



Fairfield School of Business

HER Action Plan

Higher Education Review Report November 2017

Recommendations to be completed by July 2018				
Recommendations 1	Action	Deadline	Staff	Evidence
<p>A2.1: Degree Awarding Bodies' Reference Points for Academic Standards – in order secure their academic standards, degree awarding bodies establish transparent and comprehensive academic frameworks and regulations to govern how they award academic credit and qualifications</p> <p>1.12 The School adequately operates and implements the academic frameworks and regulations specified by the awarding body and awarding organisation. However, the academic governance structure that supports the implementation does not operate fully as intended and may impede effective oversight of academic standards and quality. The review team concludes the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is moderate.</p> <p>The review team recommends that the School ensure the alignment of academic policies, practices and procedures with the governance framework.</p> <p>Chapter B8: Programme Monitoring & Review – Higher education providers, in discharging their responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, operate effective, regular and systematic processes for monitoring and for review of programmes</p> <p>2.88: The School completes annual monitoring reports diligently and effectively. However, oversight of these processes is often exercised informally. Key committees do not formally receive or approve monitoring reports and few instances of discussion of monitoring reports at committees were identified. Therefore, the School cannot satisfy itself that review processes are supplied systematically and operated consistently. In order to address these shortcomings, the review team recommends that the School ensure effective institutional oversight of</p>				

programme monitoring and review processes.

<p>1</p>	<p>Ensure the alignment of academic policies, practices and procedures with the governance framework</p>	<p>Review and implement new FSB Governance structure</p> <p>Review and revise as appropriate, the Executive and Deliberative Committee structure terms of reference, primary responsibilities and membership</p>	<p>22/05/18</p> <p>13/06/18</p>	<p>CEO Deputy CEO Principal</p> <p>JP AN MB</p>	<p>1.1 Governance Structure Chart</p> <p>1.2 Governance Handbook</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Ensure effective institutional oversight of programme monitoring and review processes (Expectation B8)</p>	<p>Ensure the terms of reference for the Programme Committees and the new Quality Enhancement Committee carry oversight responsibility for the review and evaluation of module and annual monitoring reports</p> <p>Review the process for responding to External Examiner reports to feed into Programme Evaluation Monitoring Reviews including exploring approaches to ensuring the effectiveness of the function of the Master Action Plan</p> <p>Design & implement an overarching organisational Self-Assessment reporting (SAR) process drawing from outcomes in the programme reviews</p>	<p>13/06/18</p> <p>13/06/18</p>		<p>1.2 Governance Handbook</p> <p>1.3 Office for Students (OfS) Management & Governance arrangements template</p> <p>1.4 Revised Programme & Annual Monitoring Review documentation</p>

01/05/2018 - Commentary on Recommendations 1 & 10 Quality Enhancement Committee (QEC)

The Quality Enhancement Committee (QEC), met for its inaugural meeting at the FSB Croydon campus on Tuesday 1st May 2018, with the predominant focus of considering and further developing the QAA draft HER Action Plan and strategies for Enhancement.

Members representing Programme Leaders, Student Services, Senior Managers, Principalship and Quality Assurance were in attendance. The Chair confirmed to the members that the QEC has oversight of quality assurance and monitoring of academic standards, quality of student learning opportunities and enhancement. It was further confirmed that over the duration of the action plan timelines (set by QAA: July & September), the QEC will meet on a monthly basis to ensure timely responses are actioned as agreed. The Chair confirmed the next QEC will meet on Tuesday 22nd May.

In the absence of student members due to semester end, it was stressed that Student Representatives studying on programmes from Pearson and London Metropolitan University were formally required to attend to ensure the student body as a whole is kept informed of academic and quality developments and given the opportunity to represent student views on how they can contribute to enhancing their learning environment and outcomes. A Student Representative Development Programme, a framework for training, was considered, which outlines the roles, responsibilities and requirements of potential student representatives.

