



# Hertfordshire Higher Education Consortium Quality Handbook

October 2025



Hertford Regional College





# Contents

Abbreviations used in this document: .....	4
Amendments for 2025/26.....	5
<b>1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2 Approval of Programmes .....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Programme Approval Process .....	7
2.2 Suspension or Withdrawal of Programmes .....	8
Figure 1: The Proposed Withdrawal or Suspension of Programmes of Study .....	8
<b>3 Delivery and Assessment .....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1 Main Duties of a Programme Manager/Programme Leader.....	9
3.2 Specific Training and Support for Programme Managers/ Programme Leaders.....	11
3.3 Role of the Module Leader .....	11
3.4 Approval of Staff Teaching on Modules on HHEC Programmes .....	13
3.5 Subject Advisors for HHEC programmes .....	14
3.6 Review of the Standard of Coursework and Exam Questions .....	14
3.7 Marking of student examination scripts.....	16
3.8 Moderation of marked student work - Coursework and Examinations .....	18
3.8.1 Module at Level 6 and above.....	19
3.8.2 Internal moderation for all modules within each college .....	19
3.8.3 Moderation for cross college modules .....	20
3.8.4 Moderation by University of Hertfordshire subject specialists.....	22
3.9 External Examiner Moderation of marked student work.....	22
3.10 Core Composition of Module and Programme Boards of Examiners.....	24
3.10.1 Module Board of Examiners .....	24
3.10.2 Programme Board of Examiners.....	25
3.11 University Collaborative Partnership Leaders .....	27
3.12 Academic Misconduct .....	27
3.13 Academic Appeals .....	28
3.14 Student Discipline and Academic Complaints .....	28
3.15 Student Discipline and Non-academic Complaints.....	28
3.16 Exceptional Circumstances .....	29
3.17 Final Award – Distinction and Commendation .....	29
<b>4 External Examiner Duties and Reports .....</b>	<b>29</b>
4.1 The role of the External Examiner.....	29
4.2 UH Validated Programmes .....	30
<b>5 Student Feedback.....</b>	<b>30</b>
5.1 Pulse Check: module level feedback .....	30
5.2 First Impressions Survey.....	31
5.3 National Student Survey.....	32
<b>6 Module Evaluation Forms .....</b>	<b>34</b>
6.1 Completing Module Evaluation Forms .....	34
6.2 College based MEF .....	34
6.3 Consortium Based MEF .....	34
6.4 Submission of MEFs.....	34
<b>7 Programme Academic Experience Group (PAEG) .....</b>	<b>35</b>
7.1 Core Terms of Reference.....	35
7.2 Core Composition .....	35
7.3 Core Agenda .....	36
<b>8 Continuous Enhancement Planning (CEP) Process .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>9 Professional Development Planning – Guidelines for Consortium Programmes .....</b>	<b>40</b>
9.1 Introduction.....	40



9.2 Guidelines for Professional Development Planning..... 40

9.3 Implementation of the general guidelines ..... 41

**10.0 Centre for Education and Student Success (CEdSS Education) .....41**

**11.0 Proceedings for Ethical Application Approval .....42**

**12.0 OfS: Potential risk of fraud at franchised partners .....43**

**Appendix I Consortium Quality Framework .....44**

**Appendix II Terms of Reference for College HE Committees .....45**

**Appendix III Approval of staff teaching on modules in the Consortium .....46**

**Appendix IV - Reviewers Comment Form (College reviewer, UH Moderator and External Examiner).....47**

**Appendix V - Internal / Cross College Moderation Form .....64**

**Appendix VI - College Based Module Evaluation Form (MEF) .....67**

**Appendix VII - Consortium Module Evaluation Form (MEF) template .....69**

**Appendix VIII Roles and Responsibilities of a Consortium Collaborative Partnership Leader ...71**

**Appendix IX Core Agenda for Consortium Programme Academic Experience Group .....73**

**Appendix X OfS and Fraudulent Activity at Franchised Partners.....75**

**Abbreviations used in this document:**

ADC	University's Academic Development Committee
ADAQ	Associate Director for Academic Quality (formerly ADAQA)
ADoS ESS	Associate Dean of School Education and Student Success (amalgamation of former ADoS AQ and ADoS LT)
AQ4	Application for the ratification by the Academic Board of a collaboration with a partner institution
AS	University Academic Services
CEdSS AQ	Centre for Education and Student Success Academic Quality (formerly CAQA)
CEdSS Ed	Centre for Education and Student Success Education (formerly CLASS)
CEP	Continuous Enhancement Planning process (formerly AMER)
CSG	Consortium Strategy Group (formerly CEG)
CPL	Collaborative Partnership Leader
CPU	Collaborative Partnerships Unit
DMD	Definitive Module Document
ESSC	Education and Student Success Committee (formerly ESEC)
FEC	Further Education College(s)
HHEC	Hertfordshire Higher Education Consortium (the 'Consortium')
LRC	University Learning Resources Centre
LTAQ	Learning Teaching Academic Quality
MEF	Module Evaluation Form
NSS	National Student Survey
PDP	Professional Development Planning
PAEG	Programme Academic Experience Group (formerly Programme Committee's)
Quercus	The University Student Management Information System
SEG	School Executive Group (SEG)
SRAC	Standards, Regulations and Audit Committee (formerly ASAC)
Tableau	The University business intelligence data visualisation
UH UPRs	University of Hertfordshire University Policies and Regulations

### **Amendments for 2025/26**

The following amendments have been made to this handbook for the September 2025/26 session. All hyperlinks have been tested to ensure they are current and working.

<b>Section</b>	<b>Rationale for Amendment(s)</b>
Throughout the Handbook all dates have been revised for the next academic session	Ensure all are aware of key dates
Abbreviations used in this document. Throughout this handbook all abbreviations have been updated.	Updated to reflect recent changes within the governance and structure of UH
Section 2.1 Programme Approval Process	Updated to reflect recent changes to the programme approval process.
Figure 1: New Programme Approval	Update to reflect recent changes to the programme approval process.
Figure 2: Revalidation of programmes	Update to reflect recent changes to the revalidation of programmes process.
2.2 Suspension or withdrawal of programmes	Updated links to direct readers to the relevant paperwork.
Figure 3: The proposed withdrawal or suspension of programmes of study	Updated to reflect the recent governance changes and removed reference to CQMC. Updated terms to reflect SEG replacing SAC
3.1 Main duties of a programme manager / programme leader	Reference to enrolment in October at UH updated to induction day in September. Reference to programme handbook changes to programme Canvas page.
3.2 Specific training and support for programme managers / programme leaders	Reference to and a direct link to the Unit 3 within the Programme Leaders Toolkit on Canvas.
3.3 Role of the module leader	Updated to align with the role of a module leader within the Programme Leaders Toolkit on Canvas.
3.6 Review of the standard of coursework and exam questions	Updated to reflect the current UPR AS13 and use of Sharepoint for collaborative working.
3.7 Marking of student examination scripts	Updated to reflect the use of gradebook on Canvas.
3.8 Moderation of marked student work – coursework and examinations	Updated to reflect the current UPR AS12 and use of online examinations.
4.2 UH Validated programmes	Removal of reference to CQMC and relevant updates to references to the Programme Committee.
5.1 Pulse Check survey	End of module survey (SVQ) removed and replaced with information relating to the Pulse Check survey.
5.2 First Impressions survey	Removal of the reference to CQMC
5.3 National Student Survey	Removal of the reference to CQMC
5.4 General survey to first year students	Removed ahead of further information
5.5 UHSU Student Experience Survey	Removed due to concerns of survey fatigue.
6.1 Completing module evaluation forms, section 3 submission of MEF's	Updated to clarify both the individual college MEF and the Consortium MEF should be submitted to CPU.

7 Programme Committee's	Updated to reflect the new Programme Academic Experience Group core terms of reference, composition and agenda.
9.3 Implementation of the general guidelines	Removal of the reference to CQMC
10.0 Centre for Learning Access and Student Success	Updated to reflect the teams new name, the Centre for Education and Student Success (CEdSS Education).
12.0 OfS: Potential risk of fraud at franchised partners	Updated to make reference to annual monitoring activities
Appendix I Consortium Quality Framework	Updated to reflect recent UH governance changes and terms of reference for the CQMC removed.
Appendix II Terms of reference for college HE Committees	Reference to CQMC and QAA reviews removed. Reference to APO and CPAG added where appropriate.
Appendix VIII Terms of reference for a Consortium Collaborative Partnership Leader	Removed and replaced with the Roles and Responsibilities of a Collaborative Partnership Leader.
Appendix IX Core Agenda for Consortium programme Committee	Updated to reflect the change to the Programme Academic Experience Group Terms of reference.

## 1 Introduction

This handbook identifies the quality assurance processes and procedures that operate within the Hertfordshire Higher Education Consortium (HHEC). The procedures apply to all programmes and awards within the Consortium Colleges that are validated by the University of Hertfordshire (UH). There is, in addition, higher education provision delivered by the Colleges which is validated by other bodies (mostly Edexcel - Pearson) which fall outside the scope of the Consortium Quality Handbook.

The handbook takes account of the Consortium Academic Quality Framework (Appendix I refers) which has been agreed by all members of the Consortium. Under the terms of this framework, each College is required to establish a College Higher Education Committee. Core terms of reference for these committees have been agreed and are shown in Appendix II.

This handbook will be reviewed annually at the end of the academic session and then sent by the Academic Partnerships Office (APO) to all external examiners. Should you wish to offer suggestions for improvement or amendment please contact the APO [s.isaacs2@herts.ac.uk](mailto:s.isaacs2@herts.ac.uk) or [c.haffenden-gale@herts.ac.uk](mailto:c.haffenden-gale@herts.ac.uk).

This handbook should be read in conjunction with the University's [Collaborative Partnerships Handbook](#) which gives more general guidance on operational procedures for collaborative programmes. Other general information and links related to HHEC provision can also be found in here. Please be aware that a guide for UH students at partner organisations has also been published for UH students studying at Partner Institutions of the University.

## 2 Approval of Programmes

This section should be read in conjunction with [UPR AS17](#) and associated [Academic Quality guidance published here](#) within the review and validation section and [here](#) on the UH website.

### 2.1 Programme Approval Process

The process of revalidation enables the University to ensure that the portfolio of study remains relevant to both the School and to our prospective students at our collaborative partners, that the curriculum content is appropriate, and that learning and teaching is up-to-date and well-resourced. This process also ensures that our internal requirements are met, for example, University strategic priorities and Academic Quality regulations, as well as all external requirements, such as the [Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies \(2024\)](#), [the OfS conditions of registration](#), [QAA Subject benchmark statements](#) and any relevant professional and statutory regulatory body standards requirements. [Competition and Markets Authority \(CMA\)](#) regulations are also considered during the development of programmes.


All academic programmes offered by our collaborative partners are required to undergo revalidation no longer than every six years.

A Validation Handbook published on the [LTAQ Sharepoint site](#) provides important guidance for academic staff involved in the validation process.

## 2.2 Suspension or Withdrawal of Programmes

Forms for the withdrawal ADC5 or suspension ADC7 of a programme are available via the Collaborative Partnership Unit (CPU) or [here on HertsHub](#). These shall be completed and submitted as appropriate and before the last UH working day of December of the preceding academic year. If a programme is to be withdrawn or suspended after this date staff should be aware of the possible CMA implications. The process is outlined in Figure 1 below.

**Figure 1: The Proposed Withdrawal or Suspension of Programmes of Study**



**NB** ADC5 Proposal for the withdrawal of programme of study; ADC7 Proposal for the suspension of programme of study

### 3 Delivery and Assessment

#### 3.1 *Main Duties of a Programme Manager/Programme Leader*

A Programme Manager (the equivalent of a University Programme Leader) shall be appointed for each Programme at each College in order to manage the Programme as appropriate. This is a very important post for the smooth and efficient running of the Programme at the College.

This is not an exhaustive list but will give some idea about the commitment needed to do the job successfully. Sufficient time shall be given to each Programme Manager to ensure that these duties can be carried out effectively and efficiently. It is likely, depending on the size and complexity of the Programme, that 0.2 to 0.3FTE (or equivalent) will be required to ensure the duties are carried out in a proper manner.

