



Quality and Standards Review for Providers Registered with the Office for Students

The Windsor Forest Colleges Group

September 2019

Contents

Summary of findings and reasons	1
About this report.....	4
About The Windsor Forest Colleges Group.....	5
The Windsor Forest Colleges Group and Pearson Education Ltd: Responsibilities	6
How the review was conducted.....	7
Explanation of findings	9
Q1 The provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system	9
Q5 The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.....	16
Q6 The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students	21
Q9 The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.....	26
Annex 1.....	31

Summary of findings and reasons

Ref	Core practice	Outcome	Confidence	Summary of reasons
Q1	The provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system.	Met	High	The College Group has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system. This is evidenced through the College Group's clear and comprehensive Higher Education Admissions Policy which provides detailed guidance on the application and selection processes, which is also clearly outlined in the policy as a flowchart. The standardised admissions procedure with evidence-based paper trail and the robust processes to monitor and review the implementation of the policy demonstrate that the College Group's admissions system is reliable and fair. The admissions system is inclusive because the admissions policy is informed by the Access and Participation Statement and details the College Group's approach to supporting applicants, especially applicants with disabilities or learning difficulties. The admissions policy makes explicit reference to the opportunity for an applicant to complain about the admissions process or to appeal a decision not to offer a place. Information for applicants is transparent, accessible and fit for purpose. The admissions requirements set out in programme specifications are consistent with the Admissions Policy. Sampled admissions records demonstrate that the College Group's admissions policy is implemented in practice and reliable and fair admissions decisions were made for the applicants. Staff involved in the admissions process demonstrated a clear understanding of their role and clearly explained how they are appropriately skilled and supported. Students tend to agree that the admissions system is reliable, fair and inclusive. The review team, therefore, concludes that the Core practice is met.
Q5	The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their	Met	High	The College Group actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience. This is because the College Group has clear approaches to engaging students in the quality of their experience, through collecting

	educational experience.			<p>student feedback from surveys, focus groups and student liaison committee meetings, having Student Unions, and having student representation on key committees and groups. Given that the detailed policies and procedures to engaging students individually and collectively are in place, and the consideration of student feedback in committee meetings are minuted and reflected in the meeting and review reports, the review team considered the College Group's approach to student engagement to be credible and robust. Both staff and students provided many examples of the College Group changing and improving students' learning experience as a result of student engagement. Students reported in the student submission and the meeting that the College Group engages them in the quality of their educational experience. The review team, therefore, concludes that the Core practice is met.</p>
Q6	The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students.	Met	High	<p>The College Group has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students. This is because the College Group's complaints policy clearly explains what process should be followed within the College Group or when they should be escalated to the relevant validating universities or the OIA, and the timescale for each stage. To handle academic appeals from Pearson programmes, the College Group's Pearson Academic Appeal Procedure explains the grounds for appeal, the process followed within the College Group, the personnel responsible at each stage and relevant timescales. All academic appeals from university-validated programmes are referred to the university partners for investigation and determination using their regulations and procedures. Given that detailed procedures for handling and monitoring complaints and appeals are in place, and information for students making complaints and appeals is clear and accessible, the review team concluded that the College Group has credible, robust and evidence-based approaches for developing and operating fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals, which are accessible to all students. The</p>

				<p>College Group reported that no academic appeal was received and only one complaint was received from the full-time programmes over the last three years. The review team confirmed that the complaint had been dealt in a fair, transparent and timely manner, in line with the process outlined in the Complaints Policy. Students who met the team had no experience of making complaints or appeals, but they were aware of different procedures in making complaints and academic appeals and where to access the procedure documents and forms. The review team, therefore, concludes that the Core practice is met.</p>
Q9	The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.	Met	High	<p>The College Group supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. The College Group's approaches to supporting students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes are explained in the Higher Education Guidance, the Careers and Employability action plan and the Quality framework. The Quality framework also specifies the College Group's approach to identifying and monitoring the needs of individual students. Given that detailed policies and procedures for student support are in place and the effectiveness of student support services is monitored and reviewed within the quality cycle, the review team considered that the College Group's approaches to supporting students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes are credible and robust. Assessed student work provides evidence that the feedback given to students is comprehensive, timely and helpful in supporting their further development. Students tend to agree that they are adequately supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. Both academic and professional support staff demonstrated a clear understanding of their roles in supporting student achievement and explained a range of staff development opportunities in supporting their roles. The review team, therefore, concludes that the Core practice is met.</p>

About this report

This is a report detailing the outcomes of the Quality and Standards Review for monitoring and intervention conducted by QAA in September, 2019 for The Windsor Forest Colleges Group.

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

At the OfS's request, this review focused on the following Core practices:

- Q1: The provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system.
- Q5: The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.
- Q6: The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students.
- Q9: The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.

The focus of this report is full-time undergraduate students at all levels of study.

The review team for this review was:

Name: Dr Anne Harbisher

Institution: Staffordshire University

Role in review team: Institutional and subject reviewer Education and Teaching

Name: Mr Ben Hunt

Institution: University for the Creative Arts

Role in review team: Student reviewer

Name: Emeritus Professor Diane Meehan

Institution: formerly Liverpool John Moores University

Role in review team: Institutional and subject reviewer Computing

Name: Dr Nina Seppala

Institution: University College London

Role in review team: Subject reviewer Business and Management

The QAA Officer for the review was: Dr Yue Song.

The size and composition of this review team is in line with published guidance and, as such, is comprised of experts with significant experience and expertise across the higher education sector. The team included members with experience of a similar provider to the institution, knowledge of the academic awards offered and included academics with expertise in subject areas relevant to the provider's provision. Collectively, the team had

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

About The Windsor Forest Colleges Group

The Windsor Forest Colleges Group (the College Group) was formed in May 2017 through a merger of Strode's College and East Berkshire College. The College Group has three main college sites situated in Langley, Egham and Windsor. Across the three colleges, the College Group offers a broad range of provision from entry level to degree for 16-18-year-olds and adults. In 2018-19 the College Group had 2,830 16-18-year-olds, 2,300 adults, 450 apprentices and 192 higher education students. At the time of the visit, its full-time higher education provision consisted of 83 students and was primarily based at Langley College.

The College Group has a Higher Education Steering Group (HESG), comprising the Principal, the assistant principals, higher education quality manager, directors and heads of departments based at each college. HESG is responsible for all academic matters relating to higher education. It reports directly to the College Group's Curriculum and Quality team, which reports to the Senior Leadership Team and the Curriculum and Quality Committee of the governing body [012].

The College Group offers 11 higher education programmes that are validated by four universities and Pearson and delivers across seven subject areas. The following higher education courses offered by the College Group during the 2018-19 and 2019-20 academic sessions are within the scope of this review.

Full-time higher education provision	Degree awarding body/organisation	2018-19 number of full-time students
HND Business	Pearson	9
HNC/D Computing Systems Development	Pearson	8
HNC/D General/Aeronautical Engineering	Pearson	9
HNC/D Performing Arts	Pearson	6
HNC Visual Merchandising	Pearson	3
Foundation Degree in Children's Development and Learning	University of Reading	10
Foundation Degree in Working with Children and Young People	University of West London	0
Foundation Degree in Tourism and Hospitality	University College Birmingham	9

The HNC/D Performing Arts, the HNC Visual Merchandising and the Foundation Degree in Tourism and Hospitality stopped recruiting full-time students for the 2019-20 academic

session. The Foundation Degree in Working with Children and Young People, which was a part-time provision in 2018-19, has changed to a full-time provision in 2019-20.

The College Group does not have degree awarding powers. Its higher education partnership arrangements, which fall within the scope of this review, involve three universities and Pearson as detailed in the table below.

Programme type	Awarding institution	Ways of working
Foundation degree (only in scope for 2019-20)	University of West London	Partnership validation
Foundation degree	University College Birmingham	Partnership validation
Foundation degree	University of Reading	Partnership validation
HND and HNC	Pearson - nationally-approved QCF/RQF programmes	College directly funded

The Windsor Forest Colleges Group and Pearson Education Ltd: Responsibilities

The Windsor Forest Colleges Group offers five Higher National programmes in the scope of this review that lead to an award from Pearson Education Ltd (Pearson).

Pearson is an awarding organisation that has its qualifications, examinations and assessments regulated by the Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation (Ofqual). As an awarding organisation Pearson creates Ofqual-regulated curricula (which include detailed learning outcomes) as well as programme specifications and handbooks. Pearson also issue certificates to students, when providers submit evidence that their students have completed the relevant programme of study, to the standard required.

Pearson devolves responsibility for the recruitment, teaching, support and assessment of students to providers and uses information gained from the initial approval and subsequent external examiner visits to determine if the relevant sector-recognised standards continue to be met. The provider should also have in place processes and procedures to ensure that the learning materials and the learning and teaching strategy are regularly reviewed and modified, as appropriate, to ensure their continued relevance and validity.