The Principal confirmed that the Group Head of Quality has produced a Governance Review paper, in response to the forthcoming Office for Students (OfS) www.ofs.gov.uk/governance requirements that HE institutions have in place appropriate governance structures aligned with new regulatory requirements and the Committee of University Chair's HE Code of Governance. www.cuc/hecode to provide greater assurance about academic governance. This has supported the initial work of the Executive Management Group's review of existing governance arrangements across the group institutions, including the London School of Science & Technology (LSST – London, Luton & Birmingham), Fairfield School of Business (FSB) & the UK Business College (UKBC)

The meeting received a copy of the draft Governance structure with the Principal outlining the key changes in some functions but with particular emphasis given to the development & inclusion of the new Quality Enhancement Committee and its roles and responsibilities.

A second draft version of the Governance Review paper, confirming the academic committee/group structure with updated information on committee membership, terms of reference, quoracy and key responsibilities was explored, once again with the focus on the QEC. The Chair confirmed that minutes of the QEC will provide evidence of the effective functioning of the committee and its role in the governance structure.

The Head of Centre and Programme Leaders informed the meeting of the current Programme Monitoring Review practice within the School confirming that monitoring review were undertaken and reported directly to the appropriate awarding bodies. The Head of Quality explained that QAA required institutions involved in collaborative arrangements with partner universities to not only

respond to the requirements of the partner, but to undertake a formal oversight process of receiving and considering outcomes to both External Examiner actions and Programme Monitoring Reviews by key committees in the governance structure.

It was further confirmed that an overarching, organisational Self-Assessment Report (SAR), part of a reflective, self-critical process, reviewing and evaluating academic performance would summarise the key outcomes and requirements from the programme reviews and be implemented by the Head of Quality and reported to the Quality Enhancement Committee and Academic Board confirming institutional awareness of the 'academic health' of provision.

The Head of Quality confirmed the development of a Self-Assessment Report (SAR) template would be designed and considered for approval by the Executive Committee and implemented as part of the academic year-end monitoring process in July/August 2018.

30/05/2018 - Commentary on Recommendations 1 & 10 from Quality Enhancement Committee (QEC)

The Quality Enhancement Committee met on the 30th May to review and evaluate actions from the inaugural QEC meeting on the 01/05/18. Discussion centred around the Governance Review process, undertaken at Executive-level, with several iterations resulting in the production of an updated Governance Handbook. The handbook comprehensively documents and maps out the primary aims, responsibilities and terms of reference of each committee within the FSB executive and deliberative committee structure, which has undergone an extensive process of evaluation and review to ensure that the School's key committees, boards and panels are fit for purpose and effective in their oversight of academic standards and quality assurance.

The requirements to comply with the Office for Students application for providers designated for student support has proved supportive of the need to further develop the agreed actions in this action plan. The self-assessment of Management & Governance arrangements comprehensively articulates the School's committee structure and confirms its alignment to the HE Code of Governance. The FSB Board of Governance Primary Responsibilities are mapped against the HE Code's Primary Elements, demonstrating that the School's Primary Responsibilities of governance underpin the values and beliefs outlined in the Core Values of Higher Education.

Discussion at the QEC confirms the dissemination and sharing of the governance review outcomes with key staff who are tasked with ensuring all academic and support staff and students are fully aware of the revised governance structures. The FSB Head of Centre confirmed that staff met with students on 22nd May 2018 to ensure full student awareness of the HER Action Plan.

Recommendations 2 & 5	Action	Deadline	Staff	Evidence
----------------------------------	---------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------

Expectation B6: Assessment of Students & the Recognition of Prior Learning – Higher education providers operate equitable, valid & reliable processes of assessment, including for the recognition of prior learning, which enable every student to demonstrate the extent to which they have achieved the intended learning outcomes for the credit or qualification being sought.

2.69 In order to eliminate differing versions of the policies and procedures discussed above, and to align practice with the requirements of these policies, the review team **recommends** that the School review and implement appropriate changes to its policies, procedures and guidance in relation to mitigating circumstances, academic misconduct, reasonable adjustments and recognition of prior learning, to ensure coherence and equitable treatment of students.