#### Programme Management

- To be the main academic point of contact at their College and in particular work closely with the CPL and Programme Administrator at UH
- To work closely with the Programme team at the College and the College Programme Administrators where relevant
- Working with student representatives to promote active student participation in the management of the programme
- To be responsible for all full-time and part-time students on their Programme at their College, in particular to give up-to-date and accurate academic advice to students
- To prepare Induction material and arrange induction sessions at their College for both full-time and part-time students and attend any induction sessions at UH
- To attend Progression Open Days at UH if appropriate and required (normally one per year for Level 5 students)
- To attend all Programme Academic Experience Group meetings
- To attend all Programme Managers' meetings
- To routinely update the Continuous Enhancement Plan (CEP) for their College by the specified deadlines
- To attend the College HE Committees to discuss the CEP
- To take a pro-active role with the monitoring of academic standards, paying particular attention to the needs of professional bodies, the reports of external examiners, other external evaluations, the recommendations of university committees, and the result of student feedback questionnaires
- To make decisions on applications for part-time study (only) and keep UH informed
- To deal with enquiries on the Programme

- To attend Clearing in August of each year if appropriate and attend any associated training at UH
- To attend the induction session at UH in September
- In conjunction with the Collaborative Partnership Leader, other Programme Managers (if applicable) and the Programme Academic Experience Group, develop the programme, which may include introducing where appropriate new subject areas, revising existing modules, deleting existing areas/modules and introducing new or revised teaching and/or assessment methods
- In consultation with the CPL and other Programme Managers and academic staff (as appropriate), ensuring that the Programme Specification, Definitive Module Documents and Programme CANVAS page are updated as appropriate.

#### Pastoral Care and Advice

- To be responsible for the overall pastoral care of their students and in particular, to liaise with appropriate staff from their College concerning the pastoral care of students (accommodation, finance)
- To coordinate, as appropriate, with relevant staff from their College concerning any additional needs students may require, and to keep the CPL informed
- To be available to students at specified times during the week

#### Assessment

- To ensure that internal College Moderation of coursework and exam scripts is carried out in accordance with the requirements of the School and prior to the Cross-College Moderation meetings
- To attend all Cross-College Moderation meetings if appropriate (normally one per semester) and to arrange for appropriate staff in their College to also attend
- To collate coursework and exam marks from the Canvas gradebook and add these to the relevant SharePoint site sending an email to the Programme Administrator at UH to confirm completion by the specified deadline
- To attend all Module and Programme Exam Boards (normally February, June/July and September (where appropriate)) with relevant information to ensure accuracy of the grades/progression

#### Module Coordination

- To take responsibility for the coordination of a set number of modules
- To ensure their College module teams meet to prepare and agree work (and across the Consortium teams if appropriate)
- To coordinate the coursework and exam questions for those modules they

are responsible for

#### General

- To inform the CPL by set dates of staff teaching on UH validated modules and notify the CPL of any new staff
- To attend staff development events as appropriate and to ensure that other appropriate staff in their College are aware and are encouraged to attend
- To support the marketing of their Programme at their College
- Carry out appropriate scholarly activity and/or research
- Leading the dissemination of experience and good practice in academic quality, learning, teaching and assessment in the programme at their college

### **3.2 Specific Training and Support for Programme Managers/ Programme Leaders**

Induction and on-going support by way of the Programme Leader Development Programme, an online forum once a semester, an annual Programme Leader Symposium and offer of a mentorship programme for a year is offered by the University and can be accessed by all Programme Managers/Leaders. Places can be booked via contacting Jo Cahill [m.j.cahill3@herts.ac.uk](mailto:m.j.cahill3@herts.ac.uk). A Programme Leaders Toolkit module is also available, and Programme Managers are encouraged to [join this module](#) for support and development. There is a specific [Unit 3](#) for Consortium Programme Managers.

### **3.3 Role of the Module Leader**

Each College has responsibility for leading designated (and in some cases, all) modules on their Programmes for **Semester A and Semester B**. Each module will have a designated College responsible for its co-ordination - the College responsible will appoint a specified (but normally not an hourly paid) Lecturer to be Module Leader.

As the Module Leader it is essential to set the tone for the module, to set out the expectations for the students and staff involved. The Module Leader shall stimulate curiosity and enthusiasm for the module with the intention of providing an excellent learning experience for the students and the module team.

Much of the Module Leader's role is about academic leadership, organisation and management but it is much more than that in that the Module Leader is also the advocate for the module and stimulates interest for all.

As a leader of staff teaching on the module, the Module Leader shall support the team in providing an inclusive and friendly learning environment that respects individual learners and diverse learning communities.

The Module Leader has a key role in ensuring equality of opportunity, assuring the academic standards and leading the quality enhancement of the module.

Acknowledging the wider context in which the module operates, the Module Leader shall work closely with the Programme Manager and liaise with other internal and external contributors (e.g. College LRC, alumni and local employers).

The Module Leader will introduce themselves as the key contact for students on the module and will share the principles of partnership working with students; ensuring staff and students understand each other's roles, responsibilities and expectations.

The most important aspect of module leadership is effective communication with staff and students.

The responsibilities of the Module Leader are:

- **To meet with and maintain contact** with the lecturers delivering the module at other Colleges during the **preparation weeks** and co-ordinate the production of the following based on the DMD (Definitive Module Document):
  - The Module Guide – Specific module information should be embedded within the Module information section on the CANVAS module site. Details of what should be included and examples to follow can be found on the [Guided Learner Journey](#) within the units 'Designing a module' and 'Leading a module'. For further guidance please consult the CPL.
  - Coursework Assignments, Grading Criteria and Marking Schemes (as appropriate) and Referred Coursework.
  - A Main and Referred Exam Paper (agreement by team before submission to UH for Moderation both internally and externally)
  - Model Answers for both the Main and Referred ExamFurther guidance on assessment can be found on the [Learning Teaching and Academic Quality](#) UH website page. Staff are also advised to refer to the [assessment update](#) which has links to different resource pages that should be familiarised.
- **To ensure agreement** with all colleges involved in the module delivery on the

schedule of the submission of assignments which shall be included on Studynet or as stated in the School policy. It is recommended that submission dates are shared with the Programme Manager to create an assessment overview for the programme. It is not the intention that the Module Leader produces all assessments for the module alone – it is a joint effort by the module team;

- **To ensure the production** of a Module Evaluation Form (MEF) for the module run at their college, considering ALL comments from those teaching on the module at their college. The Module Leader will ensure that the MEF is submitted to the Programme Manager and University before the appropriate Module Exam Board;
- **To agree all details** with all Colleges teaching the module (via the Lecturer/representative at module planning) and distribute to all Lecturers teaching on the module;
- **To arrange for all Coursework and Exams for each module** to be signed off by a senior member of the College for which they have responsibility and sent to the University for moderation;
- **To attend Cross-College Moderation meetings** or arrange without fail a suitably briefed colleague to do so;
- **To ensure StudyNet** is used on their module (meeting the Consortium's minimum usage requirements) and that information is correctly and accurately set up on individual module Canvas sites according to the Guided Learning Journey principles, and that they are appropriately maintained. All module sites should include the name and contact details of the Module Leader at the relevant College.

NB: 1) The Module Leader who is currently leading will be responsible for the preparation of the module the next year (even if s/he will not be leading the module in the future) BUT alternative arrangements will need to be put in place by the College who is leading the module if the current Module Leader leaves their employment at the college before the preparation for the next year is complete; 2) The Module Leader shall not change this role unless and until the Module Leader has informed the CPL/Programme Manager (it is important to always know who the Module Leaders are – in particular College HE Managers need to know this when they sign off assessment material to submit to the University each September).

### **3.4 Approval of Staff Teaching on Modules on HHEC Programmes**

All teaching staff are initially approved at validation/revalidation events. However, new staff shall also be approved on an annual basis, by the CPL (or an appropriate nominee). At the start of each academic year, the CPL shall be provided with a list of staff who are teaching on HHEC programmes and any new staff employed since the last validation or revalidation (by **Friday 12th September 2025**). If required, a second submission for staff teaching in Semester B shall be submitted by **Friday 2nd January 2026** at the latest. College Programme Managers shall submit the names of staff using Appendix III.

The CPL will confirm approval in writing (or otherwise) to the Programme Manager (or alternate) within **5 working days** of receipt of this form. The Collaborative Partnership Leader will continue to monitor staffing at each visit.

### **3.5 Subject Advisors for HHEC programmes**

There are occasions where the University (through ADC) may wish to agree a proposal from a School to allow a collaborative partner to deliver a programme in a discipline where there is little or no expertise within the University. [UPR AS17](#) describes the upfront and on-going approval and monitoring processes that must be followed in these circumstances.

### **3.6 Review of the Standard of Coursework and Exam Questions**

Students must be “assessed effectively” in accordance with the expectations of the Office for Students Ongoing Condition of Registration B4. This means assessed in a challenging and appropriately comprehensive way, consistent with the level of study. “Assessed effectively” includes a requirement that assessments are designed in a way that minimises the opportunities for academic misconduct and facilitates the detection of such misconduct where it does occur.

All assignment tasks (including examination papers) should not normally be identical in detail on successive occasions that a module runs, nor at first and second (referred/deferred) sitting of a module. While the nature of an assignment task and the learning outcomes assessed can be the same, this requirement will reduce the possibility of academic misconduct by students utilising work produced by other students in earlier years. However, an identically worded coursework task may be used where the assessment is based on an individual student’s experience since this will produce a unique response. Likewise, it may be appropriate to use an identically worded coursework task at a second (referred/deferred) sitting in order to assess progress in achievement of learning outcomes based upon feedback provided on the

first attempt.

The procedure to ensure assessments are reviewed rigorously and in a timely manner are detailed below. The form to be used for this procedure by the University, Subject Advisors or External Examiners is at Appendix IV.

Each college, for each programme, has the responsibility of coordinating a set of modules. The normal expectation is that all summative assessments (coursework and exams) are either a) agreed by members of a module team when the module is taught at more than one college (as part of the June/July module planning) or b) reviewed by an academic colleague at a college if the module is taught only within one college. Deadlines are set out in the annual Consortium Calendar and shared and agreed with the colleges. The Consortium Calendar is available upon request from the Collaborative Partnerships Unit (CPU).

## **The Review Process**

The review process for all summative exams and coursework comprises:

- An internal review within the module team for each module (cross college or within a college if only offered by one college)
- The review by a subject specialist at the University, or a subject advisor where appointed (in-course assessment shall be reviewed by the member of University staff/subject Advisor before assignments are given to students). However, it is recognised that this is not always practicable, so where scrutiny is retrospective then any necessary action shall be taken in time to be effective for the following cohort).

Where a single element of coursework counts for 30% or more of a module grade, approval of the appropriate External Examiner should also be sought for that element of coursework before being handed out to students. However, it is not expected that the External Examiner should be asked to approve each individual project or individually negotiated portfolio. For elements of coursework counting less than 30% of a module grade, the coursework assessment tasks will be reviewed retrospectively by module External Examiners. Communication with the External Examiner will be from the University.

## **The Signing off of assessment documentation by Colleges**

- 1 Modules shall be checked and signed off by a designated senior academic in collaboration with the HE Manager at each college before being submitted to the University.
- 2 The person designated to sign-off at each college will ask each Module Leader to ensure that everything is checked before it comes to him/her but the designated person will have the overall and ultimate responsibility.
- 3 In order to help the checking process several suggestions/questions for checking are

included in the forms found in Appendix IV. However, the forms do not present an exhaustive list. Appendix IV shall be completed and signed off for each module.

- 4 CPU prepare files on SharePoint for staff at the colleges to upload the assessment documents in accordance with agreed deadlines for both Semesters A and B as outlined on the Consortium Calendar. Once received, administrators in CPU coordinate with subject specialists at the university and external examiners where appropriate (levels 5, 6 and 7) to ensure all assessment have been reviewed.
- 5 If there are any issues from the University Subject Specialist/Subject Advisor or External Examiner they will be channelled back through the Chair of the HE Committee (or alternate) to avoid confusion and to be aware of version control (who will then discuss with appropriate college staff). However, there should not be many issues, as the thorough checking and review would have been completed already at each college.

### **3.7 Marking of student examination scripts**

The following guidance sets out what markers and moderators need to do as part of the examination marking and moderation process.

#### **Before Marking**

- Collect and sign for completed exam booklets, UH generated mark sheets, approved, marking schemes and approved question papers from the appropriate college exams office at the end of the exam.

#### **Marking**

- The marking of the examination scripts shall be such that the total mark awarded is a true indication of the ability of the student *as judged by the pre-prepared ideal solutions to the examination questions*.
- Scripts must be marked in such a way that it is clear, in any subsequent analysis by someone else, where marks have been awarded and the reasons for the non-awarding of marks.
- Unnecessary comments on scripts must be avoided.
- The marks awarded for the various parts of a question must be written in fractional form, e.g. 3/5, in the right-hand margin adjacent to the relevant part of the solution.
- To ensure complete marking, a zero mark shall be shown where appropriate (no value or not attempted) e.g. 0/4. These fractional marks shall NOT be enclosed in circles.
- At the end of the solution, a double horizontal line shall be drawn across the right-hand margin.
- The total mark for the whole question shall then be placed in the right-hand margin at the beginning of the solution and must also be in fractional form e.g. 16/20 and must be enclosed in a circle. It will then be seen level with the question number.

