefield College
- 53 Warwickshire College
- 54 West Cheshire College
- 55 West Nottinghamshire College
- 56 West Thames College
- 57 Weston College
- 58 Weymouth College
- 59 Wiltshire College
- 60 Xaverian College
- 61 Yeovil College

## Appendix 3: Amended judgements

<b>Provider</b>	<b>Year initial review report published</b>	<b>Final amended judgements</b>
Carlisle College	2013-14	meets UK Expectations
City College Coventry	2014-15	meets UK Expectations
City College Norwich	2014-15	meets UK Expectations
East Durham College	2014-15	meets UK Expectations
Fareham College	2014-15	meets UK Expectations
Greenwich Community College	2014-15	meets UK Expectations
Hartlepool Sixth Form College	2014-15	meets UK Expectations
Henley College Coventry	2013-14	meets UK Expectations
LeSoCo	2014-15	meets UK Expectations
Lincoln College	2014-15	meets UK Expectations
Peter Symonds College	2015-16	meets UK Expectations
South Downs College	2014-15	meets UK Expectations
Southampton City College	2014-15	meets UK Expectations
South & City College Birmingham	2014-15	meets UK Expectations
South Leicestershire College	2014-15	meets UK Expectations
St Mary's University, Twickenham	2014-15	meets UK Expectations
St Vincent College	2014-15	meets UK Expectations
Stoke on Trent College	2015-16	meets UK Expectations

QAA 1778 - Dec 2016

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2016  
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB

Tel: 01452 557 050

Website: [www.qaa.ac.uk](http://www.qaa.ac.uk)

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786