Part C: Information about Higher Education Provision – Higher education providers produce information for their intended audiences about the higher education they offer that is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy

3.8: There is contradictory information about the process of appeal against the academic misconduct decisions between the Academic Misconduct Policy and the Student Code of Conduct. The Student Handbook informs students that they need to access coursework submission sheets from two different sources. The review team **recommends** that the School ensures all published information is accurate and trustworthy.

2	Review and implement appropriate changes to its policies, procedures and guidance in relation to mitigating circumstances, academic misconduct, reasonable adjustments and recognition of prior learning, to ensure coherence and equitable treatment of students (Expectation B6)	Review the organisation’s overall approach to the teaching, learning and assessment of students with a targeted focus upon reviewing and updating the following policies and procedures, aligned with QAA Expectation B6 and sector benchmarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigating Circumstances policy • Academic Misconduct policy • Reasonable Adjustments policy • Recognition of Prior Learning policy 	14/06/18	AN MH	1.5 Teaching, Learning & Assessment Handbook
5	Ensure all published information is accurate	Develop and implement a Publications Committee for the development, review and oversight	14/06/18	AN JP MBu	1.6 Revised Mitigating Circumstances policy 1.7 Revised Academic Misconduct policy 1.8 Reasonable Adjustments policy 1.9 Recognition of Prior Learning policy 2.0 Publications Committee Rationale and terms of reference

	and trustworthy (Expectation C)	of all published and web-based information			
<p>01/05/2018 - Commentary on Recommendations 2 & 5 from Quality Enhancement Committee (QEC) The School has amalgamated Recommendations 2 & 5, giving a wider focus on the issues of accuracy and trustworthiness of information. The FSB Head of Centre confirmed that work has been undertaken to review the Mitigating Circumstances policy, Academic Misconduct policy, Reasonable Adjustments policy and Recognition of Prior Learning policy, as per the recommendation. Copies of the revised policies will be circulated to QEC members prior to the next meeting on the 22nd May for consideration and approval.</p> <p>Members discussed the current processes in place within the School on how information is developed and confirmed to be accurate, trustworthy and approved before publication in print and electronic formats. It was agreed that the current practice of producing and agreeing updates to information at various levels within the School was responsible for inaccuracies in a number of documents. The Principal highlighted that practices were often informal with no central oversight of updated information publications and confirmed that a Publications Committee, with the prime responsibility for the commissioning, oversight and approval of all published and electronic information, be developed to provide a formal process to ensure School level approval.</p>					
<p>30/05/2018 - Commentary on Recommendations 2 & 5 from Quality Enhancement Committee (QEC) The Head of Centre confirmed that the Reasonable Adjustments Policy and the Recognition of Prior Learning Policy were complete and awaiting consideration at the forthcoming QEC meeting on 14th June, prior to final approval by the Executive Committee. The Mitigating Circumstances Policy and Academic Misconduct Policy were in the process of review and evaluation and would be considered at the QEC meeting before also being considered for approval at the next Executive meeting.</p> <p>The Principal confirmed that the development of the Publications Committee was an important addition to the School's executive and deliberative committee structure confirming a formal and consistent process for the management and oversight of published information. As Chair of the Publications Committee, the Principal was confirmed as holding executive responsibility for 'sign-off of all electronic or printed academic and publicity material.</p>					
Recommendations 3 & 4	Action	Deadline	Staff	Evidence	
<p>Expectation B9: Academic Appeals & Student Complaints: <i>Higher education providers have procedures for handling academic appeals and student complaints about the quality of learning opportunities; these procedures are fair, accessible and timely, and enable enhancement</i></p>					

2.92: Both the Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure and the Student Complaints Procedure were recently and updated, and clearly state the scope of the policy. However, while staff who met the review team were familiar with the School's processes for Pearson provision, they were unclear about the processes that would apply to students on university programmes. The review team recommends that the School ensure staff are fully familiar with the complaints and appeals processes of the awarding body.