- If the candidate has omitted the question number, it should be inserted by the Marker.
- If a candidate makes a purely arithmetic or algebraic error which affects the results of more than one part of the question but clearly demonstrates a full understanding of the principles being examined, the candidate shall not be penalised for the error more than once. Nevertheless, the candidate shall be expected to give some indication of recognition of an absurd numerical result.
- There should be adherence to the approved marking scheme. If, for any special reason, you find it necessary to depart from that scheme, you should draw attention to this and state the reasons for doing so in a note attached to the marking scheme.
- It must be ensured that all parts of each question within a script have been marked and included in the total marks for that question. It is strongly recommended that you draw a vertical line down the right-hand margin as the answers are marked. This facilitates easy checking by others that no parts of the script have been missed.
- Before starting to mark transfer the numbers of the questions attempted into the marking box in the top right corner of the front sheet of the answer book. These should be written DOWN the left-hand column.
- On completion of marking, the mark shall be transferred to the front of the exam booklet, into the relevant numbered section of the marks box.
- If it is necessary to change a mark in the marks box at a later stage, it shall be crossed through with a single line and the amended mark together with the Marker's initials inserted in the space immediately to the right.
- Students often attempt more questions than the exam paper allows. When this happens, the following procedure must be applied. When all questions have been marked, the question with the lowest mark must be discarded. Cross out the lowest mark with a single line and write the word "deleted" alongside, then add your initials.
- Examination papers are often split into sections, students being required to use more than one answer book. In these cases, one set of answer books must show clearly the overall totals and the final percentages.
- After marking, sign or initial against the marks recorded in the marks box on every exam booklet.

### **Submission of Results**

- Before submitting your marks you should complete a series of checks to review and ensure your results are accurate. Please refer to the guidance on the [Gradebook CANVAS site](#) for support with this.
- All marks must be transferred to the relevant SharePoint site that will have been sent to you by your CPU administrator. If you have not received this link please email your relevant CPU administrator and request access.
- All marks recorded on the gradebook file should be saved to your specific modules folder within the SharePoint site that you have been given access to by your CPU administrator and confirm to them via email that you have completed this.

- As Marker you are responsible for the accuracy of the marks submitted so you should check accordingly.
- The marks shall then be submitted by the required deadline for entry on to Quercus (See Consortium Calendar).
- The entry of marks to Quercus is a very big task and of top priority. The deadlines are arranged to give the necessary balance between marking time and the subsequent administrative time. Please observe these deadlines.

### **3.8 Moderation of marked student work - Coursework and Examinations**

It is essential that the learning experience through teaching and assessment is of a high standard within each College and across Colleges. In order to achieve this, amongst other things, and to ensure equity and fairness for all students and so to meet quality standards, all coursework **and** exam answers must be moderated at all levels and in accordance with [UPR AS12 Section 5.5](#). Moderation procedures must be robust, effective and consistent and will be transparent for external scrutiny.

Internal moderation is a process separate from that of marking and provides assurance of the quality of marking and feedback. The process of internal moderation involves checking that the marks have been awarded fairly and consistently and in accordance with the grading criteria/marketing scheme. The process also provides the opportunity to reflect on and refine assessment and feedback practices. Moderation must take account of the marks awarded to the full set of assessed work for the task, module or programme, in the context of the academic standards for the award. It is, therefore, not about making changes to an individual student's marks. In accordance with [UPR AS12 Section 5.5.7](#) the outcome of the moderation process may result in a judgement that one or more of the following apply:

- i. the marking is fair and consistent, requiring no change to either the marks or the feedback provided to students;
- ii. the marking is consistent but too harsh or too generous, requiring all relevant marks to be adjusted up or down following consultation with the relevant marker(s);
- iii. there are significant inconsistencies in marking, requiring a re-mark of all work following consultation with relevant marker(s);
- iv. the quality of the feedback provided by one or more markers requires improvement
- v. the feedback provided by one or more markers requires greater consistency.

In making a judgement about the quality of assessment feedback specifically the moderator should ensure the feedback helps clarify understanding of the grade given. Feedback should facilitate the development of reflection in learning and encourage motivation and self-esteem. It should be clear, specific, and constructive and feed forward

as it should give information to students about how to improve future work. Further information relating to assignment marking and moderation can be found [here](#).

Clear documentation must be provided to evidence the process of moderation and this must be made available to the external examiner where applicable.

There is a four-stage moderation process, depending on the programme and what has been agreed with the CPL. Normally the process will involve:

- a) Internal moderation within each college – for all programmes and modules.
- b) Cross college moderation – for all programmes with modules taught at more than one College.
- c) Moderation by University of Hertfordshire subject specialists/Subject Advisors on all Programmes.
- d) External Examiner moderation – for all programmes with Level 5 or above modules and other programmes if they have an External Examiner.

### **3.8.1 Module at Level 6 and above**

Blind double marking is the process whereby two assessors work independently and neither marker is aware of the other's assessment decision in formulating their own mark. For modules at levels 6 and 7, a coursework assignment requires blind double marking if:

- I. it counts for over 50% of the module assessment;
- II. and is marked by more than one first marker;
- III. and the question or title has been developed and/or agreed on an individual basis.

An example of an assessment task that must be blind double marked is the individual project/dissertation module. Assignments where students, for instance, respond to a common question but draw on practice in order to answer that question do not need to be blind double marked. Blind double marking replaces internal moderation and culminates in a single agreed mark.

### **3.8.2 Internal moderation for all modules within each college**

A minimum sample size, approximately equal to the square root of the total number of items, **but not less than 5**, selecting work from across the range of grades awarded. If there are less than five items of assessment, then all items will be moderated. All scripts (exams and coursework) for those students gaining 39% overall (i.e. a bare fail) shall be moderated to check that an overall pass shall be granted or not. This is important and will be expected by the Chair of the Exam Board. Internal moderation proceedings must be documented fully. An Internal Moderation form is included in Appendix V however each School may have their own template so please check with the Collaborative Partnership Leader for your programme. The audit trail with regards to marking and moderation must be fully transparent so it is important that a moderation report is completed.

If after moderation it is agreed by the first marker and the internal moderator that the marks given shall be adjusted (e.g. because too high or too low) then ALL the marks for the piece of work in question shall be altered either up or down as a group or ALL completely individually remarked. These adjustments shall be noted on ALL the relevant assignment front sheets as a record of what has happened.

If agreement cannot be reached between the first marker and internal moderator the Programme Manager will set up a further process which will normally mean that all scripts are remarked by a third marker.

An important part of the internal moderation process is the checking of exam scripts for accuracy of adding marks.

### **3.8.3 Moderation for cross college modules**

A date will be set before each exam board (Semester A and B, and C where applicable) when cross college moderation will take place. The date and venue will be published in line with the annual Consortium Calendar. Programme Managers will attend as will appropriate subject specialists from each college. The Collaborative Partnership Leader will coordinate the event and attend and will usually moderate scripts on behalf of the University although other UH subject specialists may also moderate scripts. Programme Managers will alert those who need to come from their respective colleges at an early stage. For part-time lecturers, it is recommended, their contract shall specify that attendance at this moderation process is very important and that they will be expected to take part. It is a requirement for all full-time staff who have taught and set work on the modules being cross college moderated to attend.

All summative assessment must be internally moderated, except for those assessments that have been blind double marked. A minimum sample size, approximately equal to the square root of the total number of items, **but not less than 5**, selecting work from across the range of grades awarded must be reviewed. If there are less than five items of assessment, then all items will be moderated. A minimum sample of **5 pieces/scripts** shall be provided for each individual assessment for each module from each College with a sample from a range of grades awarded. For example, if Module A has an exam, plus coursework which comprises two pieces of assessed work, then the sample will be:

- Five examination scripts.
- Five pieces of coursework from assessment 1
- Five pieces of coursework from assessment 2

Where there is more than one marker, the moderated sample shall include a minimum of 5 items of assessment marked by each of the markers and shall for each marker reflect the range of grades awarded.



No College shall cross moderate their own scripts. This shall include Work Based Learning Projects.

All marks will be available on the gradebook ahead of moderation. Appendix V, the Internal / Cross College Moderation Form will be completed ahead of moderation / cross college moderation to clearly indicate which assessments are to be moderated. If after moderation it is agreed by the first marker and the cross college moderator that the marks given shall be adjusted (e.g. because too high or too low) then ALL the marks for the piece of work in question shall be altered either up or down as a group or ALL completely individually remarked. These adjustments shall be noted on ALL the relevant assignment front sheets as a record of what has happened.

If agreement cannot be reached between the first marker and the cross-college moderator the Collaborative Partnership Leader will set up a further process which will normally mean that the moderated batch of scripts are remarked by a third marker (from the University or a college).

Proceedings will be documented by the Module Leader using the form in Appendix V, which will then be presented to the appropriate Module Exam Boards. In particular, if there have been disagreements and what action has been taken shall be reported to the Module Exam Board. The audit trail with regards to marking and moderation must be fully transparent, so it is important that a cross college moderation report is completed.

*It is important that any action necessary is taken at the cross-college moderation meeting and not left for the Exam Board to resolve.*

The moderation forms for each module at each college shall be **shared ahead of cross-college moderation, showing what sample has been chosen for moderation**. This shall be given to the CPL who will retain it for the Module Exam Board.

The Module Exam Boards will consider these reports and take any appropriate action necessary, taking fully into account the advice and recommendations from the External Examiners (if appropriate).

If coursework is submitted and marked online using CANVAS the sample in 3.8.3 above should be moderated online and only in exceptional circumstances shall work be printed out for submission at Cross College Moderation. Each sample of coursework shall include the CANVAS feedback form showing the student's name, date submitted, mark given and the first and second markers' feedback comments. Attached to this form shall be a copy of the student's submitted work, showing any comments added by the marker. This is important in case all work needs to be remarked.



### ***3.8 4 Moderation by University of Hertfordshire subject specialists***

An important part of the quality assurance process is that a sample of student work is moderated by University of Hertfordshire subject specialists. This moderation may be undertaken by appropriate Collaborative Partnership Leaders and/or other subject specialists (e.g. could be moderators of the examination questions and coursework) or Subject Advisors. Where programmes are delivered at more than one college an appropriate time may be at cross college moderation. Where the programme is delivered at only one college a separate process will need to be arranged.

The cross college moderated sample of student work as defined above shall be looked at for each module from each College.

If after moderation it is agreed by the first marker and the University Subject Specialist moderator that the marks given shall be adjusted (e.g. because too high or too low) then ALL the marks for the piece of work in question shall be altered either up or down as a group or ALL completely individually remarked. These adjustments shall be noted on ALL the relevant assignments within Canvas as a record of what has happened.

If agreement cannot be reached between the first marker and the University Subject Specialist the Collaborative Partnership Leader will set up a further process which will normally mean that all scripts are remarked by a third marker (from the University or a College).

A note of this process shall be taken (using the form in Appendix V) and sent to the Collaborative Partnership Leader for the Programme. These will be considered by the Module Exam Board.

**It is important that any action necessary is taken at this stage of the moderation process and not left for the Exam Board to resolve.**

In-course assessment should ideally be reviewed by the member of University staff and External Examiner before assignments are given to students. However, it is recognised that this is not always practicable, so where scrutiny is retrospective it will be expected that any necessary action is taken in time to be effective for the following cohort.

Where coursework is submitted and marked online using CANVAS the sample provided for Cross College Moderation and the electronic copy of all submitted coursework will also be made available for moderation by University of Hertfordshire subject specialists.

### ***3.9 External Examiner Moderation of marked student work***

The University does not require External Examiners to be appointed for Extended Degree Programmes (Level 0). However, they may be appointed if the Programme team so



wishes (at present External Examiners have not been appointed for the Initial Year for Extended Degree Science or the LLB Extended Degree (Initial Year) but have been for the Engineering with Foundation Year.

In the case of Foundation Degrees and other programmes, the External Examiners will want available a sample of coursework and exam scripts at Level 5 and above (and may request to see Level 4). The cross college moderated sample of student work as defined above shall be made available for the External Examiners. Online moderation by the external examiner is to be encouraged and only in exceptional circumstances should work be made available in hard copy.