As set out in BTEC Centre Guide to Quality Assurance (2018-19), providers are specifically responsible for:

- preparing for external examiner visits and seriously considering and acting upon recommendations which are outcomes of visits
- designing effective learning materials and a learning and teaching strategy that meets the learning outcomes of the Higher Nationals
- putting in place processes and procedures to ensure that the learning materials and the learning and teaching strategy are regularly reviewed and modified as appropriate to ensure their continued relevance and validity
- providing definitive programme information relating to the Higher Nationals as delivered at their institution, including a tailored programme specification
- operational responsibility for ensuring that students have appropriate opportunities to show they have achieved the intended learning outcomes and grading

descriptors (where appropriate). This includes responsibility for setting assessments in direct compliance with Pearson requirements

- first marking of students' work
- giving feedback to students on their work
- the admission of students including promoting and marketing the programme; setting admissions criteria; selecting applicants; making offers and enrolment, induction and orientation of new students and making student registrations in a timely fashion
- widening access so that all students have an equal opportunity to access their qualifications and assessments
- the appointment of teaching staff and ensuring they have the right skills and experience to deliver a high-quality programme
- delivery of the programme, including provision of learning resources and all aspects of learning and teaching strategy. Appointment of teaching staff. Strategic oversight of the identification and provision of learning resources to enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential, including provision for students with additional learning needs
- developing, implementing and facilitating arrangements and processes that ensure the engagement of students, individually and collectively, in the enhancement and assurance of the educational experience
- ensuring appropriate processes are in place to routinely monitor and periodically review the programme as delivered by them and to keep under constant review all aspects of standards management, quality assurance and day-to-day delivery of the programme
- implementation of a fair and accessible complaints procedure for the informal, and where appropriate formal, investigation and determination of a student complaint.

Prior to delivery, any provider must be approved by Pearson to deliver the relevant qualifications. Once approved, providers must register students with Pearson and then be subject to annual visits from Pearson-appointed external examiners to determine if the delivery of the qualifications is in line with the published specifications. Providers are also required to submit provider-wide evidence of review of their higher education Pearson provision annually and some providers are subject to annual academic management review (AMR) visits.

As such, Pearson does not have direct relationships with the students of a provider but does provide online support materials (<https://hnglobal.highernationals.com/>). Pearson also accepts complaints or academic appeals from students if the students do not feel that these issues have been dealt with appropriately by the provider.

How the review was conducted

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

To form its judgements about the College Group's ability to meet the Core practices, the review team considered a range of evidence that was submitted prior to the review visit and evidence gathered at the review visit itself (Annex 1). To ensure that the review team focused on the principles embedded in the Core practices, and that the evidence it considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other reviews, the team used Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers to construct this report and detail the key pieces of evidence seen. Annex 4 expects that review teams will sample certain types of key evidence using a combination of representative sampling, risk-based sampling and

randomised sampling. In this review, the review team sampled the following areas for evidence for the reasons given below.

- To assess whether reliable, fair and inclusive admissions decisions were made for the applicants sampled, the review team considered a random sample of 11 admissions and interview records [127] from three full-time programmes covering different subjects, delivery sites and a mixture of larger and smaller cohorts of students. These programmes were the FdA Children's Development and Learning, the HND Business, and the HNC Visual Merchandising.
- To test whether admission requirements for the courses sampled reflect the College Group's overall regulations and/or policy, the review team considered programme specifications [128] for three full-time programmes covering different subjects, delivery sites and a mixture of larger and smaller cohorts of students. These programmes were the FdA Children's Development and Learning, the HND Business, and the HNC Visual Merchandising.
- To identify students' views about student engagement and student support mechanisms, the review team considered a sample of completed module evaluation surveys [126] from 2018-19 from three full-time programmes covering different subjects, delivery sites and a mixture of larger and smaller cohorts of students. These programmes were the FdA Children's Development and Learning, the HND Business, and the HNC Visual Merchandising.
- The review team requested lists of all formal complaints or appeals, but from the programmes in scope for the review, only one complaint was available over the past three years. The team, therefore, considered this example [091] to assess whether complaints were dealt with in a fair, transparent and timely manner. The College reported that there were no academic appeals in scope for this review.
- To test whether the College Group has a reliable and robust student support infrastructure across different courses, the review team considered a sample of course handbooks for four full-time programmes covering different subjects, delivery sites and a mixture of larger and smaller cohorts of students. These programmes were the BA (Hons) Working in Integrated Services for Children and Young People [006], the FdA Working with Children and Young People [118], the HND Business [081], and the HNC Visual Merchandising [119].
- To test whether students are given comprehensive, helpful and timely feedback, the review team considered 35 assessed student work [098, 099, 131, 138] and external examiner reports [096, 097, 132, 140] from three full-time programmes covering different subjects, delivery sites and a mixture of larger and smaller cohorts of students. These programmes were the FdA Children's Development and Learning, the HND Business, and the HNC Visual Merchandising.

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

Explanation of findings

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

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

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

The evidence the team considered

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

- a Partnership agreements with UCB [076] University of Reading [077] UWL [078]
- b Pearson-responsibilities-checklist [142]
- c The Higher Education Admissions Policy [003]
- d Invitation to interview [017]
- e Interview proforma [008]
- f Example of interview questions [018]
- g Offer letter [019]
- h The Access and Participation statement [004]
- i Higher Education Quality Manager job description [064]
- j Admissions records [127]
- k The Complaints Policy and Procedure [047]
- l The Annual report of complaints [2016-2017 report 089, 2017-2018 report 048]
- m OIA annual statement [049]
- n Terms of reference of Higher Education Steering Group and the Steering Group's meeting agendas [012]
- o Induction survey and results [032]
- p Enrolment report [013]
- q Equality and Diversity Committee minutes [014]
- r Annual self-assessment report [053].
- s Programme specifications [128]
- t The Complaints Policy and Procedure [047]
- u Higher Education Fairs [022]
- v Job Description - Head of Admissions and School Liaison [063]
- w Job Description - Higher Education Quality Manager [064]
- x Organogram for Responsibilities for Higher Education Recruitment and Admissions [002, 062] admissions training for staff [010]
- y The College Group's website [<https://www.windsor-forest.ac.uk/>]
- z Student Submission [000]
- aa Meeting with staff involved in admissions [M1]
- bb Meeting with students [M2]

cc meeting with academic and professional support staff [M3]
dd Meeting with and senior staff [M4].

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

- the review team did not consider any evidence in relation to arrangements with recruitment agents, as the College Group reported that they do not contract with any recruitment agencies.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

5 To assess whether reliable, fair and inclusive admissions decisions were made for the applicants sampled, the review team considered a random sample of 11 admissions and interview records from three full-time programmes covering different subjects, delivery sites and a mixture of larger and smaller cohorts of students. These programmes were the FdA Children's Development and Learning, the HND Business, and the HNC Visual Merchandising.

6 To test whether admission requirements for the courses sampled reflect the College Group's overall regulations and/or policy, the review team considered programme specifications for three full-time programmes covering different subjects, delivery sites and a mixture of larger and smaller cohorts of students. These programmes were the FdA Children's Development and Learning, the HND Business, and the HNC Visual Merchandising.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

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

8 To identify institutional policy relating to the recruitment, selection and admission of students; support for applicants; how the College Group verifies applicants' entry qualifications; how the College Group facilitates an inclusive admissions system; and how it handles complaints and appeals, the review team considered partnership agreements with UCB [076], University of Reading [077], UWL [078], Pearson-responsibilities-checklist [142], the Higher Education Admissions Policy [003], invitation to interview [017], interview pro forma [008], the example of interview questions [018], offer letter [019], the Access and Participation Statement [004], Higher Education Quality Manager job description [064], Admissions records [127], the Complaints Policy and Procedure [047], the Annual Report of Complaints [2016-2017 report 089, 2017-2018 report 048], OIA Annual Statement [049] and meetings with staff involved in admissions [M1] and senior staff [M4].

9 To assess whether admissions systems are reliable, fair and inclusive, the review team considered the Higher Education Admissions Policy [003], the Terms of reference of Higher Education Steering Group and the Steering Group's meeting agendas [012], Induction survey and results [032], Enrolment report [013], Equality and Diversity Committee minutes [014] and the annual self-assessment report [053].

10 To test whether the information given to applicants is transparent, inclusive and fit for purpose, the review team considered the Higher Education Admissions Policy [003], programme specifications [128], the Complaints Policy and Procedure [047], Higher Education Fairs [022], Terms of reference of Higher Education Steering Group [012], the College Group's website, Student Submission [000] and meeting with students [M2].

11 To test whether admissions requirements for courses sampled reflect the College Group's overall regulations and/or policy, the review team considered the Higher Education Admissions Policy [003], programme specifications [128], and the College Group's website.

12 To assess whether reliable, fair and inclusive admissions decisions were made for the applicants sampled, the review team considered admissions records [127] and the Higher Education Admissions Policy [003].

13 To test whether staff understand their responsibilities, are appropriately skilled and supported, the review team considered the Higher Education Admissions Policy [003], Job Description - Head of Admissions and School Liaison [063], Job Description - Higher Education Quality Manager [064], Organogram for Responsibilities for Higher Education Recruitment and Admissions [002, 062], admissions training for staff [010], invitation to interview [017], interview pro forma [008], interview questions [018], offer letter [019], meeting with staff involved in admissions [M1] and meeting with academic and professional support staff [M3].