2.94 While senior staff can access individual student complaint and appeal files, there is no formalised process for institutional oversight of these cases. The review team **recommends** that the School formalise the process for the effective oversight of complaints and appeals

3	Ensure staff are fully familiar with the complaints and appeals processes of the awarding body (Expectation B9)	<p>Senior management team to review processes for ensuring staff awareness of all policies and procedures, with a particular focus on Complaints and Appeals, are consistently reviewed and updated</p> <p>FSB to implement an Annual Quality Enhancement Conference in July 2018 to include a presentation workshop on Complaints & Appeals with support from its awarding body partner London Metropolitan University and external 'critical friends', to identify and share good practice relating to Complaints & Appeals. Principal to liaise with London Metropolitan University to arrange support.</p>	14/06/18	MBu	<p>2.1 Annual Quality Enhancement Conference Staff Development workshop Documentation to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Quality Framework rationale and strategy • Staff Development rationale for sharing and implementing good practice • Agenda
4	Formalise the process for the effective oversight of complaints and appeals (Expectation B9)	Review and update Complaints and Appeals policies and procedures in Staff Handbooks and Student Handbooks and terms of reference for Programme Committees	14/06/18	AN MH PIs	<p>2.2 Updated Staff Handbook 2.3 Updated Student Handbooks 1.2 Governance Handbook</p>

--	--	--	--	--	--

01/05/2018 - Commentary on Recommendations 3 & 4 from Quality Enhancement Committee (QEC)
 It was noted, once again, that Recommendations 3 & 4 had been amalgamated given the similarity and nature of the issues.

Members discussed the FSB Appeal & Complaints policies and terms of reference, with the Principal reminding staff that issues relating to complaints or appeals must be handled internally in line with the School's policies. Students must exhaust the internal procedures to potentially reach a satisfactory conclusion before escalating to the awarding body if not fully satisfied with internal outcomes. Programme Leaders were requested to ensure this message was relayed to the student representatives on both the Pearson & LMU programmes.

The Head of Centre was requested to review the policies and terms of reference to ensure that a formal process is scoped out in the documentation with timescales and deadlines for stage outcomes clearly implemented. Updated draft documents to be reviewed at the next QEC on Tuesday 22nd May.

30/05/2018 - Commentary on Recommendations 3 & 4 from Quality Enhancement Committee (QEC)

The Head of Quality informed the meeting of a proposal to design and implement an Annual Quality Enhancement Conference to provide opportunity for managers, academic staff and students to come together to review pedagogical issues and developments highlighted over the course of the academic year from a range of sources including: external examiner reports, student surveys, outcomes of annual monitoring review, collaborative partner feedback and regulator reports including QAA and Pearson.

The conference format will include a focused development workshop on the oversight and management of the Complaints and Appeals processes within the School. The workshop will be jointly run by the FSB Quality team and academic staff with support from London Metropolitan University and external HE Academy Fellowship teaching and learning specialists.

A Strategic Quality Framework outline will be reviewed at the next QEC on 14th June, which will outline the role of staff development in support of QAA HER Review report outcomes and propose an event structure and draft agenda.

It was further confirmed that Staff and Student Handbooks were in the process of review and update.

Recommendations to be completed by September 2018

Recommendations 6 & 7	Action	Deadline	Staff	Evidence
-----------------------	--------	----------	-------	----------