For this to be achieved, sample coursework and exam scripts shall be lodged with the Programme Administrator in CPU at the University before this moderation process. The dates/times for this are set out in the Consortium Calendar prepared each year at the start of session. It is the duty of the Programme Manager to ensure all work is available on time on the specified day. External Examiners will also have available the full report of the college, cross college moderation and University Subject Specialist process. Agreement must be reached on the standard of assessed work before it is moderated by External Examiners.

In order to be helpful to the External Examiner (and Internal/Cross college/University Moderators) each piece of coursework must have:

- Clear feedback comments to the student and the mark awarded must be stated
- Sufficient comments to justify the mark awarded (and to give useful feedback to the student)
- If internally moderated or cross college moderated a date to indicate when this happened and the name of who completed this activity must be clearly identifiable.
- The assignment brief for the piece of work must be available.

Exam scripts must have:

- Brief comments throughout and justification of mark awarded at the end;
- The mark awarded clearly displayed on the front of the exam booklet;
- The exam question paper;
- An indication that the adding up of the exam marks have been checked by someone else other than the main marker.

If work is viewed by the external examiner online, they will need access to mark sheets, assignment briefs with mark schemes plus evidence of internal, cross college and UH moderation as appropriate. The External Examiners will then report their findings to the Module Exam Board and make recommendations as appropriate.

Where coursework is submitted and marked online using CANVAS the sample provided for Cross College Moderation and the electronic copy of all submitted coursework will also be made available for moderation by the External Examiner as appropriate for each programme.

### **3.10 Core Composition of Module and Programme Boards of Examiners**

#### **3.10.1 Module Board of Examiners**

**Levels 0 and 4 - The core composition of the Board will be as follows: Core Membership**

- Chair
- Collaborative Partnership Leader (CPL) and where there is provision across:
- Four Colleges – to include at least one PM or alternate from at least three colleges plus Chair & CPL
- Three Colleges– to include at least one PM or alternate from at least two colleges plus Chair & CPL
- Two Colleges– to include at least one PM or alternate from at least two colleges plus Chair & CPL
- One College – to include PM or alternate plus Chair and CPL.

One third of the members will constitute a quorum unless the total membership of the Board is less than five, in which case the quorum will be two members.

The following are Officers in Attendance who may be called upon to offer expert advice and support to the Board but they have no voting rights.

- College and University Lecturers who have taught on the programme
- Module Moderators at the University of Hertfordshire
- Subject specialist
- Subject Advisors

The following are ex officio and therefore full members of the board by virtue of their position.

- Dean of School (or named alternate)
- Associate Dean of School (Education and Student Success)) (or named alternate).
- Appropriate Heads of Department/Deputy Heads of Department at Colleges.
- Director of Academic Quality (or named alternate).
- Head of Academic Partnerships, University of Hertfordshire.
- Deputy Head of Academic Partnerships, University of Hertfordshire.



- College HE Managers.

**Levels 5, 6 and 7 -The core composition of the Board will be as follows:**

**Core**

- Chair
- Collaborative Partnership Leader (CPL)
- Module External Examiner

And where there is provision across:

- Four Colleges – to include at least one PM or alternate from at least three colleges plus Chair and CPL
- Three Colleges – to include at least one PM or alternate from at least two colleges plus Chair and CPL
- Two Colleges – to include at least one PM or alternate from at least two colleges plus Chair & CPL
- One College – to include PM or alternate plus Chair and CPL.

One third of the members will constitute a quorum unless the total membership of the Board is less than five, in which case the quorum will be two members.

The following are Officers in Attendance who may be called upon to offer expert advice and support to the Board but they have no voting rights.

- College and University Lecturers who have taught on the programme
- Module Moderators at the University of Hertfordshire Subject Specialist and Subject Advisors.

The following are ex officio and therefore full members of the board by virtue of their position.

- Dean of School (or named alternate)
- Associate Dean of School (Education and Student Success)) (or named alternate).
- Appropriate Heads of Department/Deputy Heads of Department at Colleges.
- Director of Academic Quality (or named alternate).
- Head of Academic Partnerships, University of Hertfordshire.
- Deputy Head of Academic Partnerships, University of Hertfordshire.
- College HE Managers.

**3.10.2 Programme Board of Examiners**

**Levels 0 and 4 - The core composition of the Board will be as follows: Core**

- Chair
- Collaborative Partnership Leader



- One Programme Manager (PM) from each College (or alternate)

Core Membership for quoracy and voting:

- Four Colleges – to include at least one PM or alternate from at least three colleges plus Chair and CPL
- Three Colleges– to include at least one PM or alternate from at least two colleges plus Chair and CPL
- Two Colleges– to include at least one PM or alternate from at least two colleges plus Chair and CPL
- One College – to include PM or alternate plus Chair and CPL

One third of the members will constitute a quorum unless the total membership of the Board is less than five, in which case the quorum will be two members.

The following are Officers in Attendance who may be called upon to offer expert advice and support to the Board but they have no voting rights.

- College and University Lecturers who have taught on the programme
- Module Moderators at the University of Hertfordshire
- Subject Specialist
- Subject Advisors

The following are ex officio and therefore full members of the board by virtue of their position.

- Dean of School (or named alternate)
- Associate Dean of School (Education and Student Success) (or named alternate).
- Appropriate Heads of Department/Deputy Heads of Department at Colleges.
- Director of Academic Quality (or named alternate).
- Head of Academic Partnerships, University of Hertfordshire.
- Deputy Head of Academic Partnerships, University of Hertfordshire.
- College HE Managers.

**Level 5, 6 and 7 -The core composition of the Board will be as follows:**

#### **Core**

- Chair
- Collaborative Partnership Leader (CPL)
- Programme External Examiners (EE)
- One Programme Manager (PM) from each College (or alternate)

**Core Membership for quoracy and voting:**

- Four Colleges – to include at least one PM or alternate from at least three colleges plus Chair, CPL & EEs
- Three Colleges – to include at least one PM or alternate from at least two colleges plus Chair, CPL & EEs
- Two Colleges – to include at least one PM or alternate from at least two colleges plus Chair, CPL & EEs
- One College – to include PM or alternate plus Chair, CPL & EEs

*(A quorum is half of core membership – see Standing Orders)*

**The following may also attend the Exam Board:**

- Dean of School (or alternate)
- Associate Dean of School (Education and Student Success) (or alternate) Director of Academic Quality (or alternate)
- Appropriate Heads of Department/Deputy Heads of Department at Colleges
- Head of Academic Partnerships, UH
- Deputy Head of Academic Partnerships, University of Hertfordshire.
- College HE Managers
- College and University Lecturers who have taught on the programme
- Module Moderators at UH
- Subject Specialist
- Subject Advisors

*The Secretary of the Exam Board will be an administrator nominated by the School Administration Manager.*

### **3.11 University Collaborative Partnership Leaders**

The general responsibilities of UH Collaborative Partnership Leaders are described in the University's Collaborative Partnerships Handbook available on the CEdSS AQ Sharepoint site. The level of programme knowledge of a Collaborative Partnership Leader is comparable with that of the Programme Leader in order that he/she can give effective advice and support to Colleges. The School will need to allocate an appropriate time allowance to Collaborative Partnership Leaders according to the range of activities to be undertaken (to be agreed between the CPL and the Dean of School).

The core terms of reference for UH CPLs for Consortium College programmes is given in Appendix VIII.

### **3.12 Academic Misconduct**

The regulations for Academic Misconduct are set out in [UPR AS13, Section 8](#). Allegations of cheating, plagiarism, collusion and other academic misconduct offences are defined in [UPR AS14 Appendix III](#) alongside the penalties to be imposed. Procedures associated with academic misconduct can also be found in this UPR.



### **3.13 Academic Appeals**

Academic appeals shall be dealt with in accordance with [UPR AS 13 Appendix 1](#), Section 5 refers:

The permitted four (4) grounds on which students are permitted to lodge a request for a review of an assessment decision or recommendation are detailed in Section

5.3.1. All programme staff shall be familiar with the grounds in order that they can advise students appropriately. It shall be noted that the University will not admit queries, which consist solely of a challenge to the academic judgement of examiners. The procedure for raising a query or submitting a request will be the procedure that operates in the respective College. Key is that all programme handbooks make explicit appeal proceedings and to whom students shall submit a request for a formal review of a decision of a Board of Examiner.

### **3.14 Student Discipline and Academic Complaints**

Where it is alleged that a student has breached the University's academic regulations or a student has a complaint which could reasonably be expected to have a material effect on the students' academic performance the matter will be referred to the University in this instance the relevant School for consideration in accordance with [UPR AS16](#). Should the decision be made to withdraw the student all relevant paperwork and supporting documents must be submitted to the Collaborative Partnerships Unit ([consortium@herts.ac.uk](mailto:consortium@herts.ac.uk)) within 5 working days of signature by the partner.

### **3.15 Student Discipline and Non-academic Complaints**

Students are subject to the policies, regulations and procedures of whichever of the Consortium College they are enrolled with. Any alleged breach of such policies, regulations and procedures or any complaint of a non-academic nature will be dealt with by the relevant Consortium College in accordance with proceedings operated by the respective Consortium College. These proceedings may result in a student withdrawal or rest from study. All relevant paperwork and supporting documents must be submitted to the CPU ([consortium@herts.ac.uk](mailto:consortium@herts.ac.uk)) within 5 working days of signature by the partner. A Consortium College's decision in respect of non-academic complaints and non-academic disciplinary matters shall be final, save and except the student may petition the University for a formal review of the handling by the relevant Consortium College once all internal levels of appeal at the respective College have been exhausted. In such cases students have the right to request the Vice Chancellor of the University to review their case but may only make representation to the Vice Chancellor on the grounds that exceptional circumstances apply. The form to be used in such cases is published and available from the Dean of Students at the University.

### **3.16 Exceptional Circumstances**

Exceptional Circumstances are significant unforeseen circumstances beyond a student's control that would have affected their ability to perform to their full potential if they were to sit or submit an assessment at the appointed time. ([UPR AS14 Section C 3.8](#)).

If a student has problems or difficulties significantly affecting performance on their programme of study, they should consult the online advice and guidance on [Ask Herts](#) as well as discuss their concerns with either their personal tutor or an academic support officer or their programme leader.

Exceptional Circumstances significantly affecting student performance will only be considered by a Module Board or Short Course Board if submitted by the student via their Student Portal. The request(s) must be submitted by the student at the earliest possible time after the applicable assessment deadline and within fifteen (15) working days of the assessment deadline, and at least five (5) working days before the applicable Board of Examiners' meeting.

Information and guidance are available to students via the 'Ask Herts' service to explain how to submit a request for Exceptional Circumstances and a [FAQs](#) section is available to further support students. Students may find out the dates of the relevant Module or Short Course Board via the Ask Herts service.

### **3.17 Final Award – Distinction and Commendation**

The award of a Foundation Degree is made 'with Distinction' or 'with Commendation' on the recommendation of the Programme Board of Examiners. In considering the award to be made account is taken of the best 120 credits at Level 5. The specific criteria for conferring University awards 'with Distinction' or 'with Commendation' are detailed in [UPR AS14 Section 7.2](#). Please note a Foundation Degree is not classified in the same way as for an Honours classification i.e. 1<sup>st</sup>; 2:1; 2:2; 3<sup>rd</sup> Class degree.

## **4 External Examiner Duties and Reports**

### **4.1 The role of the External Examiner**

The role of the External Examiner is an essential part of the University's quality assurance processes. They essentially externally 'audit' the programmes that they are appointed to, in terms of the attainment of academic standards and the quality of the education.

External Examiners submit annual written reports to the University, based on what they have observed of the institution's assessment processes and the sample of student work that they have seen – see section 4.2 for more detail.

The University of Hertfordshire recognises the importance of the role of students in the management of academic standards and quality. External Examiners' reports are



therefore made available to student representatives, as part of the annual monitoring process. If a student or student representative would like to request a copy of the External Examiners' reports relating to their programme, then they shall be advised to email [aqo@herts.ac.uk](mailto:aqo@herts.ac.uk), stating their ID number, the full title of their programme and their current year/level.

For information on External Examiners per programme, please email the [External Examiners' Administration](#) team. Please note that the UK Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) explains that contacting of External Examiners regarding any aspect of a programme of study is prohibited. The University has appropriate internal mechanisms in place if a student wishes to raise a concern using the complaints or appeals procedures, as appropriate.