14 To assess students' views about the admissions process, the review team considered the Student Submission [000], Induction survey and results [032], and the meeting with students [M2].

What the evidence shows

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

16 The validating universities [Partnership agreements with UCB 076, University of Reading 077, UWL 078] and Pearson [Pearson-responsibilities-checklist 142] delegate responsibility for the recruitment and admission of students to the College Group. The College Group has a clear and comprehensive admissions policy [003] which provides a sound basis for the establishment and operation of a reliable, fair and inclusive system for recruitment. The Higher Education Admissions Policy [003] provides detailed guidance on the application and selection process which is also clearly outlined in the policy [003] as a flowchart. All applications for higher education courses are made through the College Group's online application system. The College Group Admissions team initially assesses whether the applicant has met the entry requirements for the course and verifies the applicant's prior qualifications. For all applicants who meet the entry requirements, interviews will be booked with course leaders and the applicants will be sent an email invite [017] to attend an interview. Course leaders interview all applicants according to a systematic and standardised set of questions [interview questions 018] to ensure consistency of approach which includes discussions of entry requirements and any conditions upon which an offer is made, and identification of any support needs. Interview outcomes are recorded on a standard interview pro forma [008] with fields to capture qualifications and employment history, and any support required. Once the interview has been completed and the applicant has been offered a provisional/conditional place by the course leader, an email [Offer letter 019] is sent to the prospective student which provides information and options on paying for their course, key dates for induction and enrolment and requests that the applicant confirms acceptance of their place on the course. The offer letter [019] also contains contact details for the Admissions team for any further support or

advice. Unsuccessful applicants are directed to the admissions team or the course team for advice and guidance and in most cases to an alternative programme of study [003].

17 The review team considered the procedure for the recruitment and admission of students reliable, because the admission process outlined in the Higher Education Admissions Policy [003] is clearly evidenced by the paper trail which includes standardised invitation to interview [017], standardised interview pro forma [008] including the same set of interview questions [018], and a standardised offer letter [019]. The review team found the admissions process fair because applicants are considered based on their previous attainment (for example, qualifications and experience). All applicants' entry qualifications are initially assessed by the admissions team and further verified by the course leader at interview. All applicants with conditional offers must provide proof that all conditions are met before they are enrolled [stated in the offer letter 019].

18 The Higher Education Admissions Policy [003] is informed by the Access and Participation Statement [004] which addresses widening access by targeting adults from areas of high deprivation, students with learning disabilities, care leavers and students progressing from Level 3 further education. Accordingly, the Higher Education Admissions Policy [003] details the College Group's approach to supporting applicants, especially applicants with disabilities or learning difficulties. On the application form, at any interview or other selection activity, applicants are encouraged to disclose and discuss their needs [003]. Specialist Additional Learning Support staff are available during admissions to offer advice and support to any prospective student, including applicants who have disclosed a learning need. In addition, non-standard or complex application queries are referred to either the Higher Education Quality Manager [Higher Education Quality Manager job description 064] and dealt with in accordance with the Higher Education Admissions Policy [003] or to the validating Universities to check that offers made to applicants meet their requirements [Admissions records 127, meeting with staff involved in admissions M1]. Reasonable adjustments can be made to support applicants who have disclosed a physical or sensory disability, specific learning or unseen difficulties [Admissions records 127]. The review team, therefore, considered the College Group's admissions system inclusive.

19 The Higher Education Admissions Policy [003] makes explicit reference to the opportunity for a prospective student to complain about the admissions process or to appeal a decision not to offer a place. Applicants who want to make a complaint regarding the admission process are directed to the College Group's Complaints Policy and Procedure [047] which sets out the process to be followed for all complaints received. Applicants who want to appeal against a decision not to be admitted are required to write to the Head of Admissions and School Liaison. The Assistant Principal responsible for the delivery of the programme will investigate the case in consultation with the Head of Admissions and School Liaison, and give a written ruling within 10 working days. As confirmed in the Annual Report of Complaints [2016-2017 report 089, 2017-2018 report 048], OIA Annual Statement [049], and reported by senior staff in the meeting [M4], no complaints or appeals on admissions have been received to date.

20 College Group arrangements are in place to monitor and review the admissions system. The Higher Education Admissions Policy [003] is reviewed and approved by the Senior Leadership Team in a three-year cycle. As evidenced in the Terms of Reference of Higher Education Steering Group (HESG) and the Steering Group's meeting agendas [012], HESG meets termly to monitor and review all matters related to admissions, including application data, student feedback on admissions collected from induction surveys [Induction survey and results 032], student complaints and appeals on admissions, recruitment materials and any pre-entry information and activities. In addition, the application data is analysed by the Admissions team and reported to the Senior Leadership Team, Curriculum and Quality Committee and Board of Governors [Enrolment report 013] and to the Equality

and Diversity Committee [Equality and Diversity Committee minutes 014]. Any issues identified and associated actions feed into the College Group's annual self-assessment report [053]. The review team, therefore, concludes that the College Group has a robust and credible approach to monitoring admissions, ensuring that the admissions system is reliable, fair and inclusive.

21 The Higher Education Admissions Policy [003], including the admissions flowcharts which clearly detail the admissions processes, from application to interview to decision-making and to enrolment, is clearly presented on the College Group's website [www.windsor-forest.ac.uk/about-us/governance.html]. Information for potential applicants about entry requirements for each programme is provided on the College Group's website [www.windsor-forest.ac.uk/courses.html] and in programme specifications [128]. The standardised information for each course includes entry requirements, programme structure and content, types of assessment, career and progression expectations, and basic information, including duration, location, and start date [www.windsor-forest.ac.uk/courses.html]. Guidance for prospective students to make a complaint or appeal regarding admissions is detailed in the Complaints Policy and Procedure [047] and the Higher Education Admissions Policy [003], available on the College Group's website [www.windsor-forest.ac.uk/about-us/governance.html]. To provide information to prospective students, the Academy holds advertised open days/evenings and taster days [Higher Education Fairs 022]. To ensure the publication of information is accurate and consistent, all published materials on higher education are reviewed by the Higher Education Steering Group [Terms of reference of Higher Education Steering Group 012] on a regular basis [Minutes of Higher Education Steering Group 066] and approved annually by validating universities and Pearson. All policies on the website include links to further information and points of contact, should applicants have any questions. Students stated in the Student Submission [000] and in the meeting with the review team [M2] that information provided about the application and admissions process was clear and transparent, and all students agreed in the meeting that their experiences as students aligned with the expectations that they had based on pre-admission information. Therefore, the team concludes that the College Group has procedures in place to manage the publication of information, ensuring information for applicants is fit for purpose.

22 As stated in the Higher Education Admissions Policy [003], admissions requirements formally approved at validation by universities and Pearson are specified for each course. Admissions requirements for each course are presented on the course webpages [www.windsor-forest.ac.uk/courses.html] and in programme specifications [128], consistent with the Admissions Policy [003] and the academic regulations and policies of validating universities and Pearson which are available on the College website [www.windsor-forest.ac.uk/courses/higher-education/5416-information-for-higher-education-students.html].

23 The review team considered a random sample of 11 admissions and interview records [127]. The admissions records indicate that all applicants' prior qualifications they had obtained were submitted for consideration. The interview records indicate that all applicants were invited for interview and were provided with appropriate information advice and guidance in relation to their applications. No applicant had been made an offer when their qualifications were below the admissions requirements and no applicant had been rejected with qualifications that met the admissions requirements. The review team, therefore, concludes that the College Group's Higher Education Admissions Policy [003] is implemented in practice and the admissions decisions, made in accordance with the Higher Education Admissions Policy [003], are reliable and fair.

24 The review team found that staff roles and responsibilities in relation to the recruitment and admissions of students are well defined in the Higher Education Admissions

Policy [003] and in staff's job descriptions [Job Description - Head of Admissions and School Liaison 063, Job Description - Higher Education Quality Manager 064]. The centralised admissions team [Organogram for Responsibilities for Higher Education Recruitment and Admissions 002, 062] includes dedicated higher education staff who provide initial information, advice and guidance to applicants, check all applications and verify entry qualifications. To ensure the staff are appropriately skilled and supported, admissions training [010] regarding qualification check, interview and the use of the online application system is provided to staff. In addition, standardised templates used for communications with students, including invitation to interview [017], interview pro forma [008], interview questions [018], and offer letter [019], also help staff to deal with applications in a consistent way. Staff involved in the admission process, including Head of Admissions and School Liaison, Higher Education Admissions Officer, and course leaders [M1], and Head of Student Services [M3] demonstrated a clear understanding of their respective roles because they were able to explain their responsibilities relating to admissions in detail and referred to relevant policies when questioned. For example, the admissions officer explained how to verify whether international qualifications meet the course entry requirements through the National Academic Recognition Information Centre (NARIC) [M1]. The Additional Learning Support adviser explained how student support could be provided to applicants with disabilities or learning difficulties during admissions [M3]. The Admissions team [M1] and the Higher Education Quality Manager [M4] clearly outlined the processes to be applied in admissions and how these admissions processes are monitored and audited. The Admissions team and course leaders confirmed that they had been appropriately trained and supported through admissions training [010], updates on any changes to course admissions criteria or any national policy changes, and staff briefings at the beginning of the admission cycle [M1].