<p>Chapter B1: Programme Design, Development & Approval – Higher education providers, in discharging their responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, operate effective processes for the design, development and approval of programmes.</p> <p>2.7: The School has undertaken little programme design and development activity to date but is able to manage amendments to existing programmes in practice. In view of the planned expansion of the academic portfolio, the review team recommends that the School put in place formal policies, processes and guidance for the design, development, approval and amendment of modules and programmes.</p> <p>2.8: There have been no opportunities for employers to contribute to the development of the foundation degrees, even though they contain mandatory work placement elements. The School confirmed that employers, professional support staff, and students were not involved in the design and development of the new top-up programmes. To ensure the currency and validity of future academic provision, the review team recommends that the School develop and implement opportunities for employers, external experts and students to contribute to the design and development of modules and programmes.</p>					
6	Put in place formal policies, processes and guidance for the development, approval and amendment of modules and programmes (Expectation B1)	Develop and implement a new Programme Development & Review Group procedure (PDRG) to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme Development & Review Group 	14/0618	MBu	1.2 Terms of reference for Programme Development & Review Group in Governance Handbook
7	Develop and implement opportunities for employers, external experts and students to contribute to the design and development of modules and programmes (Expectation B1)	Design, develop and implement an Externality Framework Strategy and policy to further develop external relations in support of curriculum development, with wider enhancements to student placements and careers development.	14/06/18	MBu	2.4 Externality Strategy Framework documentation
		Develop a database of external industrial and professional practitioners to support and further	14/06/18	AN JP	2.5 External industrial and professional database

		develop the currency of academic provision and create and enhance opportunities for external workplace engagement for students			
		Create an Employer Forum to formalise external engagement with curriculum development and staff development activities	14/06/18	MB	2.6 Employer Forum terms of reference and documentation

01/05/2018 - Commentary on Recommendations 6 & 7 from Quality Enhancement Committee (QEC)

Recommendation 6 clearly states the need for formal processes to be in place to support the development, approval and amendment of modules and programmes. The Head of Quality confirmed that a new framework process to address this issue will be designed and implemented consisting of the Programme Design & Review Group and a Curriculum Resource Model (CRM).

The development will be aligned with QAA guidance with expectations that higher education providers define the respective roles, responsibilities and authority of the different individuals and bodies involved in programme design, development and approval. It is further expected that individuals involved in this development process are clear about their individual roles and the hierarchy of procedures.

Terms of reference and roles and responsibilities will be drawn up aligned with this guidance. The model was explained and considered by the group, confirming that a 'Programme Design & Review Group' be implemented to formalise the process of development of new provision or amendments to existing provision.

The Curriculum Resource Model (CRM), confirms the physical and human resource (staff/student ratio – SSR) formulae for programme development and is a mandatory component of the internal development and approval process, requiring executive 'sign-off' by the Deputy CEO prior to final award approval. Due to the financial & human resource implications of the CRM, it was agreed that before design & implementation of the documentation, the Executive Committee should be informed of this development.

The group looked at Recommendation 7 in its widest sense, with the Head of Quality explaining that 'Externality' is featured in the QAA Quality Code which expects that higher education providers ensure independent and external participation in the management of threshold academic standards.

QAA guidance confirms that external input into institutions' quality management may arise through a number of processes and from a variety of sources including: External Examiners (Chapter B7), External inputs into programme design and approval (Chapter B1), External inputs into Assessment (Chapter B6), External input into Student Support, in particular the development of careers education, information, advice &

guidance and support for disabled students (Chapter B4), External inputs into Programme Monitoring & Review (Chapter B8) and External inputs into collaborative activity (Chapter B10).

Discussion centred around the need to design, develop and implement an Externality Framework Strategy and policy to further develop external relations in support of curriculum development, with wider enhancements to student placements and careers development. It was agreed that a database of external industrial and professional practitioners be developed to support and further develop the currency of academic provision and create and enhance opportunities for external workplace engagement for students. In addition, members confirmed the benefits of establishing an Employer Forum to formalise external engagement with curriculum development and staff development activities. It was recognised that encouraging external/industrial contacts to give up their time to engage with the School's external activities is challenging, but brings huge benefits to both staff and students and the institution as a whole and contribute to formal enhancement activities across the School. The School, however, noted that being a franchisee of both London Metropolitan University & Pearson, there is a limit to the influence it has on programme modification and design.