#### **4.2 UH Validated Programmes**

All External Examiner Reports are sent in the first instance to the Office of the Vice Chancellor. They are read by one of: The Pro Vice-Chancellor with responsibility for academic quality; the Director of Academic Quality; or the Deputy Director of Academic Quality. Issues of concern to the University are identified at this stage. Copies are then placed in the electronic document management system which is accessible via the [External Examiners information for Herts Staff page](#) on the UH website.

At the start of each academic year a list of all External Examiners is shared so colleges can identify relevant External Examiners on Sharepoint.

External Examiners' reports are considered by the appropriate College Programme Academic Experience Group and necessary actions are identified. It is the responsibility of the UH Chair of the Module or Programme Board (or nominee) to reply to the External Examiner indicating the actions taken in respect of all issues raised in the report.

External Examiners are requested to differentiate between colleges in their annual reports in relation to any issues of concern and areas of good practice identified.

## **5 Student Feedback**

Opinion from all students registered on HE provisions within the Consortium is sought and evaluated systematically. The process is currently the same as that employed within UH, so that opinion is sought at both the module level and for the College as a whole.

### **5.1 Pulse Check: module level feedback**


The Pulse Check survey will be administered centrally to all modules from L4 – L7 during college teaching week 6. The usual end of module SVQ will not run. The Evasys survey tool will be used and responses will be collated quickly for the module and

programme teams to review.

The following questions will be asked within the Pulse Check survey:

- |   |             |
|---|-------------|
| a) I feel confident that I will be able to learn this subject with the help of the teaching and the resources provided. | Yes/No      |
| b) I know where to find what I need on the module Canvas site.  | Yes/No      |
| c) I know what's expected of me in the assessments.   | Yes/No      |
| d) Most useful thing so far?  | (open text) |
| e) Can you think of one thing which might improve your learning?  | (open text) |

The timeline for the Pulse Check survey is shared below:



In summary the Module Leader will provide a short summary of survey findings and return this to the Programme Manager within one week of the collection of feedback.

This summary will include:

- The number of students on the module and the number of responses received.
- The main messages shared.
- How the main messages shared have been acted upon.

The Pulse Check survey is not intended to stop established dialogue with students in modules, and indeed Pulse Check could inform mid module feedback questions later in the semester. All modules will still need to collect feedback from students during the module which could be as simple as handing out post-its for feedback or you may choose to do a quiz on Canvas or conduct a focus group. Students are to be allowed to give feedback anonymously.

Programme Managers should work with module leaders to ensure that they have planned ways to gather students views throughout the module delivery, and that there are also plans to respond to that feedback and talk to students about the response so that they understand how their feedback has been acted on.

There are resources available on [this page](#) identifying ways to maintain the conversation about learning. Student Forums should be used as a space for students to raise and discuss non-academic matters affecting their experience. At UH these will be managed within the Schools. Module evaluation forms will provide details about how the student views were collected, the main points made by students and any actions taken to close the feedback loop.

## 5.2 First Impressions Survey



Although each college has a First Impressions Survey, it is thought important that a common survey, to also include the University, shall be administered across the four colleges. This enables comparisons of early student experiences across institutions.

Each college will be responsible for administering the survey to first year students at an agreed date simultaneously, **typically** for a two week period. In addition, they will collate the survey information and present this to a routine HE Managers meeting. The questions asked by the respective Colleges will be agreed in advance and may vary on an annual basis as agreed by HE Managers and the KAM.

### **5.3 National Student Survey**

The National Student Survey (NSS) is an opportunity for students to feedback on their academic experience. The results are used to help future students to choose courses that best suit their needs and interests, as part of the Government's drive to open up education and ensure individuals can make informed choices. The survey is commissioned by the Office for Students formerly the Higher Education Funding Council for England and conducted independently by Ipsos MORI, and has the support of the NUS.

All final year undergraduates across all HEIs are surveyed in January to March each year – that includes all final year Foundation Degree students at Consortium Colleges. The NSS asks 27 questions relating to seven aspects of the learning experience. Topic areas covered include teaching, learning, assessment and feedback, academic support, organisation and management, learning resources and student voice.

Each College is responsible for managing the NSS process and annually informing staff and students of arrangements for distributing/accessing the questionnaire. The participation rates and results of the NSS will be considered by respective College HE committees, as well as by APO, and action plans agreed accordingly.

#### **Theme 1: Teaching on my course**

- How good are teaching staff at explaining things?
- How often do teaching staff make the subject engaging?
- How often is the course intellectually stimulating?
- How often does your course challenge you to achieve your best work?

#### **Theme 2: Learning opportunities**

- To what extent have you had the chance to explore ideas and concepts in depth?
- How well does your course introduce subjects and skills in a way that builds on what you have already learned?
- To what extent have you had the chance to bring together information and ideas from different topics?
- To what extent does your course have the right balance of directed and independent study?
- How well has your course developed your knowledge and skills that you think you will



need for your future?

### **Theme 3: Assessment and feedback**

- How clear were the marking criteria used to assess your work?
- How fair has the marking and assessment been on your course?
- How well have assessments allowed you to demonstrate what you have learned?
- How often have you received assessment feedback on time?
- How often does feedback help you to improve your work?

### **Theme 4: Academic Support**

- How easy was it to contact teaching staff when you needed to?
- How well have teaching staff supported your learning?

### **Theme 5: Organisation and management**

- How well organised is your course?
- How well were any changes to teaching on your course communicated?

### **Theme 6: Learning resources**

- How well have IT resources and facilities supported your learning?
- How well have the library resources (e.g. books, online services and learning spaces) supported your learning?
- How easy is it to access subject specific resources (e.g. equipment, facilities, software) when you need them?

### **Theme 7: Student voice**

- To what extent do you get the right opportunities to give feedback on your course?
- To what extent are students opinions about the course valued by staff?
- How clear is it that students feedback on the course is acted on?

### **Other**

- How well does the students union (association or guild) represent students academic interests?
- How well communicated was information about your university / colleges mental wellbeing support services?
- During your studies, how free did you feel to express your ideas, opinions and beliefs?

## 6 Module Evaluation Forms

### 6.1 Completing Module Evaluation Forms

As the teaching and assessment period is completed, the cross-college moderation meeting will present an opportunity for the team to consider evaluation of the module and completion of the Module Evaluation Forms (MEF). The purpose of the MEFs is to ensure that each module has been evaluated by its module team as soon as the teaching and assessment period is over. This should allow time for action to be taken before the module is next delivered. The MEF has little value if it is not completed promptly. Templates for the MEFs are presented in Appendices VI and VII.

### 6.2 College based MEF

As soon as teaching and assessment of the module are over and once final marks from coursework and exams are available, the lecturer(s) at each college for their modules shall complete the College based MEF (Appendix VI). Questions, which might be asked, include: is the module content in need of updating? Have the students' expressed views on any aspects of the module? Is the time allocated for various aspects of the module appropriate? Do the lectures, practical's and workshops achieve what is intended? Is the teaching accommodation satisfactory? Is student achievement satisfactory? Were there any administrative problems? The team must reflect on the outcomes of any actions agreed the previous year.

The lecturer shall indicate sources of feedback (note that External Examiners' reports will not normally be available at this stage, but an EE might already have made significant comments about draft exam papers or might have sampled coursework during the year). 'Main issues' shall be obvious, but the lecturer should remember to look back at the previous year's action plan and comment on outcomes. Data on the number of students, passes and fails at first sit and the average grades for coursework and exams shall be included on the MEF. The 'Action plan' is self-explanatory, but the lecturer should ensure that any actions are well defined. It will often be possible to write 'No changes planned'.

### 6.3 Consortium Based MEF

If the module is taught across more than one college, the Module Leader for the module (from one of the colleges) shall complete the Consortium MEF (Appendix VII). The MEF shall be seen by all members of the Module Team (across colleges), either at the Cross college moderation meeting and all shall either confirm that they are able to approve the report or suggest changes. The Module Leader shall make any necessary changes and then sign the form to confirm that it represents the views of the Module Team.

### 6.4 Submission of MEFs

The signed MEF (the college based MEF if only taught at one college or the consortium based MEF and the college based MEF's if taught at more than one college) must be

submitted to the CPU no later than five working days before the Module Board of Examiners which will consider the module. **This is an important deadline.** Consideration of MEFs must be an agenda item for each Module Board and MEFs shall be available to the External Examiners in advance of the Module Board along with samples of student work and mark sheets.

## 7 Programme Academic Experience Group (PAEG)

### 7.1 Core Terms of Reference

The School Executive Group (SEG) will establish Programme Academic Experience Groups which form part of the committee structure of the Academic Board. The establishment of PAEGs requires approval from Academic Board.

In exercising this power the SEG concerned will ensure that the number of individual PAEGs reflect the size, nature and academic level of the programmes for which the School is responsible and their constituent awards. Where cognate awards at the same academic level are offered, a single PAEG should be established, with responsibility for all of the awards. The core [Terms of Reference and agenda for PAEGs](#) can be found as attachments on the bottom of the page linked.

### 7.2 Core Composition

The composition of PAEGs is listed below. Where it is appropriate to the content and delivery of the Programme(s) concerned, the Group may extend the composition to include other members of academic and professional staff.

- Collaborative Partnership Leader (who may be Chair where more than one College delivers the programme)
- Programme Administrator (Clerk)
- One Programme Manager (PM) from each College (or alternate)
- One full-time student representative from each college at each level taught

#### **Core Membership for quoracy and voting:**

- Four Colleges – must include at least one PM or alternate from at least three colleges plus CPL and Students
- Three Colleges – must include at least one PM or alternate from at least two colleges plus CPL and Students
- Two Colleges – must include at least one PM or alternate from at least two colleges plus CPL and Students
- One College – must include PM or alternate plus CPL and Students (*A quorum is a third of core membership – see Standing Orders*)

**The following may also attend the PAEG:**

- Dean of School
- Associate Dean of School (Education and Student Success)
- Relevant Head of Curriculum at UH
- Appropriate Heads of Department/Deputy Heads of Department at Colleges
- Head of Academic Partnerships at UH
- Deputy Head of Academic Partnerships at UH
- College HE Managers
- College and University Lecturers who have taught on the programme
- Module Moderators at UH
- Admissions Tutor
- LCS Academic Liaison Librarian UH
- College LRC representatives
- Other Student Representatives
- Subject Specialist
- Subject Advisors

### **7.3 Core Agenda**

A core agenda for Consortium PAEG meetings is presented in Appendix IX.

## **8 Continuous Enhancement Planning (CEP) Process**

This section should be read in conjunction with [UPR AS17](#) - and associated Academic Quality guidance.

The purpose of the CEP process is to assure the quality of the University/Partner's taught (franchised, university validated and externally validated) provision and enhance the student learning experience. The CEP process replaces Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Reports and Collaborative Operational Delivery Plans. The CEP process outputs are:

- i) a 'live' action plan (the CEP action plan) owned by the Programme Team and located within the University's Collaborative CEP database.
- ii) Programme Manager and Programme Team engagement with specified Partner/School/Department enhancement activities.

A CEP Action Plan should be developed for each Consortium programme, but where appropriate may encompass a group of cognate programmes at the same PO. The CEP Action Plan database can be accessed via the University MS-Teams. Written guidance on the CEP is published within the CEP for Collaborative Partnerships MS-Teams channel under 'Files'. Narrated presentations outline the CEP process and demonstrate the CEP action plan. Programme Leaders and CPLs should access these resources

online.

The development and maintenance of the CEP action plan is the responsibility of the Partner Programme Manager/Leader together with the CPL, on behalf of the Programme Committee. Partner Programme Managers/Leaders and CPLs should develop and review the CEP action plan at least three times a year, in line with specified data release points (normally end of October, March and July). The blue tabs (see below) are completed by Programme Leaders by exception reporting in response to issues arising from external examiner reports, programme data, student feedback, recommendations from (re-)validation and/or modules identified as being 'at risk'.

JB TEST 1		Action Plan Screen	
Last edited by: Charlotte Haffenden-Gale, 12-Jul-24 10:32		Show completed lines	
CPL EXEMPLAR			
>	🔍	Actions arising from the External Examiners' reports - (1) active, (0) actions signed off as completed A.0.0	
>	🔍	Actions arising from data - (1) active, (0) actions signed off as completed B.0.0	
>	🔍	Actions arising from students' feedback - (2) active, (0) actions signed off as completed C.0.0	
>	🔍	Recommendations from validation or revalidation - (1) active, (0) actions signed off as completed D.0.0	
>	🔍	Programme delivery/learning infrastructure - (9) active, (0) actions signed off as completed E.0.0	
>	🔍	Assessment process - (7) active, (0) actions signed off as completed F.0.0	
>	🔍	Ongoing developments to enhance the student experience/programme - (1) active, (0) actions signed off as completed G.0.0	
>	🔍	Modules identified as being at risk - (1) active, (0) actions signed off as completed I.0.0	

The CEP Action Plan green tabs should be developed by CPLs in liaison with partner organisations with reference to the requirements outlined in this handbook, the relevant Memorandum of Agreement (MoA), the CPL Activity Form and other relevant University guidance. The CEP should reflect current practices and the key requirements outlined in this handbook. There are two green tabs: i) Programme Delivery/Learning Infrastructure covers all areas from marketing to graduation and ii) Assessment Process covers all assessment related activities.