25 Student views presented in the Student Submission [000] and induction survey [Induction survey and results 032] confirmed that higher education students are satisfied with their experience of the recruitment and admissions process. Students who met the review team [M2] also expressed satisfaction with the admissions process. All students agreed that, in their experience, the admissions procedure is fair and transparent [M2]. All students confirmed in the meeting that they had been interviewed and received appropriate information regarding the admissions process and the courses they intended to study [M2]. Students confirmed that they were aware of the entry requirements, the application process and how they could raise a complaint during the application process. Students agreed that the information for applicants was easily accessible and useful and that the College Group's close engagement with them during the application process ensured they were well informed and given opportunities to clarify where there were uncertainties [M2].

Conclusions

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

27 The College Group has a reliable, fair and inclusive admission system. This is evidenced through the College Group's clear and comprehensive Higher Education Admissions Policy which provides detailed guidance on the application and selection processes which is also clearly outlined in the policy as a flowchart. The standardised admissions procedure with evidence-based paper trail and the robust processes to monitor and review the implementation of the policy demonstrate that the College Group's admission system is reliable and fair. The admissions system is inclusive because the admissions

policy is informed by the Access and Participation Statement and details the College Group's approach to supporting applicants, especially applicants with disabilities or learning difficulties. The Admissions Policy makes explicit reference to the opportunity for an applicant to complain about the admissions process or to appeal a decision not to offer a place. Information for applicants is transparent, accessible and fit for purpose. The admissions requirements set out in programme specifications are consistent with the Admissions Policy. Sampled admissions records demonstrate that the College Group's Admissions Policy is implemented in practice and reliable and fair admissions decisions are made for the applicants. Staff involved in the admissions process demonstrated a clear understanding of their role and clearly explained how they are appropriately skilled and supported. Students tend to agree that the admissions system is reliable, fair and inclusive. The review team, therefore, concludes that the Core practice is met.

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

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

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

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

The evidence the team considered

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

- a Learner Involvement Statement [031]
- b The Quality Framework [051]
- c The Quality Cycle [050]
- d Induction survey and results [032]
- e Examples of modular and end of year surveys and results [126]
- f NSS Summary and Analysis [034]
- g Course committee minutes [028]
- h Minutes of Higher Education Steering Group reviewing student feedback [038]
- i Annual Self-assessment Report [053]
- j Higher Education Quality Improvement plan [039]
- k UWL annual programme monitoring report [111], UCB annual programme monitoring report [133], Pearson Annual Programme Monitoring Report [112]
- l Higher Education Focus Group plan [036]
- m Higher Education Focus Group report [037]
- n Student Liaison Committee minutes [108]
- o Quality and Curriculum Committee minutes [088]
- p Student reps' meetings with students [035]
- q Student Parliament meeting minutes and action plans [083]
- r Student Union Constitution [029]
- s Feedback boards [110]
- t Higher Education Centre Bid [040]
- u Higher Education Centre Student Consultations [041]
- v The Higher Education meeting minutes [073]
- w Student Submission [000]
- x Meeting with students [M2]
- y Meeting with academic and professional support staff [M3].

How any samples of evidence were constructed

32 To identify students' views about student engagement, the review team considered a sample of completed module evaluation surveys from 2018-19 from three full-time programmes covering different subjects, delivery sites and a mixture of larger and smaller

cohorts of students. These programmes were the FdA Children's Development and Learning, the HND Business, and the HNC Visual Merchandising.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

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

34 To identify how the College Group actively engages students in the quality of their educational experience and to assess whether the College Group has credible, robust and evidence-based approaches for engaging students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience, the review team considered the Learner Involvement Statement [031], the Quality Framework [051], the Quality Cycle [050], Induction survey and results [032], Examples of modular and end of year surveys and results [126], National Student Survey Summary and Analysis [034], course committee minutes [028], Minutes of Higher Education Steering Group reviewing student feedback [038], annual Self-assessment Report [053], Higher Education Quality Improvement plan [039], UWL annual programme monitoring report [111], UCB annual programme monitoring report [133], Pearson Annual Programme Monitoring Report [112], Higher Education Focus Group plan [036], Higher Education Focus Group report [037], Student Liaison Committee minutes [108], Quality and Curriculum Committee minutes [088], Student representatives' meetings with students [035], Student Parliament meeting minutes and action plans [083], Student Union Constitution [029], Feedback boards [110], Student Submission [000] and meeting with students [M2].

35 To illustrate the impact of the College Group's approach, the review team considered the Higher Education Centre Bid [040], Higher Education Centre Student Consultations [041], the Higher Education Meeting minutes [073], Self-assessment reports [053], higher education improvement plans [039], Student Submission [000], meeting with students [M2] and meeting with academic and professional support staff [M3].

36 To identify students' views about student engagement in the quality of their educational experience, the review team considered the Student Submission [000] and meeting with students [M2].

What the evidence shows

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

38 The Learner Involvement Statement [031], the Quality Framework [051], and the Quality Cycle [050] explain the College Group's approaches to maintaining a strong learning community informed by the student voice, including how individual and collective feedback is obtained to engage students in the quality of their educational experience and how student feedback is fed into relevant groups, committees and bodies.

39 Individual student feedback is gathered through an induction survey [Induction survey and results 032], course evaluations [Examples of modular and end of year surveys and results 126] and National Student Survey [NSS Summary and Analysis 034]. Results from these surveys are reported at Course Committee meetings [course committee minutes 028] and subsequently at the College Group's Higher Education Steering Group [Minutes of Higher Education Steering Group reviewing student feedback 038]. A summary of student

feedback gathered from surveys and any action points from Higher Education Steering Group meetings feed into the College Group's annual Self-assessment Report [053] and associated Higher Education Quality Improvement Plan [039], and annual programme monitoring reports to validating universities and Pearson [UWL annual programme monitoring report 111, UCB annual programme monitoring report 133, Pearson Annual Programme Monitoring Report 112].

40 Individual feedback is also collected through Higher Education Student Focus Groups and Student Liaison Committee meetings. The College Group invites all higher education students to Higher Education Student Focus Groups which are carried out at least three times per year to collect student views on topics that are either of concern to students or help with the delivery of a high-quality learning experience [Higher Education Focus Group plan 036]. For example, the College Group identified a decline in satisfaction in the NSS report [NSS Summary and Analysis 034]. In response, the College Group instigated a series of Student Focus Groups to understand the issues and put actions in place. A detailed report [037] was produced from the Student Focus Groups and presented to the Higher Education Steering Group to inform action plans going forward. In addition, the College Group holds the Student Liaison Committee meetings [Student Liaison Committee minutes 108] three times per year to provide an opportunity for all students to speak to a governor and give feedback to staff on any issues relating to their educational experience. The Student Liaison Committee meetings are open for all students to attend and are attended by the Assistant Principal Student Services as well as key student voice staff [031]. Student Liaison Committee meetings are attended by a College Group Governor who then directly feeds back to other governors and the leadership team in Quality and Curriculum Committee meetings [Quality and Curriculum Committee minutes 088].

41 Collective student feedback is gathered through student representatives, Student Union and Student Parliament. As explained in the Learner Involvement Statement [031], each course has one student democratically elected to represent their peers as a student representative. Student representatives are required to gather input from their fellow students on issues, including good practice examples as well as concerns [Student reps' meetings with students 035]. Student representatives are then expected to represent the student voice for their fellow students in Course Committee meetings [course committee minutes 028], Student Parliament meetings [Student Parliament meeting minutes and action plans 083] and Student Liaison Committee meetings [Student Liaison Committee minutes 108]. Issues that student representatives raised and possible solutions discussed in these committee meetings are reported to the Higher Education Steering Group [Minutes of Higher Education Steering Group reviewing student feedback 038]. Student representatives also confirmed in the meeting [M2] and in the Student Submission [000] that they have been invited to make contributions to key committee meetings and were asked to provide feedback on student educational experience. The College Group does not provide formal training for student representatives, but student representatives, whom the team met, stated that they were well supported in their role when joining Committee meeting discussions [M2].

42 The merged College Group introduced a new Student Union structure in 2018 [Student Union Constitution 029]. As explained in the Student Union Constitution [029], each campus has an independent Student Union. All students are members of the Student Union and two elected bodies, the Executive Committee and the Student Parliament, run the affair of the Student Union on behalf of members. The elected Executive Committee is required to meet at least once every two weeks in term time to discuss any matters affecting students. The Langley College and Windsor College Student Union has higher education student representatives sit on the Executive Committees to represent the higher education student voice. An Annual Impact Report, including a summary of the year's activities in response to student feedback, is prepared by the Executive Committee and presented to the Assistant Principal, Student Support [029]. The Student Parliament, facilitated by the Student Services

team, runs at least three meetings per academic year at each College [Learner Involvement Statement 031]. These Student Parliament meetings are student-led and attended by student representatives as well as the Student Union Executive Committee members who report activity and progress against the Student Union's development plan [Student Submission 000, Student Parliament meeting minutes and action plans 083]. The College Group's senior managers and governors are also invited to the Student Parliament meetings [031]. Student representatives and the higher education student representative who sits on the Student Union's executive committee confirmed that they attended the Student Parliament meetings at which the senior managers and governors, such as the Assistant Principal, Student Support, provided detailed feedback in response to student queries [M2].