30/05/2018 - Commentary on Recommendations 6 & 7 from Quality Enhancement Committee (QEC)

It was noted that the rationale, primary aims and terms of reference for the Programme Development & Review Group had been developed as part of the Governance review process. A description and outline of the group can now be found in the revised Governance Handbook. The Head of Quality confirmed that programme development and the functioning of the group will be included in workshop presentations as part of the Annual Quality Enhancement Conference.

Academic staff confirmed that employer engagement was developing positively confirming a series of employer-led events and support for student employment had recently been undertaken through:

- Barclays Bank – student employment
- Caridon Property Design & Development – curriculum enhancement
- FSB 'Dragon's Den event

Recommendations 8 & 9	Action	Deadline	Staff	Evidence
-----------------------	--------	----------	-------	----------

Chapter B5: Student Engagement - Higher education providers take deliberate steps to engage all students, individually and collectively, as partners in the assurance and enhancement of their educational experience

*2.42: The School has run an annual student survey for the past two years. However senior staff were unfamiliar with this feedback mechanism and the results had not been considered by any formal decision-making body, although the terms of reference of the Students' Union Committee assign responsibility for this to the Committee. Although they had been discussed at a weekly staff meeting, staff could not inform the team of any actions that had taken place as a result. The review team **recommends** that the School fully implement its policy to include*

student feedback in module monitoring review reports.

*2.46: There is a need to further develop the role that students play in relation to the outcomes of quality assurances processes linking with School-level decision-making. The review team **recommends** that the School further strengthen the effectiveness of its engagement with students as partners in the assurance and enhancement of their educational experience.*

8	Fully implement its policy to include student feedback in module monitoring review reports (Expectation B5)		Review Student Engagement Policy to ensure mechanisms are in place to effectively and consistently capture student feedback.	13/06/18	AN	2.7 Module Template
9	Further strengthen the effectiveness of its engagement with students as partners in the assurance and enhancement of their educational experience (Expectation B5)		Confirm formal student engagement in the development of the new FSB Strategic Quality Framework	22/05/18	MBu	2.8 FSB Strategic Quality Framework documentation
		Design, develop and implement a 'Student Representative Development Programme' The programme is developed to equip Student Representatives with the basic information needed during their term of office	22/05/18	MBu	2.9 Student Representative Development Programme	
		Engage Student Representatives in reviewing the Governance and Quality Framework documentation as part of Quality Enhancement Committee function	22/05/18	AN MBu	3.0 QEC minutes	

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

01/05/2018 - Commentary on Recommendations 8 & 9 from Quality Enhancement Committee (QEC)

The Head of Centre informed the group of the School's current practice confirming that students had the opportunity to feedback on completion of modules. It was agreed, however, that this process was required to be formalised and that engagement with the Student Committee would take place to develop a new Module Feedback template to include Student Feedback section.

The Head of Quality confirmed that students would be kept informed of the new FSB Strategic Quality Framework, currently being developed and would have opportunity to contribute to the structure. It was agreed that the School's Teaching, Learning & Assessment & the Student Engagement policies be reviewed to ensure student engagement is identified as a formal process in the academic cycle.

The Head of Quality informed the group that a 'Student Representative Development Programme/ Framework' was currently being developed and explained how the programme is designed to equip Student Representatives with the basic information needed during their term of office. Documentation explains the role and who they will be working with and how academic and support staff can help in providing support to ensure representatives play a vital role in enhancing the learning experience and environment for both current and future students at the School. The programme, consisting of an initial 'training session' after election, includes topics such as behaviours, attitudes and standards, dealing with the student body, recording, reporting and feedback mechanisms and the formal requirement of committee membership, including the Academic Board, Quality Enhancement Committee and the new Teaching & Learning Forum.

30/05/2018 - Commentary on Recommendations 8 & 9 from Quality Enhancement Committee (QEC)

The Head of Centre confirmed that a staff/student sub-committee meeting of the QEC met on the 22nd May 2018 to share the development of the School's responses to the recommendations in the HER Action Plan. Student reviewed the series of recommendations having opportunity to contribute to further developments as the actions are progressed. Students will be represented at the Annual Quality Enhancement Conference in July.