As part of the monitoring of the action plan, the Programme Leader and/or CPL should report on progress and evaluate the impact of actions on the student and/or staff experience. The Associate Dean of School (Education and Student Success) and managers with responsibility for quality assurance within the partner organisation will have oversight of and periodically review the CEP action plans. The ADoS (ESS) will 'sign-off' completed actions.

Each Partner Organisation has responsibility to set up at least one enhancement activity per academic year requiring Programme Managers and programme teams to attend to:

- i) share good practice, including actions that have led to improved data outcomes; and
- ii) develop further their CEP action plan to reflect (i) School- and Department-wide enhancement actions; and (ii) the University's and Partner's strategic direction.

Colleges will determine the timing and number of enhancement activities to be held each

year, whether such activities are held at Organisational, School or Department level and effective ways to integrate the action plan enhancement activities into existing activities (e.g. Away Days, Learning and Teaching events). The Programme Leader (or nominee) must attend and engage in specified enhancement activities organised by the Partner/School and add any agreed actions to the programme's CEP action plan.

The CEP process seeks to reflect a Risk Based Approach to the management of collaborative programmes (franchised, university validated and externally validated provision). The process seeks to maintain a self-critical academic community supporting programme teams in their continual efforts to maintain academic standards, to improve the quality of learning opportunities and to enhance the student experience by an ongoing, evidence informed monitoring process, with effective oversight at Partner/School and University level.

### **A note about Risk Based Approaches:**

The CEP should therefore set out requirements for differential arrangements dependent on the type of partnership and the level of risk. It is therefore important when developing the CEP to consider and discuss risk with your ADoS (ESS) to ensure that academic quality requirements are proportionate to the nature of the collaborative partnership. Whilst AQ arrangements may differ between partners, dependent upon the level of risk, the principles laid out in [UPR AS17, Section D](#) must always be observed.

Some of the Risk-Factors to consider when determining the level of risk are outlined below (not an exhaustive list):

- Partner risk assessment (AQ2a) – at the outset, was the partnership considered to be low, medium or high risk?
- Type of partnership arrangement
- Size of partner organisation
- Duration of partnership
- Nature of the partnership
- Stability of staff
- Experience of HE
- UK-based or international partner
- Relationship with UH (such as Hertfordshire Higher Education Consortium)
- Engagement with quality processes
- Assessment practices
- Consistency of marking and moderation
- Comparability with UH
- Feedback from external examiners
- Student feedback and feedback from other key stakeholders
- Programme data (Tableau) and student achievement

The University uses three categories of risk (Low, Medium, High).

### **Low risk**

Typically, an established partnership where an existing programme(s) has been delivered successfully for 3 years or more, with none (or very minor) issues relating to quality and academic standards. Quality monitoring and evaluation has been positive and no (or very few) risk factors have been identified (see list). The partner staff have been consistent throughout. The university has a high level of confidence in the quality of the student learning experience and academic standards.

### **Medium risk**

Typically, a new or established partnership where some (potential) issues relating to quality and academic standards have been identified and resolved. Quality monitoring and evaluation has been satisfactory although some risk factors have been identified (see list). There has recently been some new partner staff appointed. The university has confidence in the quality and academic standards of the partnership arrangements due to the quality management processes in place and in general, standard practices apply.

### **High risk**

Typically, a new or established partnership where (potential) issues relating to quality and academic standards have been identified. Quality monitoring and evaluation has been variable, and several risk factors have been identified (see list). There is a high staff turnover. The university's confidence in the quality and academic standards of the partnership arrangements is dependent upon the robust quality management processes in place, which generally exceeds standard practices.

Remember that any differential arrangements could result in both increased and decreased QA activity. For example, if there have been no issues with the standard admissions process, the partner and university may wish to focus on enhancing the student induction instead. However, it is not expected that the introduction of differential arrangements will change the resource for partnership arrangements, instead it should enable the university to work more effectively to enhance further the collaborative provision. Differential arrangements may change on a regular basis in response to changing risk factors.

Remember the University places value on feedback and reciprocal learning from partners so please ensure that this is reflected within your plans.

### **CEP overview:**

- a. Data is released at various points in the year
- b. Programme Leader and team develop actions
- c. Programme Leader enters actions on the CEP action plan as required in the sections 'Actions arising from External Examiners' reports', 'Actions arising from data',

Actions arising from students' feedback', Recommendations from validation or revalidation', Ongoing developments to enhance the student experience/ programme' and 'Modules identified as being at risk'.

- d. Collaborative Partnership Leader (CPL) identifies quality management actions/ responsibilities in the sections 'Programme delivery / learning infrastructure' and the 'Assessment process'.
- e. Associate Dean of School/ Head of Curriculum reviews action points and provides feedback
- f. Programme Leader evaluates their impact as part of monitoring of action plan
- g. Monitoring of action plan is completed before meeting of Programme Academic Experience Group
- h. Programme Academic Experience Group agrees action plan on an ongoing basis
- i. Associate Dean of School/ Head of Curriculum will sign off completed actions in the CEP database
- j. Once a year (31st July) completed action points are archived
- k. The Partner Organisation organises enhancement event, which may give rise to further actions to include in the action plan

## **9 Professional Development Planning – Guidelines for Consortium Programmes**

### **9.1 Introduction**

Historically professional development planning (PDP) has been a key element of all the Consortium Foundation Degree provision and fully embedded within the WBL modules and integrated across the programmes. There are some variations between the application of PDP in each college but in general it is well integrated and facilitated by a range of methods including WBL provision; group and personal tutorials; module tutorials; individual learning plans (electronic); reflective tutorials and the use of Blogs or personal logs. This proposal is designed to consolidate a well-established culture of PDP within the Consortium. It will also provide guidelines to ensure the continuation of good practice whilst providing the emphasis for improvement and accurate monitoring.

### **9.2 Guidelines for Professional Development Planning**

PDP should be taken to mean 'Professional Development Planning' rather than 'Personal Development Planning' although in effect it will support both personal and professional development planning. This rebranding will reinforce the close association between effective PDP and the realisation of the Graduate Attributes. PDP shall be implemented and supported in all Consortium programmes

- The process needs to be sustainable and give students access to ongoing support.
- A key output is that students must be able to recognise and articulate their learning and skills.

- The process is developmental and so not all programmes are starting from the same point.
- Normally each programme should have its own approach to implementing PDP based on either the Integrated or Embedded approach (Listed below).

**Embedded** - where PDP is embedded in specific elements of a programme, which provide the main support for PDP. They may also serve to link with material covered elsewhere in the programme.

**Integrated** - a whole-curriculum approach where all or most parts of a programme involve activities, which are aligned with PDP processes, including those in the workplace. In this model, every programme leader has a responsibility for supporting PDP.

**NB:** Both models may include personal logs and diaries, or compulsory sessions as part of personal tutoring or skills weeks. In addition, either of these models may be developed to draw in extra-curricular activities.

These approaches build on the current good practices within the Consortium. It is important to take account of the varying student body needs particularly full-time, part-time and more experienced students.

It is important that programmes do not rely entirely on extracurricular activities to support PDP- for some students, reflection may be an unfamiliar and inaccessible process and they will need proper support to develop the skills. Students shall be enabled to have private reflections and goals, a 'safe space', and then the ability to share part or all of their reflections with whom they wish, when they want.

### ***9.3 Implementation of the general guidelines***

All programmes will review current PDP implementation and ensure that it meets the guidelines set out above. The implementation of PDP across programmes will be monitored by the relevant Programme Committees. Any issues arising from PDP will be addressed through the CEP and Action Plan. The HE Committee will have a strategic overview of PDP implementation within the college and will feedback to the routine HE Managers meetings as appropriate. Relevant staff development will be available as required through the University and the College.

### **10.0 Centre for Education and Student Success (CEdSS Education)**

Our centre of excellence enables student success by ensuring evidence-driven and innovative teaching, learning and support. We aim to develop compassionate and engaged staff and students, supporting our overall commitment to transforming lives. Within the Centre for Learning, Access and Student Success we have the following



teams, supported by our cross-centre administrative colleagues:

- Herts Academic Skills
- Learning and Teaching Excellence
- Technology Enhanced Learning and Digital Capabilities
- Widening Access and Student Success

We provide support for staff throughout their academic careers including initial opportunities to gain a teaching qualification ([PgCertLTHE](#)) and then [continuing support](#) to enhance and recognise their learning and teaching expertise ([CPD Framework](#)).

We work closely with academic Schools and central departments within the University to advise on the adoption of [learning technologies](#), enabling movement from isolated innovation to wide scale implementation.

Through our [Widening Access and Student Success](#) (WASS) work we support the transition, retention and engagement of all students considering university, as well as entering and studying at UH.

Working across the University, Herts Academic Skills provide resources and expertise to ensure that students have opportunities to reach their academic potential. We provide help and tuition for individuals, or groups of students, in academic writing skills, reading and research, English language development, and the wider range of attributes needed for successful outcomes, such as organisation and time management.

We work in partnership with academic Schools to support curriculum design ensuring [employability](#) development and [workplace learning](#) is embedded within programmes.

## **11.0 Proceedings for Ethical Application Approval**

The programme operates in accordance with the University's Regulations Governing Studies Involving the Use of Human Participants ([UPR RE01](#)) agreed from time-to-time by the Academic Board of the University, unless and until responsibility for ethical standards is transferred to a Partner Organisation. On transfer, the Partner Organisation will be responsible for all insurance liability in connection with the observance of ethical guidelines. Unless a Partner Organisation has obtained the approval of the Academic Board, through the University's Ethics Committee for Studies Involving the Use of Human Participants, to have responsibility transferred to it for the ethical conduct of studies involving Human Participants, all protocols must be applied for and monitored through the relevant Ethics Committee with Delegated Authority. The member of staff involved in the assessment process will liaise with the Chair of the appropriate ECDA to assist in the identification of those studies which might need

ethics approval and to advise on the application of the procedures in bringing protocol applications forward to the relevant University ethics committee.

## 12.0 OfS: Potential risk of fraud at franchised partners

In 2022 the OfS extended their regulatory work within the area of investigating possible fraudulent activity of lead or franchised providers. Concerns were raised towards potentially fraudulent applications and opaque recruitment practices within the sector especially where agents are used due to the significant risk they pose to taxpayers and student interests. Further to this, concerns are raised around the insufficient evidence available that students are attending and engaging with their course of study. Since the SLC depend on lead providers to determine whether or not their own students and franchise partners students are meaningfully engaged and attending, it is seen as another potential risk.

Due to these concerns the University requires its franchised partners to remain vigilant to these potential areas of risk and is required to oversee partner organisation arrangements to monitor this. As a result, partner organisations will be required to complete the following activities on an annual basis:

- a) Submit their attendance and engagement monitoring policy and processes to the University who will use this as a basis to complete their own audit of its implementation.
- b) Submit their withdrawal policy and processes to the University who will use this to support the audit referred to above.
- c) Confirm to the University whether or not they are using an agency to recruit HE students to the University of Hertfordshire programmes.
- d) Routinely consider the effectiveness of points a and b above at HE Committee meetings and provide opportunities to discuss any concerns of fraudulent activity.
- e) Support the APO with any annual monitoring activity relating to this in order to satisfy the University that regulatory requirements are being met.

The University will remain fully supportive and offer guidance and updates as appropriate on this item through its engagement at HE Committee meetings and from outcomes of the audit as referred to above. Further support is made available in terms of a case study in **Appendix X** to highlight possible fraudulent situations, actions taken and questions for consideration to improve practice. A focus on this item will be included at the annual Consortium Conference.



## Appendix I Consortium Quality Framework

### HERTFORDSHIRE HIGHER EDUCATION CONSORTIUM ACADEMIC QUALITY FRAMEWORK

#### SCOPE

This framework will apply to all taught Higher Education provision in the Consortium Colleges for which funding is received indirectly via the University. Any reference in this paper to Higher Education (HE) provision is intended to relate only to such provision.

#### COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Academic quality oversight of HE provision in the Consortium Colleges will be the responsibility of the University as lead provider in collaboration with Consortium College Leaders. Ongoing academic quality assurance will be provided to the Collaborative Partnerships Assurance Group (CPAG) via the APO.

Each College will have a **College Higher Education Committee** focusing on academic quality matters for all HE provision in the College. The Chair of each College HE Committee (or nominee) will have the responsibility of ensuring consistency of HE practice across the College and will attend and feedback on these during routine HE Managers meetings. This will ensure effective communications and exchange of ideas and good practice within the Consortium.

Core Terms of Reference for each HE Committee will be agreed by APO in collaboration with the colleges. The core common purposes of College HE Committees include the interpretation of Consortium quality assurance policies and procedures and ensuring that there are appropriate College procedures for: considering External Examiner and External Verifier reports; considering CEP's; monitoring action plans contained within CEP's. Links with the University are strengthened through the role of the Director of Academic Quality (or alternate from the CEdSS Academic Quality team). He or she is an ex-officio member of each College HE Committee. Additionally, a Key Account Manager (KAM) is appointed by the University to act as the strategic liaison between it and the Consortium Colleges to ensure that there is satisfaction on both sides and to explore opportunities for new developments. He or she is a member of each College HE Committee.



## Appendix II Terms of Reference for College HE Committees

- To provide a focus for all HE quality assurance issues including potential fraudulent activities, and support the College in developing it's HE strategy;
- To disseminate good practice in HE provision;
- To be responsible to the University for the interpretation and implementation of both Consortium and College policies and procedures for the design, validation, monitoring, evaluation and quality enhancement of all HE provision within the College;
- In particular, to ensure that there are appropriate procedures for:
  - the receipt of External Examiner and Verifier Reports.
  - the production of CEPs and action plans
- To ensure consistency of practice in the provision of HE across the College;
- To have strategic overview of the implementation of PDP within the College;
- To have an oversight of the monitoring of the use of StudyNet and CANVAS in the College and the use of blended learning (normally through the CEP process);
- To have oversight of the HE curriculum provision and structure of HE programmes, and to advise the Schools and APO on curriculum matters;
- To report annually to the APO and CPAG on key issues arising in HE provision.

### Core Composition for HHEC College HE Committees

#### Category

1	HE Manager (or equivalent)	1
2	Deputy Principal (or nominee)	1
3	Quality Manager (or equivalent)	1
4	Heads of Curriculum with HE provision	1
5	Programme Leaders/Managers	1
6	Head with responsibility for Learning Resources	1
7	Director of Academic Quality, University of Hertfordshire (ex-officio) (or alternate)	1
8	Student representatives	2

#### Officers in attendance:

Clerk to the Committee

#### Quorum:

One third of the members





**Appendix IV - Reviewers Comment Form (College reviewer, UH Moderator and External Examiner)**

This form should be used to review module documents prior to module delivery. The form is appropriate when reviewing module guides, as well as first sitting and referral / deferral sitting coursework, practical and exam assessments. Relevant sections should be completed by the appropriate person according to their role within the moderation process.

Colleges should complete section 1 and 4.

UH Moderator should review section 1 and complete section 2 and 4.

External Examiner should review section 1 and section 2 and complete section 3 and 4.

**Section 1 – For College Reviewer to complete, and for UH Moderator and EE to review**

Programme Name:		Level: 0 / 4 / 5 / 6	
Module Documents Prepared by: HRC / NHC / OAK / WHC (delete as appropriate)		Module delivered at: HRC/ NHC/ OAK/ WHC (delete as appropriate)	
Module Title:		Credits:	Semester: A / B / C
% of Assessment		Ethics Class Protocol Record Number (if appropriate)	
CW: %	Exam: %		
Practical: %		Module Guide on Canvas? (delete as appropriate)	Yes / No
Assessment available for review (tick all that apply):			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Coursework 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	Exam paper + rubric
<input type="checkbox"/>	Coursework 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	Model answer
<input type="checkbox"/>	Coursework 3	<input type="checkbox"/>	Deferred / Referred paper + rubric
<input type="checkbox"/>	Deferred / Referred Coursework	<input type="checkbox"/>	Deferred / Referred model answer



**Section 2 – For UH Moderator to complete, and EE to review**

*UH Moderator to comment on the First and Referred/Deferred assessment below. If there is more than one mode of assessment, please include your comments below for each mode of assessment. A guideline for reviewing coursework and exams is included at the end of this form.*

First Assessment Comments:

Referred/Deferred Assessment Comments:

**Please tick appropriate box below:**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Accepted without changes
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accepted with minor changes to be made before distribution to students. Final version to be lodged with the University.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accepted with minor changes to be made but reviewed by the University again before distribution to students.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not accepted. Substantial changes must be made and resubmitted to the University.

Name (UH Moderator): \_\_\_\_\_

Date completed: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_



**Section 3 – For the EE to complete**

*External Examiner to comment on the First and Referred/Deferred assessment below. If there is more than one mode of assessment, please include your comments below for each mode of assessment.*

First Assessment Comments:

Referred Assessment Comments:

**Please tick appropriate box below:**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Accepted without changes
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accepted with minor changes to be made before distribution to students. Final version to be lodged with the University.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accepted with minor changes to be made but reviewed by the University again before distribution to students.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not accepted. Substantial changes must be made and resubmitted to the University.

Name (External Examiner): \_\_\_\_\_

Date completed: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_



**Section 4 – For the College Reviewer, UH Moderator and EE to complete the relevant sections**

**Guidelines for reviewing documents**

MODULE GUIDE	College Reviewer			UH Moderator			External Examiner		
	Yes	No	Comments	Yes	No	Comments	Yes	No	Comments
The Module Guide contains accurate information in relation to the following: <i>Module Title/ Code/ Credits/ Level Module Leader &amp; Teaching Team, Module Aims &amp; Intended Learning Outcomes</i>									
The Module Guide provides: <i>Module Introduction/ Timetable/ Attendance Requirements/ Assessment Details/ Graduate Attributes Extenuating Circumstances / StudyNet Use/ Referencing Conventions/ Student Support/ Module Evaluation</i>									
The Module Guide provides an up to date reading list and includes indicative reading by session?									



COURSEWORK/ PRACTICAL ASSESSMENT	College Reviewer			UH Moderator			External Examiner		
	Yes	No	Comments	Yes	No	Comments	Yes	No	Comments
Is the front assessment attached with the relevant learning outcomes?									
Are the first and refer/defer assessment tasks included?									
Does the assessment relate to the module Intended Learning Outcomes stated in the DMD?									
Are the tasks unambiguous and clearly expressed? Please comment as appropriate on grammar, syntax and spelling.									
Is the assessment appropriate to the level of the module? Have the appropriate SEEC Level Descriptors been used for the level of study?									
Is the breakdown of marks for each task set accurate and appropriate?									
Do the total marks for the tasks add up to 100? (if applicable)									
Has the assessment been modified since the last assessment period (if applicable)?									
Check that the assignment is not unduly open for plagiarism									
Are the first and referral submission dates clear and appropriate and included in the module date.									



EXAM ASSESSMENT	College Reviewer			UH Moderator			External Examiner		
	Yes	No	Comments	Yes	No	Comments	Yes	No	Comments
Is the examination format the same as last year, if applicable?									
Is the content of the examination sufficiently different from last year, if applicable?									
Are the questions unambiguous and clearly expressed? Comment as appropriate on grammar, syntax and spelling									
Is it possible for the average student to read the entire paper within 5 minutes?									
If a case study is being used in an exam, how relevant and up to date is it?									
Are the questions appropriate to the level of the module? Have the appropriate SEEC Level Descriptors been used for the level of study?									
Are the questions appropriate to the time allowed?									
Is the rubric clear e.g. correct module title; length of exam; how many questions to be answered?									
Any additional information required on rubric e.g. graph paper/formula sheet									
Do the questions show the mark allocation (out of 100)?									
Check that the breakdown of marks per question is consistent									
Do the total marks add up to 100?									
Is the mark allocation reasonable?									
Are the model answers/ solutions correct?									
Check that there is/ are not the same Question(s) on referred and first paper									



## Appendix V - Internal / Cross College Moderation Form

Internal and cross college moderation is a process separate from marking and provides assurance relating to the quality of marking and feedback. The process of internal and cross college moderation involves checking that the marks have been awarded fairly and consistently and in accordance with the grading criteria/marketing scheme. The process also provides the opportunity to reflect on and refine assessment and feedback practices. Moderation must take account of the marks awarded to the full set of assessed work for the task, module or programme, in the context of the academic standards for the award. It is, therefore, not about making changes to an individual student's marks. Moderators must select a minimum sample size that is equal to the square root of the total number of items, but not fewer than five (5), selecting work from across the range of grades awarded. If there are fewer than five (5) items of assessment, then all items will be reviewed. All scripts (exams and coursework) for those students gaining 39% overall (i.e. a bare fail) shall be moderated to check that an overall pass shall be granted or not. Where there is more than one marker, the sample must include at least three (3) items from each marker.

<b>Module Leader:</b>		<b>Module Code:</b>	
<b>Module Title:</b>			
<b>College students are selected from:</b> (please circle) <b>HRC</b> <b>NHC</b> <b>OAK</b> <b>WHC</b>			
<b>Type of Script:</b> (please tick) <b>Exam Paper</b>		<b>Coursework Assignment and No.</b>	
<b>Total number of scripts in college cohort:</b>		<b>No. of Scripts Internally Moderated/Cross College moderated:</b> /	
<b>Markers Name(s):</b>		<b>Internal Moderator name:</b> <b>Cross College Moderator name:</b>	
<b>Students</b> (Please add rows as appropriate)			
<b>UH Student ID</b>	<b>Numeric Grade (prior to moderation)</b>	<b>UH Student ID</b>	<b>Numeric grade (prior to moderation)</b>
1.		6.	
2.		7.	
3.		8.	
4.		9.	
5.		10.	



OUTCOME OF MODERATION (please tick and comment where appropriate)	Internal Moderator Comments	Cross College Moderator Comments
<b>i) No Action is Required</b> (the marking is fair and consistent, requiring no change to either the marks or the feedback provided to students).		
<b>ii) The marking is consistent but too harsh or too generous,</b> requiring all relevant marks to be adjusted up or down following consultation with the relevant marker(s).		
<b>iii) There are significant inconsistencies in marking,</b> requiring a re-mark of all work following consultation with relevant marker(s).		
<b>iv) The quality of the feedback provided by one or more markers requires improvement.</b>		
<b>v) The feedback provided by one or more markers requires greater consistency.</b>		
<b>Internal Moderator signature:</b>		<b>Date:</b>
<b>Cross College Moderator signature:</b>		<b>Date:</b>

**Important:** Where actions have been required and have been completed, the marked work and the moderator form should be returned to the internal / cross college moderator to complete the relevant box below.



<b>Internal moderator actions required have now been satisfactorily completed</b> (Please tick)		Yes	No
<b>Comments:</b>			
<b>Internal moderator Signature:</b>		<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Cross college moderator actions required have now been satisfactorily completed</b> (Please tick)		Yes	No
<b>Comments:</b>			
<b>Cross college moderator Signature:</b>		<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Outcome from UH moderator</b> (Please comment if appropriate with the outcomes identified above and tick the appropriate action below)			
<b>Comments:</b>			
	Accepted without changes.		
	Accepted with minor changes to be made before distribution to students. Final version to be lodged with the University.		
	Accepted with minor changes to be made but reviewed by the University again before distribution to students.		
	Not accepted. Substantial changes must be made and resubmitted to the University		
<b>UH Moderator Signature:</b>		<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Outcome from External Examiner</b> (Please comment if appropriate with the outcomes identified above and tick the appropriate action below)			
<b>Comments:</b>			
	Accepted without changes.		
	Accepted with minor changes to be made before distribution to students. Final version to be lodged with the University.		
	Accepted with minor changes to be made but reviewed by the University again before distribution to students.		
	Not accepted. Substantial changes must be made and resubmitted to the University		
<b>External Examiner Signature:</b>		<b>Date:</b>	



## Appendix VI - College Based Module Evaluation Form (MEF)

<b>Programme title</b>				<b>Academic year</b>	
<b>Module title</b>				<b>Level and semester</b>	
<b>Module Leader and College</b>			<b>Consortium Module Tutor and College</b>		
<b>FEEDBACK</b> <i>Indicate (by a ✓ in the box) the type of feedback used in your evaluation</i>	<b>Assessment Weighting</b> (% ex: % cw)				
	<b>Student feedback?</b> (if yes, please detail in action planning below)		Yes or No		
	<b>Other</b> (please specify)				
	<b>Current Academic Year</b>		<b>Previous Academic Year</b>		
<b>Number of students on module</b>	n =		n =		
<b>Number of fails at first sit</b>	CW n =	%	CW n =	%	
	Ex n =	%	Ex n =	%	
<b>Number passing at first sit</b>	CW n =	%	CW n =	%	
	Ex n =	%	Ex n =	%	
<b>Average coursework grade</b>			% %		
<b>Average exam grade</b>			% %		
<b>Overview of Module run this year, inc. reflections on last year's Action Plan</b>					
<p><i>Consider particularly module content, learning &amp; teaching, assessment type and proportion each element accounts for, and teaching accommodation and staffing.</i></p> <p><i>Include comparison to previous years achievement and feedback</i></p> <p><i>Comment on the outcomes and progress of last year's action plan</i></p>					



Action Plan for the year ahead (all actions to be added to the CEP by Programme Manager)	
<p><i>E.g. Any changes to assessment briefs; teaching methods; industry contact, staffing etc.</i></p>	

**Important:** I confirm that this report has been discussed amongst the module team (within each College if applicable) and sent to the Programme Manager.