43 To close the loop in relation to all student feedback, the Learner Involvement Statement [031] confirms that effective responses regarding the outcomes of feedback are communicated to students through the Higher Education Steering Group for dissemination and discussion with course teams, support services and higher education students, through student representatives and Student Union briefing back to students and through feedback boards [Feedback boards 110] placed around the campuses where students can leave comments in response to the College Group's actions on student feedback.

44 From what has been discussed above, it is clear how student feedback is individually and collectively sought, how actions resulting from student feedback are taken, which bodies are accountable for such actions, and how actions taken are communicated back to students. Given that the detailed policies and procedures to student engagement are in place, and the consideration of student feedback in key committees and groups are minuted and reflected in the meeting and review reports, the review team considered the College Group's approaches to individually and collectively engaging students in the quality of their educational experience to be credible and robust.

45 There are many examples of the College Group changing and improving students' learning experience as a result of student feedback. The student voice is embedded within the College Group's key decision-making and planning processes. For instance, feedback from higher education students suggested that a better, dedicated space was required exclusive for higher education teaching and independent study, particularly the provision of better Wi-Fi and technology access. As a result of this engagement, the College Group secured external funding [Higher Education Centre Bid 040] and ran consultations with students to ensure students were directly engaged in the design of the facility [Higher Education Centre Student Consultations 041]. The new Higher Education Centre was opened on the Langley Campus in September 2019.

46 There are more examples of the College Group considering and acting upon student feedback as evidenced in key committee meeting minutes [the Higher Education meeting minutes 073], the College Group's Self-assessment reports [053] and associated higher education improvement plans [039] and the students [M2] and staff [M3] meetings with the review team, including access to online academic journals now available for all higher education students [053, 039, M2, M3], support for academic study, citation and referencing skills now available in classes [053, 039, M2, M3], citation and referencing software provided to higher education students [053, 039, M2, M3], peer assessments introduced as good practice to enable students to learn from each other when carrying out their end-of-year presentations [073, M3], and developing Level 6 programmes to enable students to have more progression choices from Level 5 programmes [M2]. Students confirmed that the College Group takes prompt and appropriate action in response to student feedback [Student Submission 000, M2].

47 Students reported in the meeting [M2] and Student Submission [000] that they felt engaged in the quality of their learning experience, and that their feedback was listened to

and acted upon by the College Group in an effective and timely manner. Students demonstrated a clear understanding of the procedures in which they could be involved in improving the quality of their educational experience, including through surveys, student focus groups, student liaison committee meetings, student representations and Student Unions [M2]. Students also referred to the informal engagement that is facilitated by the accessibility and approachability of staff [M2].

Conclusions

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

49 The College Group actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience. This is because the College Group has clear approaches to engaging students in the quality of their experience, through collecting student feedback from surveys, focus groups and student liaison committee meetings, having Student Unions, and having student representation on key committees and groups. Given that the detailed policies and procedures to engaging students individually and collectively are in place, and the consideration of student feedback in committee meetings are minuted and reflected in the meeting and review reports, the review team considered the College Group's approach to student engagement is credible and robust. Both staff and students provided many examples of the College Group changing and improving students' learning experience as a result of student engagement. Students reported in the student submission and the meeting that the College Group engages them in the quality of their educational experience. The review team, therefore, concludes that the Core practice is met.

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

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

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

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

The evidence the team considered

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

- a Partnership agreements with UCB [076] University of Reading [077] UWL [078]
- b Pearson-responsibilities-checklist [142]
- c The Complaints Policy and Procedure [047]
- d Complaints application form [090]
- e Complaints letter [091]
- f Complaints response form [092]
- g Pearson Academic Appeal Procedure [117]
- h Annual Report of Complaints [2016-2017 report 089, 2017-2018 report 048]
- i Quality and Curriculum Committee and Board of Governors minutes [089, 093]
- j Annual Self-assessment Report [053]
- k UWL annual programme monitoring report [111], UCB annual programme monitoring report [133], Pearson Annual Programme Monitoring Report [112]
- l Pearson Academic Appeal Procedure [117]
- m The Complaints Guidance [015]
- n Screenshot of HE Moodle page [025]
- o Course Handbook - BA (Hons) Working in Integrated Services for Children and Young People [006], FdA Working with Children and Young People [118], HND Business [081], HNC Visual Merchandising [119]
- p Induction Presentation [120]
- q The College Group's website [www.windsor-forest.ac.uk]
- r Complaints record [091]
- s Part-time complaints example [147]
- t Meeting with students [M2]
- u Meeting with academic and professional support staff [M3]

54 The College Group reported that no academic appeals had been received in the past three years and, that for programmes in scope of the review, only one complaint.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

55 The review team requested lists of all formal complaints or appeals, but from the programmes in scope for the review, only one complaint was available over the past three

years. The team, therefore, considered this example to assess whether complaints were dealt with in a fair, transparent and timely manner. The College Group reported that there were no academic appeals in scope for this review.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

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

57 To identify the College Group's processes for handling complaints and appeals and to confirm that these processes are fair and transparent, the review team considered partnership agreements with UCB [076], University of Reading [077], UWL [078], Pearson-responsibilities-checklist [142], the Complaints Policy and Procedure [047], complaints application form [090], complaints letter [091], complaints response form [092], Pearson Academic Appeal Procedure [117], and meeting with academic and professional support staff [M3].

58 To assess whether the College Group has credible, robust and evidence-based approaches for developing and operating fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals, which are accessible to all students, the review team considered the Complaints Policy and Procedure [047], Annual Report of Complaints [2016-2017 report 089, 2017-2018 report 048], Quality and Curriculum Committee and Board of Governors minutes [089, 093], UWL annual programme monitoring report [111], UCB annual programme monitoring report [133], Pearson Annual Programme Monitoring Report [112] and the Pearson Academic Appeal Procedure [117].

59 To assess whether information for potential and actual complainants and appellants is clear and accessible, the review team considered the Complaints Policy and Procedure [047], the Complaints Guidance [015], Screenshot of HE Moodle page [025], Course Handbook - BA (Hons) Working in Integrated Services for Children and Young People [006], FdA Working with Children and Young People [118], HND Business [081], HNC Visual Merchandising [119], Induction Presentation [120], the College Group's website and meeting with students [M2].

60 To test that complaints and appeals sampled were dealt with in a fair, transparent and timely manner, the review team considered the Annual Report of Complaints [2016-2017 report 089, 2017-2018 report 048], the Complaints Policy and Procedure [047], complaints record [091], and the part-time complaints example [147].

61 To identify students' views about the clarity and accessibility of the College Group's complaints and appeals procedures, the review team met with students [M2].

What the evidence shows

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

63 The validating universities [Partnership agreements with UCB 076, University of Reading 077, UWL 078] and Pearson [Pearson-responsibilities-checklist142] delegate responsibility for dealing with complaints to the College Group. The College Group's Complaints Policy and Procedure [047] set out the approach for handling complaints. It

explains what process should be followed within the College Group or when they should be escalated to the relevant validating universities or the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for higher education (OIA), and the timescale for each stage. Stage One is an informal investigation, which may lead to a local resolution without the need for escalation to Stage Two, a formal investigation managed by the Principal's office. If the complainant is dissatisfied with the outcome of the formal investigation, an appeal can be made to the Principal whose decision is final. Where the complainant is still dissatisfied with the Principal's decision and have exhausted the College Group's internal complaints procedure, the Complaints Policy and Procedure [047] states that the complainant has a right of appeal to the validating universities following the universities' procedures and thence to the OIA, or directly to the OIA in the case of Pearson provision [047]. The Complaints Policy and Procedure [047] refer students to their tutors, the Reception, the Learning Centre, or to the Student Services Team should they wish to seek advice or support in respect of making a complaint.

64 To ensure complaints are handled in a fair and consistent manner, students are provided with a standardised form [090] when making formal complaints. The outcome of the complaint goes back to the student in a formal letter written by the Principal [091], together with a standardised response form [092] for the student to confirm whether they are satisfied with the outcome of their complaint. Both academic and professional support staff in the meeting explained how they have been supported through staff inductions and mentored by experienced colleagues in handling complaints [M3]. All staff in the meeting were aware of their roles and responsibilities with regard to handling complaints and were confident about providing guidance in helping students make complaints [M3].