Recommendations 11 & 12	Action	Deadline	Staff	Evidence
-------------------------	--------	----------	-------	----------

Enhancement: Deliberate steps are being taken at provider-level to improve the quality of students' learning opportunities

4.3: Strategic thinking in the Strategic Plan is not part of a systematic, School-wide planning process that focuses on specific activities relating

to student learning opportunities. Specifying such activities and aims in a clear plan with timelines, milestones and targets would support the integration of enhancement initiatives in a systematic and planned manner at School-level. The review team **recommends** that the School strengthen School-level planning processes by developing clear targets and timelines for implementation of agreed objectives

4.6: Staff at all levels stated that the outcomes of monitoring and review are a key source to drive enhancements. There is, however, a lack of systematic formal consideration of programme monitoring outcomes at institutional-level, which results in weak oversight of the monitoring and review processes – it also results in a weak link between monitoring and strategy. The School has a two-part master action plan, in which actions that have emerged from internal and external quality assurance processes are supposed to be captured, but there was no evidence that the action plans developed as part of module and programme monitoring are fully incorporated in a master action plan. There is also no real link between module and programme monitoring outcomes, the master action plan and the objectives in the Strategic Plan, thus impeding the School's ability to identify and implement targeted enhancements of its academic provision. The review team **recommends** that the School strengthen the link between the outcomes of quality assurance processes and School-level decision making.

11	Strengthen School-level planning processes by developing clear targets and timelines for the implementation of agreed objectives (Enhancement)	Design & implement the Quality Enhancement Committee	22/05/18	MBu JP	1.2 Governance Handbook
12	Strengthen the link between the outcomes of quality assurance processes and School-level decision making (Enhancement).	Design, develop and implement an FSB Strategic Enhancement Plan. The plan will consist of a series of Strategic Principles and an Operations Strategy to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhancement as an agenda item on key academic and management committees. • Enhancement to be included on agenda for Student Union Committee 	22/05/18	MBu	3.1 Strategic Enhancement Plan

01/05/2018 - Commentary on Recommendations 11 & 12 from Quality Enhancement Committee (QEC)

The Principal tabled the School's proposed Enhancement Strategy document, explaining the need to formalise the 'enhancement' activities to meet the QAA expectation that... **deliberate steps are being taken at provider level to improve the quality of students' learning opportunities'**

The document scopes out approaches to enhancement and how these will be formally instigated, maintained, reviewed and acted upon to ensure a process of continuous improvement to the student learning experience and environment.

The Head of Quality outlined a process for systematic and consistent oversight of activities through the design, development and implementation of a Strategic Enhancement Plan. The plan will be developed through discussions at the QEC, Teaching & Learning Forum and the Executive Committee and will consist of a series of measurable key performance indicators (KPIs). The plan will become a standing agenda item on the School's committee structure ensuring oversight is driven strategically at executive level throughout the School.

A draft exemplar will be tabled at the next QEC meeting on 22nd May for consideration and further development.

30/05/2018 - Commentary on Recommendations 11 & 12 from Quality Enhancement Committee (QEC)

The Principal and the Head of Quality confirmed that organisational-level Enhancement and the developing FSB Strategic Enhancement Plan has been discussed at Executive Committee meetings. It was agreed that in line with the wider implications of Recommendation 7 to strengthen student and external input in curriculum enhancement, the Strategic Enhancement Plan would utilise the theme of Externality & Student Employability. The Strategic Enhancement Plan, consisting of a series of precepts/expectations representing aspects/themes of external engagement will promote and enhance graduate employability through organisation-led initiatives and deliberate executive management support. The plan will be a standing item on the agendas of the Executive Committee, Academic Board, Quality Enhancement Committee and Programme committees.

The Strategic Enhancement Plan and its progress against the precepts will be central to the structure of the Annual Quality Enhancement Conference, where case studies and good practice from both staff and students will be showcased.