..... (Module Leader / Tutor)

..... (Date)



### Appendix VII - Consortium Module Evaluation Form (MEF) template

<b>Programme title</b>							<b>Academic year</b>		
<b>Module title</b>							<b>Level and semester</b>		
<b>Module Leader and College</b>				<b>Consortium Module Tutor and College</b>					
<b>FEEDBACK</b> <i>Indicate (by a ✓ in the box) the type of feedback used in your evaluation</i>	<b>External Examiner's Comments</b> ( <i>If applicable</i> )								
	<b>Assessment Weighting</b> (% exam / % coursework)								
	<b>Student Feedback</b> ( <i>indicate if available at point of completion</i> )								
	<b>Other</b> (please specify)								
<b>Comparison of module by college</b>									
<b>College Name</b>									
<b>Number of students</b>	n =		n=		n =		n=		
<b>Number of fails at first sit</b>	CW n=	%	CW n=	%	CW n=	%	CW n=	%	
	Ex n =	%	Ex n =	%	Ex n =	%	Ex n =	%	
<b>Number passing at first sit</b>	CW n=	%	CW n=	%	CW n=	%	CW n=	%	
	Ex n =	%	Ex n =	%	Ex n =	%	Ex n =	%	
<b>Average coursework grade</b>	%		%		%		%		
<b>Average exam grade</b>	%		%		%		%		



<p><b>Commentary</b></p> <p><i>(Reflections on consistency in performance across consortium, significant differences to be noted and discussed)</i></p>	
<p><b>Action plan for the module</b> (all actions to be added to the CEPs by the Programme Managers)</p>	
<p><b>Action Planning</b></p> <p><i>(Comment on currency of module e.g. particularly to note any changes to DMD and learning aims and outcomes required, by who and when required, changes to assessment weighting; delivery logistics i.e. decentralised vs centralised; level or semester delivery; programme specification change requests; removal or replacement of module.)</i></p>	

***Important:*** We confirm that this report has been approved by the module team (within each college if applicable) and sent to all the Programme Managers.

<b>Module Leader and college:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Module tutor and college:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Module tutor and college:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Module tutor and college:</b>	<b>Date:</b>

***Please return to the CPU five working days before the Module Board of Examiners***



## **Appendix VIII Roles and Responsibilities of a Consortium Collaborative Partnership Leader**

### **Main purpose of the role**

The University of Hertfordshire (UH) delegates responsibility for assuring and enhancing the quality of students' learning experience, and assuring the standard of awards, to Schools. A key role for this work is that of the Collaborative Partnership Leader (CPL) appointed within Schools for each collaborative programme. The CPL is the key contact and main academic link along with the Programme Leader (or equivalent) and other appropriate staff in the partner organisation to help ensure that students who study outside of the University, have an equivalent experience to those who study at UH. They are also key in bringing information back to the UH, to assure the University that quality and standards at a partner organisation are appropriate. In addition, they provide an opportunity for UH to learn from partners through the identification and sharing of best practice.

### **Responsibilities and duties**

The responsibilities and duties of a CPL may be expected to include the following. However, some of these responsibilities may be delegated to other members of the School or other parts of the University, but only with their specific permission. The responsibilities and duties may also be added to by the School, if this is deemed appropriate.

The responsibilities and duties of a CPL may be expected to include the following. However, some of these responsibilities may be delegated to other members of the School or other parts of the University, but only with their specific permission. The responsibilities and duties may also be added to by the School, if this is deemed appropriate.

1. To be the main academic point of contact for communications between the School and the Collaborative Partner.
2. Monitor the health of a collaborative programme (for example, through visits or other communications) and to report to the Dean of School (or nominee) any actions that need to be taken to support the collaboration or on any other matters relevant to the partnership.
3. The CPL should complete the CPL Activity form a minimum of twice a year in collaboration with the Partner. Enhancements and actions arising from the CPL Activity form are to be added to the CEP / AMER action plan.
4. Where the CEP is not used, present the AMER to the SEG or appropriate Sub-Group (or, in the case of Academic Support Partnerships, to prepare an annual report for each partner to be appended to the AMER).
5. Act as an ex officio member of the relevant Programme Academic Experience Group at the Partner Organisation.



6. Co-ordinate the review and moderation of the assessment process. When this involves the review by the University of in-course assessments or examination papers, the role of CPL gives authority to make requests of Deans of relevant Schools to provide subject staff to carry out this task.
7. Act with the Dean of School (or nominee) and the University's Marketing and Communications Department to ensure that all necessary administrative procedures, including the approval of promotional material, are carried out at the necessary time.
8. Work with Academic Services on audits of public information to ensure that all published Collaborative partner information is accurate and updated regularly through completion of the CPL Annual Review of Partner Websites and Published Materials Checklist
9. Provide, along with other members of the School, appropriate academic staff training and support to partner staff.
10. Regularly check that appropriate resources approved at (re) validation are being maintained and appropriately improved.
11. Ensure that any new staff teaching on UH programmes at the partner are approved by the School and that this approval process is auditable.
12. Obtain and respond to feedback from students in collaboration with the partner organisation.
13. Check that the agreed admissions requirements are being applied and that non-standard entry requirements are being considered through agreed procedures.
14. Regularly review academic documentation of the partner for accuracy, reliability and appropriateness, such as programme information on Canvas sites, student handbooks (where still used), module guides, online learning materials.
15. Report, as appropriate, on their required visits to the partner and any other routine engagements.
16. Share enhancements from and with the partner for wider dissemination.
17. Work closely with the Quality Liaison Manager (if appointed for that partner organisation) and or the Academic Partnerships Office (APO).
18. Work closely with the Collaborative Partnership Unit (CPU).
19. Attend appropriate staff development opportunities, including an 'unconscious bias' course and CPL Network events.
20. Be vigilant to any suspected fraudulent activity at partners where students are in receipt of SLC funding



## Appendix IX Core Agenda for Consortium Programme Academic Experience Group

### UNIVERSITY OF HERTFORDSHIRE

#### Core Agenda for Partner Programme Academic Experience Group (PAEG) meeting

(Choose the relevant School.)

Programme title (*Insert programme title here*)

This PAEG meeting was held on (*date*) at (*time*) in (*venue or MS Teams*)

Apologies shall be conveyed to the Clerk via email

---

#### Agenda

- 1.0 **Apologies**  
To receive apologies for non-attendance at the meeting
  
- 2.0 **Membership and Terms of Reference** (to be considered at the first PAEG of the academic year)
  - 2.1 **Membership**  
To receive changes and to welcome any new members
  - 2.2 **[Terms of reference](#)**  
To confirm the terms of reference and ensure understanding
  
- 3.0 **Minutes from the previous meeting** (*insert date*)  
To confirm the minutes of the last meeting and schedule of actions update
  
- 4.0 **Continuous Enhancement Planning**  
To review and discuss progress against live actions arising from data (ensuring relevance to level of programme being considered, UG or PG)  
To review and discuss progress against live actions related to programme delivery/learning infrastructure  
To review and discuss progress against live actions relating to the assessment process  
To review and discuss progress against live actions against modules identified as being at risk and confirm module evaluation actions have been addressed  
To review and discuss progress against live actions resulting from student feedback  
To review and discuss progress against live actions resulting from recommendations at validation or revalidation  
To review and discuss progress against live actions from External Examiners reports, PSRB's or other external stakeholders.  
To review and discuss progress against live actions relating to programme enhancements
  
- 5.0 **Student Voice**  
To receive reports from student reps on academic matters  
To consider feedback from all student voice mechanisms including (but not limited to); Partner Student Forum (or equivalent), Pulse Check, Programme survey, local student union (where appropriate), NSS and



PTES as appropriate

**6.0 Programme Manager (PM) Reports (Consortium only)**

**To receive** reports from PM's concerning learning, teaching and assessment matters, programme content, curriculum design, resources, student support and guidance.

**7.0 Module Leader Reports**

**To receive** reports from Module Leaders concerning learning, teaching and assessment matters, programme content including academic experience unique to the programme such as work-based learning, practice learning and PSRB's, curriculum design, resources, student support and guidance.

**8.0 Collaborative Partnership Leader (CPL) Report**

**To receive** reports from the CPL concerning learning, teaching and assessment matters, programme content, curriculum design, resources, student support and guidance not already covered by the PL's/PM's and updates on partner visits and CPL activity forms

**9.0 Other Stakeholders (to be considered annually)**

**9.1 To receive** an annual report from the UH LCS Academic Liaison Librarian (where partner students access UH LCS services)

**9.2 To receive** an annual report from other, partner based academic support teams.

**9.3 To receive** an annual report from other external stakeholders involved with the programme i.e. work based learning employers.

**10.0 Schedule of Actions**

**To report** on the PAEG's Schedule of Actions and update where necessary for reporting to the School and relevant partner committee

**To confirm** the date the Schedule of Actions will be fed forward to the School SEG and relevant partner committee

**11.0 Emergency Business**

Admissible only with permission from the Chair

**12.0 Date and location of next meeting** (*insert date and location*)



## Appendix X OfS and Fraudulent Activity at Franchised Partners

### CASE STUDY

Student X studied HE at College Y during 21/22, a partner of University Z.

After year 1 of study, the student only passed one module of her programme. Her attendance and engagement were minimal due to challenging personal circumstances. However, the student was not advised to rest from study. Given the challenging circumstances the student received deferrals for some modules and would need to re-enrol the following academic year on others. As a result, student X was required to return to college at the start of the next academic year 22/23 to repeat the year, other than the one module she had already completed.

Prior to the start of the next academic year the student registered online with University Z indicating her intention to return to study. As a result, University Z notified SFE (as is common practice) that the student would be returning to study. SFE allocated the student with a maintenance grant, it's not known how much she received but it's likely to have been several thousands of pounds. The student was not eligible to have her fees paid by SFE due to having studied the same level prior to enrolling to this course, so she was a self-funder.

At the start of every academic year CPU share class lists of all students registered at University Z with college PMs for them to check. Any conflicts should be reported back to CPU within a given timeframe. This checking process is continual from start of any programme through to the lead up to the first fee liability point.

On 12th December 2022, college Y submitted a withdrawal form for student X to University Z as she had not attended any lessons, neither had she engaged with any assessments and in fact had not returned to college to re-enrol with them to repeat her outstanding year 1 modules. The College issued a letter to the student confirming her withdrawal from the programme. The University processed this withdrawal and notified SFE that the student was a no show, as is common practice.

The student received a debtor notice from UH for 25% of her fees in February 2023.

As the student did not engage or attend with her course 22/23, she received a letter from SFE demanding she pay back the entirety of her Maintenance Grant (likely to be several thousands of pounds).

The student submitted a complaint to University Z claiming that:

1. She was not informed that she was at risk of being withdrawn
2. She did not receive the withdrawal letter from College Y until the middle of January 23 due



to the Christmas period and postal strikes. By this point she had spent the Maintenance Grant awarded to her by the SFE and was unable to pay it back

3. She had been liaising with her tutor since the start of term who had advised her to continue with her programme online, given her continued challenging circumstances. The tutor has since left the college so is unable to clarify this.

4. She had been accessing CANVAS

#### **Questions to consider and for discussion:**

- What potential issues can you see here?
- How would University Z view this?
- How would the SFE view this?
- Is there a conflict between the two viewpoints?
- How would the OfS view this?
- Was this a case of potential fraud?
- How could it have been avoided?
- What will the OIA want evidence of should the student complain to them about this?
- What steps can colleges take to ensure they do not find themselves in a similar possibly compromising position?