65 As confirmed in the partnership agreements [UCB 076, University of Reading 077, UWL 078], academic appeals on university-validated programmes are referred to the university partners for investigation and determination using their regulations and procedures. The College Group is responsible for handling academic appeals relating to Pearson awards and uses its Pearson Academic Appeal Procedure [117] which has been approved by Pearson for this purpose. The Pearson Academic Appeal Procedure [117] explains the grounds for appeal, the two-stage appeal process followed within the College Group, the personnel responsible at each stage and relevant timescales. Stage One is an informal investigation done by the course leader, which may lead to a resolution without a need for escalation to Stage Two, a formal investigation where the course leader designates an internal verifier from a different programme within the College Group to handle the appeal. As confirmed in the Pearson Academic Appeal Procedure [117] and confirmed with the Higher Education Quality Manager and the Principal in the meeting [M4], if the appeal process is exhausted without resolution within either Pearson programmes or the university-validated programmes, all higher education students have a right of appeal to the OIA.

66 To ensure academic appeals are handled in a fair and consistent manner, the Pearson Academic Appeal Procedure [117] explains that students are provided with a standardised form when making formal academic appeals. Once students have completed the appeal procedure, the College Group will issue a standardised Completion and Procedures letter detailing the investigation and subsequent outcome. All course tutors and leaders from university-validated programmes and Pearson programmes were aware of their roles and responsibilities in supporting students to make an academic appeal through guiding students to the universities' procedures or the Pearson Academic Appeal Procedure as described above [M3].

67 The Complaints Policy and Procedure [047] explains that complaints are logged and recorded by the Principal's Office and monitored by the Principal on a half termly basis [047]. The Principal's Office compiles an Annual Report of Complaints [2016-2017 report 089, 2017-2018 report 048] to understand the nature and areas of complaints and to identify

any trends or issues for action. The Annual Reports of Complaints [089, 048] also analyse the length of time taken for each complaint to assess whether all complaints are handled in a timely manner in line with the Complaints Policy and Procedure [047]. These reports [089, 048] are scrutinised by Quality and Curriculum Committee and Board of Governors [Quality and Curriculum Committee and Board of Governors minutes 089, 093] as part of the College Group's annual self-assessment process [Self-assessment Report 053] and annual programme monitoring processes which report to validating universities and Pearson [UWL annual programme monitoring report 111, UCB annual programme monitoring report 133, Pearson Annual Programme Monitoring Report 112]. In terms of reviewing Academic appeals, the Pearson Academic Appeal Procedure [117] specifies that an annual report of appeals for Pearson programmes will be considered by the Higher Education Steering Group and made available to Governors and to Pearson as part of the annual programme monitoring process [Pearson Annual Programme Monitoring Report 112]. Academic appeals handled by validating universities will also be reviewed in the annual programme monitoring process [UWL annual programme monitoring report 111, UCB annual programme monitoring report 133]. The review team, therefore, formed the view that there are mechanisms in place for the monitoring and oversight of complaints and appeals within the College Group's management structure. The College Group's approach to develop and operate fair and transparent complaints and appeals procedures are robust and credible.

68 The Complaints Policy and Procedure [047] is accessible to students on the College Group website [www.windsor-forest.ac.uk/about-us/governance.html], student virtual learning environment [Screenshot of HE Moodle page 025] and in course handbooks [Course Handbook - BA (Hons) Working in Integrated Services for Children and Young People 006, FdA Working with Children and Young People 118]. There is also a short and readable Guidance [015] summarising the key points from the Complaints Policy and Procedure [047], available on the College Group website [www.windsor-forest.ac.uk/about-us/governance.html] and at each Reception. Information regarding academic appeals is accessible to students in course handbooks [Course Handbook - BA (Hons) Working in Integrated Services for Children and Young People 006, FdA Working with Children and Young People 118, HND Business 081, HNC Visual Merchandising 119]. The course handbooks also refer students to their 'tutors, lecturers or any member of the course team' for guidance and support in respect of making complaints or academic appeals. Information regarding making complaints and academic appeals are written in easy-to-understand language, with clear explanations and without exclusionary terminology, are discussed with students at induction [Induction Presentation 120]. Students confirmed that the information is clear and accessible and that their tutors and the Higher Education Quality Manager are easily contactable, if required, to provide guidance regarding the procedure of making complaints and appeals [M2].

69 Given that detailed procedures for handling and monitoring complaints and appeals are in place, and information for students making complaints and appeals is clear and accessible, the review team concluded that the College Group has credible, robust and evidence-based approaches for developing and operating fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students.

70 The College Group's Annual Report of Complaints [2016-2017 report 089, 2017-2018 report 048] reported that 15 and 29 complaints were made respectively in 2016-17 and 2017-18 across the entirety of the College Group's provision and campuses. The College Group reported that, over the past three years, no academic appeals and only one formal complaint had been received from higher education full-time provision that is within the scope of the review. There is no difference to handling complaints between part-time and full-time provision as detailed in the Complaints Policy and Procedure [047], the review team has thus scrutinised in detail the record [091] of the one complaint from full-time provision together with another complaint example from part-time provision [147]. The records of

complaints indicated that the investigation and the outcome were communicated to the complainant through a formal letter from the Principal within 10 working days [091, 147]. The review team found that the two complaints were dealt with in a fair, transparent and timely manner in line with the College Group's procedure.

71 Students did not raise any concerns regarding the fairness, transparency or credibility of the College Group's procedures and approaches for handling complaints and academic appeals [M2]. Students who met the team had no experience of making complaints or appeals, but they confirmed that they were aware of different procedures in making complaints and academic appeals and where to access the procedure documents and forms [M2]. Students noted that if they have any issues, they always go to the course tutor or the Higher Education Quality Manager initially, but they were also aware that information on complaints and appeals are in course handbooks and on the Moodle site [M2].

Conclusions

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

73 The College Group has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students. This is because the College Group's complaints policy clearly explains what process should be followed within the College Group or when they should be escalated to the relevant validating universities or the OIA, and the timescale for each stage. To handle academic appeals from Pearson programmes, the College Group's Pearson Academic Appeal Procedure explains the grounds for appeal, the process followed within the College Group, the personnel responsible at each stage and relevant timescales. All academic appeals from university-validated programmes are referred to the university partners for investigation and determination using their regulations and procedures. Given that detailed procedures for handling and monitoring complaints and appeals are in place, and information for students making complaints and appeals is clear and accessible, the review team concluded that the College Group has credible, robust and evidence-based approaches for developing and operating fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students. The College Group reported that no academic appeal was received and only one complaint was received from the full-time programmes over the last three years. The review team confirmed that the complaint had been dealt with in a fair, transparent and timely manner, in line with the process outlined in the Complaints Policy. Students who met the team had no experience of making complaints or appeals, but they were aware of different procedures in making complaints and academic appeals and where to access the procedure documents and forms. The review team, therefore, concludes that the Core practice is met.

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

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

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

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

The evidence the team considered

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

- a The Higher Education Guidance [005]
- b The Careers and Employability action plan [059]
- c The Quality framework [051]
- d The Library Services Leaflet [023]
- e Higher Education Fair Poster [022]
- f Careers Fair Booklet [022b]
- g Guide on Higher Education Careers [121]
- h Course Handbook - BA (Hons) Working in Integrated Services for Children and Young People [006], FdA Working with Children and Young People [118], HND Business [081], HNC Visual Merchandising [119]
- i Induction Presentation [120]
- j Example of student progress tracking on ProMonitor [054]
- k Examples of modular and end of year surveys and results [126]
- l NSS Summary and Analysis [034]
- m Course committee minutes [028]
- n Minutes of Higher Education Steering Group [038]
- o Annual Self-assessment Report [053]
- p Higher Education Quality Improvement plan [039]
- q UWL annual programme monitoring report [111], UCB annual programme monitoring report [133], Pearson Annual Programme Monitoring Report [112]
- r Assessed student work [098, 099, 131, 138]
- s External examiner reports [096, 097, 132, 140]
- t Lesson Observation Policy [052]
- u Higher Education Lesson Observation Report [054]
- v Student Submission [000]
- w Meeting with students [M2]
- x meeting with academic and professional support staff [M3]
- y Meeting with and senior staff [M4].

How any samples of evidence were constructed

78 To test whether the College Group has a reliable and robust student support infrastructure across different courses, the review team considered a sample of course

handbooks for three full-time programmes and one part-time programme covering different subjects, delivery sites and a mixture of larger and smaller cohorts of students. These programmes were the BA (Hons) Working in Integrated Services for Children and Young People, the FdA Working with Children and Young People, the HND Business, and the HNC Visual Merchandising.

79 To test whether students are given comprehensive, helpful and timely feedback, the review team considered 35 assessed student work and external examiner reports from three full-time programmes covering different subjects, delivery sites and a mixture of larger and smaller cohorts of students. These programmes were the FdA Children's Development and Learning, the HND Business, and the HNC Visual Merchandising.

80 To identify students' views about student support mechanisms, the review team considered a sample of completed module evaluation surveys from 2018-19 from three full-time programmes covering different subjects, delivery sites and a mixture of larger and smaller cohorts of students. These programmes were the FdA Children's Development and Learning, the HND Business, and the HNC Visual Merchandising.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

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

82 To identify the College Group's approach to student support, including how it identifies and monitors the needs of individual students, the review team considered the Higher Education Guidance [005], the Careers and Employability action plan [059], the Quality framework [051], the Library Services Leaflet [023], Higher Education Fair Poster [022] and Careers Fair Booklet [022b], Guide on Higher Education Careers [121], Course Handbook - BA (Hons) Working in Integrated Services for Children and Young People [006], FdA Working with Children and Young People [118], HND Business [081], HNC Visual Merchandising [119], Induction Presentation [120], an example of student progress tracking on ProMonitor [054], UWL annual programme monitoring report [111], UCB annual programme monitoring report [133] and the Pearson Annual Programme Monitoring Report [112].

83 To assess whether the College Group has credible, robust and evidence-based approaches for ensuring that all students are supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes, the review team considered examples of modular and end of year surveys and results [126], National Student Survey Summary and Analysis [034], course committee minutes [028], Minutes of Higher Education Steering Group [038], annual Self-assessment Report [053], Higher Education Quality Improvement plan [039], UWL annual programme monitoring report [111], UCB annual programme monitoring report [133] and the Pearson Annual Programme Monitoring Report [112].

84 To test whether students are given comprehensive, helpful and timely feedback, the review team considered assessed student work [098, 099, 131, 138], external examiner reports [096, 097, 132, 140], and meeting with students [M2].

85 To test whether staff understand their responsibilities and are appropriately skilled and supported, the review team considered the Lesson Observation Policy [052], Higher

Education Lesson Observation Report [054], Professional Development and Performance Management Policy [102], meeting with academic and professional support staff [M3] and meeting with senior staff [M4].

86 To identify and assess students' views about student support mechanisms, the review team considered the Student Submission [000] and meeting with students [M2].

What the evidence shows

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

88 The College Group's approaches to student support are explained in the Higher Education Guidance [005], the Careers and Employability action plan [059] and the Quality framework [051] which specifies strategies for teaching, learning and assessment and student support.

89 To support students to achieve successful academic outcomes, the Higher Education Guidance [005] specifies a study skills programme which includes training for all higher education students on research skills, academic referencing, academic reading and note-taking, and academic writing. Training sessions are advertised throughout the year via Moodle and via the personal tutor [005]. Students are provided with guidance on using library resources, including books, online journals and support on searching resources [the Library Services Leaflet 023]. In addition, the Higher Education Guidance [005] explains how additional learning support is provided. Students with dyslexia, medical conditions, mental health difficulties and other disabilities are asked to register with the Learning Support Service. The Learning Support Team then discusses with students their disability or learning difficulties, the additional support required and the reasonable adjustments to the assessment regime required. Actions of supporting students' additional learning needs are also shared with the course team to ensure students' needs will be met in programme delivery, and access to the College Group sites, resources and facilities.

90 To support students to achieve successful professional outcomes, the Careers and Employability action plan [059] sets out the application of the Gatsby benchmarks, a framework of eight guidelines about what makes the best careers provision in College Groups. It explains that all programme curricula have embedded the development of employability skills and that students have multiple opportunities to link with employers and alumni to develop professionalism [059]. The Higher Education Guidance [005] specifies more career support offered by the College Group's Career Advisers, including job search, CV writing and practice job interviews. The career support is available either on a one-to-one or group basis. Careers advice is also offered at Higher Education Fair events [Higher Education Fair Poster 022] and through associated information, including a Careers Fair Booklet [022b], and a brief Guide on Higher Education Careers [121].

91 The approaches to supporting students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes described above are well explained at induction [Induction Presentation 120] and in course handbooks [Course Handbook - BA (Hons) Working in Integrated Services for Children and Young People 006, FdA Working with Children and Young People 118, HND Business 081, HNC Visual Merchandising 119].

92 The Quality Framework [051] explains the College Group's approach to identifying and monitoring the needs of individual students through a personal tutoring system. Each student is allocated a personal tutor as a first point of contact to discuss any concerns or support needs [051]. An Individual Learning Plan (ILP), including an individual's needs and targets, is agreed with all students at the start of their programme in the one-to-one meetings with their personal tutors. Students then have regular one-to-one meetings with personal tutors to review the ILP and reflect on their progress with clear targets and support needs

agreed for improvement. Student progression and the needs of individual students are monitored through the ILP and tracked on ProMonitor [054]. Concerns about individual student progress are identified through ProMonitor [054], and subsequent plans are developed by personal tutors and the course team to support underperforming students to achieve successful academic outcomes. The personal tutors may arrange one-to-one tutorial meetings to provide support and guidance, or signpost students to additional academic, as well as non-academic, support if required. Issues about the progress of individual students identified from ILPs and in progression and completion data are considered by course committees and the Higher Education Steering Group which feed into annual programme monitoring reports to validating universities and Pearson [UWL annual programme monitoring report 111, UCB annual programme monitoring report 133, Pearson Annual Programme Monitoring Report 112].

93 To ensure that all students are supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes, the effectiveness of student support services is monitored and reviewed within the quality cycle. Student feedback on student support is gathered through course evaluations [Examples of modular and end of year surveys and results 126] and National Student Survey [NSS Summary and Analysis 034]. Results from these surveys are reported at course committee meetings [course committee minutes 028] and subsequently at the Higher Education Steering Group [Minutes of Higher Education Steering Group 038]. A summary of student feedback gathered from surveys and any action points from Higher Education Steering Group meetings feed into the College Group's annual Self-assessment Report [053] and associated Higher Education Quality Improvement plan [039], and annual programme monitoring reports to validating universities and Pearson [UWL annual programme monitoring report 111, UCB annual programme monitoring report 133, Pearson Annual Programme Monitoring Report 112]. The review team, therefore, agreed that the College Group has a credible and robust approach to monitoring student support to ensure students achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.

94 Assessed student work [098, 099, 131, 138] reviewed by the team demonstrates that students are given comprehensive, helpful and timely feedback. Feedback provided on sampled assessed work identifies where students perform well and where they can improve. Areas for development make it clear to students why they had not achieved a higher grade and what they needed to do in the future to achieve higher marks and are motivational. Assessment feedback is given no later than 20 days after submission and is therefore timely. External examiner reports [096, 097, 132, 140] reviewed by the team provide further evidence that feedback is useful and designed to help students to enhance their work as they progress in their studies. Students also found that the feedback is helpful to identify areas for development and noted that they are encouraged to seek further feedback if the immediate feedback provided in assessed work is not clear for them [M2]. Based on the evidence provided, the review team concludes that feedback on assessed student work demonstrates that students are given comprehensive helpful and timely feedback.

95 All academic and professional staff demonstrated a clear understanding of their respective responsibilities for ensuring that support systems for students are effective and explained their commitment at all levels to ensuring that the College Group continues to develop support to meet the priorities of students [M3]. Senior staff [M4] gave the review team examples of the use of student progression tracking software ProMonitor [054] to ensure staff are making positive contributions to the learner experience. Learning resources support staff [M3] reported that they were able to access relevant resources such as additional tutoring or study skills development sessions to support students with disabilities or learning difficulties (and that students could also access these same resources). Careers services staff [M3] explained how they give full career advice and guidance to the higher education student community, despite students' diverse career aspirations.

96 Academic staff [M3] explained a range of staff development opportunities to support staff understanding of their roles in supporting student achievement, including peer observations [Lesson Observation Policy 052, Higher Education Lesson Observation Report 054], and opportunities to gain Higher Education Academy membership and access to partner institutions' staff development programmes. Academic and professional staff [M3] confirmed that their work on student support was considered in annual professional development and performance management review [Professional Development & Performance Management Policy 102] to identify any areas for development or any further training needs.

Conclusions

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

98 The College Group supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. The College Group's approaches to supporting students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes are explained in the Higher Education Guidance and the Careers, Employability action plan and the Quality Framework. The Quality Framework also specifies the College Group's approach to identifying and monitoring the needs of individual students. Given that detailed policies and procedures for student support are in place and the effectiveness of student support services is monitored and reviewed within the quality cycle, the review team considered that the College Group's approaches to supporting students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes are credible and robust. Assessed student work provides evidence that the feedback given to students is comprehensive, timely and helpful in supporting their further development. Students tend to agree that they are adequately supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. Both academic and professional support staff demonstrated a clear understanding of their roles in supporting student achievement and explained a range of staff development opportunities in supporting their roles. The review team, therefore, concludes that the Core practice is met.

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

Annex 1

- 000 - QAA Review Student Submission
- 001 - OFS Self Evaluation 2019 V17 Langley - 15.08.19 - Copy.doc
- 002 - Organogram for Responsibilities for HE Recruitment and Admissions
- 003 - HE Admissions Policy Apr19-Apr21
- 004 - The Windsor Forest College Groups Group Access and Participation Statement
- 005 - HE-Booklet_2019 Final
- 006 - BA Student handbook 2019-2020
- 007 - HE Flowchart application process
- 008 - HE Interview Proforma
- 009 - Guide to Admissions Criteria for Higher Education Courses
- 010 - Training and Development Programme - enrolment application training July 2019
- 011 - TWFCG matrix Report
- 012 - Terms of reference HE Steering Group 2018-19 V2 30.10.2018
- 013 - Enrolment Report for the Board
- 014 - Equality and Diversity Committee Minutes
- 015 - Complaints and Compliments Guidance to Customers Oct17-Oct19
- 016 - WFCG Acknowledgment email to applicants
- 017 - HE Interview Letter
- 018 - Interview questions FDCDL - example of interview questions
- 019 - HE Letter post interview
- 019 - Higher Education Offer Letter
- 020 - Screenshot of prompts and guidance to online application process
- 021 - HE Course Guide 'Study Closer, Go Further'
- 022 - Careers Fair Booklet Final 2019
- 022 - HE Fair poster (Langley) v2
- 022 - Langley HE Fair Booklet Final v1
- 022 - Student Destination Poster
- 023 - Library Leaflet Heritage Online Guide - library resource.pub
- 024 - Student Opportunity Fund 2019-20 Application Form
- 024 - Student Opportunity Fund 2019-20 Student Guidance
- 025 - Screenshot of HE Moodle page
- 026 - Social Media Business Case Study
- 026 - Social Media case studies
- 026 - Social Media Case Study - HND Business
- 026 - Social Media Case Study FdA Business
- 026 - Social media Case Study
- 027 - Strategic Plan 2017-2020
- 028 - Sample of course committee minutes referencing student engagement
- 029 - Student Union Constitution May18
- 030 - College Group Mission and Values
- 031 - Learner Involvement Statement v2 student voice
- 032 - FdA Childcare HE Student Induction Survey 2018-19
- 032 - HE Induction Survey 2018-19
- 033 - Course Evaluation - Analysis of student feedback for CH6EB270 Research Methods
- 034 - NSS Summary and Analysis 2018 Final Version doc 02.11.2019.doc
- 035 - 7.12.18 student rep meeting example of minutes

035 - Bucks Standard Agenda Example of student rep meeting
036 - Student Voice HE (003) HE Focus Group Plan
037 - HE Focus Group Langley 121218
038 - HE Steering Group Minutes reviewing student feedback 11.01.2019
039 - HE SAR 17-18 June 19 update
040 - HE Centre Bid
040 - Letter of Support - HETC signed part of the HE Bid Document
041 - HE Student Consultation for HE centre Bid Jan 2019
041 - Langley College Group HE Centre - presentation to students
042 - Additional Resource Access help sheet
042 - Preparing for L6 workshop academic writing and independent thinking
042 - Preparing for level 6 - referencing
043 - University of Reading - Windsor Forest College Groups Group business proposal final
12th February 2018 version 2
044 - Study support tracker 2018-19 without names
045 - Appendix A supporting document for UWL minor changes to course
045 - NUS TEAM POSTER.LANGLEY
046 - Foundation Degree in Primary Education - HE571 Inclusive Practice (1-7)
046 - Learning Research Theory Module Evaluation 17-18 update 2018
046 - Module evaluations IoE-Learning Spaces
046 - Module evaluations IoE-Professionalism in the Children's Workforce
047 - Compliments Comments and Complaints Policy Oct17-Oct19 amended Jun 19
048 - Annual Report of Complaints 2017-18 - evidence
049 - OIA Annual Statement
050 - Quality Cycle 2019-20
051 - Quality Frameworks 2019-20
052 - Lesson Observation Policy Sept18-Oct19
053 - WFCG College Group SAR 17-18 final
054 - Higher Education Lesson Observation Report 2018-19
055 - Sample ILP on ProMonitor
056 - Example of marked work
057 - Course Evaluation with feedback
058 - Example of EE report evidencing feedback ch5fd05z reflective practice project
058 - UWL - EE Report 17-18
059 - Careers and employability action plan HE 2709.18 13.02.2019
060. QSR Request for additional evidence
061. L4 Child and Young Peoples Dev Module Study Guide 19-20
061. L4 Child and Young Peoples Dev Module Study Guide
061. UWL Course Specification May 2018
062. Admissions_Aug19
063. Head of Admissions - Job Spec
064. Job description for the HE Quality Manager
065. Student protection Plan
066. Minutes of HE Steering Group showing oversight of student information prior to
publication
067. Samples of materials for applicants in accessible formats
068. Bucks meeting minutes - student rep meeting-feedback
069. HND Meeting 1 (002)

- 070. HE Steering Group Minutes 24.11.2017
- 071. Evidence of Specialist Study Skills and Strategies Support Tutors role
- 072. HE Meeting minutes - 30.01.2019
- 073. HE Meeting minutes 16.7.19
- 074. UWL Minor Amendment Template - Nov 2018 tracking stopped 05.04.2019
- 075. Minutes of EBC Academic Partnership Annual Review Meeting 11.04.2016 (chair approved)
- 076. UCB Licence Agreement May 2018
- 077. University of Reading agreement
- 078. University of West London Collaborative UWL Agreement for Foundation Degree Working with Children and Young People 2016
- 079. Buckinghamshire New University Higher Education Corporation agreement
- 080. Bucks new Uni Operations manual
- 080. UWL Quality Handbook section_2_-_the_management_of_quality_and_standards_-_sep_17
- 081. HND 2018-19 Handbook final
- 082. Collated end of course feedback 2018-19
- 083. SLT version College Group Conference and Parliament Action Plans
- 083. SLT version College Group Conference and Parliament Action Plans
- 083a List of participants
- 084. SLT Minutes 18.2.2019
- 085. SLT version College Group Conference and Parliament Action Plans 12
- 086. Yr1 Course Comm Minutes + Actions 16.03.18 Yr1
- 087. BNU completed PCM feedback forms Year 1 (3)
- 088. Extract Pt I QC Minutes 3.4.2019
- 088. extract Pt I Quality and Curriculum Minutes - 14.11.2018
- 089. Annual report of complaints 2016-17
- 089. Pt I Quality and Curriculum Minutes - 10 November 2017
- 089. Pt I Quality and Curriculum Minutes - 14.11.2018
- 090. Complaint form completed
- 091. Complaint response letter
- 092. Complaint response form blank
- 093. Complaints reports
- 094. UWL Appeal_form_2017-18_6_feb_2018 example
- 095. Copy of transcript and letter
- 096. EexReport- Business (2).doc
- 097. EexReport Business
- 098. student work (1)
- 099. Student work (2)
- 100. Student Work (3)
- 102. Professional Development and Performance Management Policy Oct17-Mar20
- 103. Annual report to HEI AM4 PAM Record Final 2017-18
- 104. Freshers' Event Agenda 2018 (003)
- 105. Definitive list of HE programmes 2018-19 and 2019-20
- 106. Reading lists email for student feedback on library resources.msg
- 107. Extract from FCDL minutes
- 108. SSLC minutes 6-02-2019
- 109. SLCJan2019Secondround

110. Feedback boards
111. UWL annual report
112. HN Annual Programme Monitoring Report 2018-19 version 1 10.09.2019
113. Annex 8 Responsibilities checklist - University College Group Birmingham
114. Email communication from the University of Reading regarding audit of Extenuating Circumstances Request
115. Student appeals WFCG 1
116. QA Framework for Internal Verification forms for 2019-20
117. Pearson appeals policy
118. FdA Working with Children and Young People Handbook 2019-2020 Final Version
119. HNC Visual Handbook 18-19
120. Final Version Freshers Day 18.9.19 Presentation
121. Leaflet Quick Guide H E Careers WFCG
122. Leaflet Quick Guide HE Learning Centre WFCG
123. Leaflet Quick Guide HE Student Services WFCG
124. QSR Request 2nd request for additional evidence and sampling (002) 09.09.19
125. Website Info HND Business
126. FdA Tourism and Hospitality - Module Evaluation Survey 2018_19 (1-24)
126. FdA Tourism and Hospitality - Module Evaluation Survey 2018_19 blank template
126. HNC Business - Module Evaluation 2018-19 blank template
126. HNC Visual merchandising End of Course feedback
126. HND Business - Module Evaluation Survey 2018_19 (1-36)
126. HND Business - Module Evaluation Survey 2018_19 blank questionnaire
127. Completed Applications (various)
128. Programme Spec CDL 18-19 - University of Reading
128. PROGRAMME SPECIFICATION HNC Visual Merchandising 2018
128. Programme Specification HND Business
129. Example of marked student work - University of Reading
130. FDCDL Year 1 Module student Handbook 2018-19 FINAL - University of Reading
131. University of Reading module feedback
132. HNC Visual Merchandising EE Report A
132. HNC Visual Merchandising EE Report B
133. University College Group Birmingham HE Programme Evaluation - oct 18.doc
134. University of Reading extract of team meeting notes
135. University of Reading Students-Staff liaison meeting
136. Induction Survey Business
137. Extract from prospectus page 3 and page 11
138. Student assessment and feedback
139. Website Screenshots
140. EE report for the University of Reading
141. Extract of student complaint for Engineering
142. QSR Pearson-responsibilities-checklist-19
- Meeting 1 with staff involved in admissions [M1]
- Meeting 2 with students [M2]
- Meeting 3 with staff [M3]
- Meeting 4 with senior staff [M4]
- Meeting 5 final meeting [M5]

QAAXXX - RXXX - Mth 20

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

Tel: 01452 557050
Web: www.qaa.ac.uk