

**University of Bristol and City
University of Hong Kong**

MAY 2007

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2007

ISBN 978 1 84482 753 4

All QAA's publications are available on our website www.qaa.ac.uk

Printed copies are available from:

Linney Direct

Adamsway

Mansfield

NG18 4FN

Tel 01623 450788

Fax 01623 450481

Email qaa@linneydirect.com

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786

The University of Bristol audit of overseas provision

1 This report considers a collaborative arrangement between the University of Bristol (Bristol), through the Graduate School of Education (GSoE), and City University of Hong Kong (CityU), through the School of Continuing and Professional Education (SCOPE).

Introduction

2 The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) is a United Kingdom (UK) organisation which seeks to promote public confidence that the quality of provision and standards of awards in higher education are being safeguarded. It provides public information about quality and standards in higher education to meet the needs of students, employers and funders of higher education. It does this mainly through a peer review process of audits and reviews. These are conducted by teams of auditors and reviewers comprising academic staff from higher or further education institutions, but with some members drawn, where appropriate, from industry and the professions. The most recent institutional audit of Bristol was conducted by QAA in April 2004.

3 One of QAA's activities is to carry out quality audits of collaborative links between UK higher education institutions and their partner organisations in other countries. In the spring and early summer of 2007, QAA conducted audits of selected partnership links between UK higher education institutions and institutions in Hong Kong. The purpose of these audits was to provide information on the way in which the UK institutions were maintaining academic standards and the quality of education in their partnerships. The reports on the individual audits will be used in the preparation of an overview report on the collaborative arrangements for the management of standards and quality of UK higher education provision in Hong Kong.

The audit process for overseas collaborative links

4 In March 2006, QAA invited all UK higher education institutions to provide information on their collaborative partnerships in Hong Kong. On the basis of the information returned on the nature and scale of the links, QAA selected for audit visits six UK institutions with links in Hong Kong. Each of the selected institutions produced a commentary describing the way in which the link operated, and commenting on the effectiveness of the means by which it assured quality and standards. In addition, each institution was asked, as part of its commentary, to make reference to the extent to which the link was representative of its procedures and practice in all its overseas collaborative activity. Institutions were also invited in their commentaries to make reference to the ways in which their arrangements met the expectations of the *Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education (Code of practice)*, in particular *Section 2: Collaborative provision and flexible and distributed learning (including e-learning)*, published by QAA in 2004.

5 In spring 2007, audit visits were made to each of the selected UK institutions to discuss its arrangements in the light of its commentary. In May 2007, an audit team visited the partner institutions in Hong Kong to gain further insight into the experience of students and staff, and to supplement the view formed by the team from the institutions' commentaries and from the UK visits. During the visits to institutions in Hong Kong, discussions were conducted with key members of staff and with students. The full audit team conducting audits of institutions with collaborative links in Hong Kong comprised Dr D Furneaux, Professor M Hunt, Professor K Hurst, Mrs S Middleton, Dr S Taylor (auditors), and Mr G Clark (audit secretary). The audit was coordinated for QAA by Dr I Ainsworth, Head of Degree Awarding Powers and University Title, Reviews Group. QAA is particularly grateful to the UK institutions and their partners in Hong Kong for the willing cooperation they provided to the team.

The context of collaborative provision with partners in Hong Kong

6 Higher education in Hong Kong is provided by public and private institutions and is organised according to four levels of award: associate degrees and higher diplomas; bachelor's degrees; master's degrees; and doctorates. The University Grants Committee is responsible for funding eight universities which have their own degree awarding powers and offer programmes at all levels. It is also responsible for funding a teacher education provider whose degrees are validated by the Hong Kong Council for Academic Accreditation (HKCAA)(now the Hong Kong Council for Accreditation of Academic and Vocational Qualifications). In 2006, university status was granted to the first private university in Hong Kong.

7 There are also approximately 20 private providers offering associate degrees and higher diplomas. Private providers must have their programmes accredited by an external body, such as the HKCAA. Graduates of higher diplomas and associate degrees may be eligible to enter bachelor's degree courses at an advanced stage, depending on the number of credits they have accumulated.

8 Higher education provision by overseas institutions in Hong Kong (hereafter referred to as 'non-local provision') has experienced considerable growth over the last 15 years to meet local demand for degree-level top-up courses and other types of non-local provision. The Education Bureau (the Education and Manpower Bureau at the time of the audit) is responsible for education, more generally, in Hong Kong and maintains a register of 'Non-local Higher and Professional Education Programmes', listing all programmes provided in whole, or in part, by non-local providers within Hong Kong.

9 The framework for the quality assurance of non-local provision in Hong Kong was established by the 1997 Non-local Higher and Professional Education (Regulation) Ordinance

(hereafter referred to as the Ordinance). The 1997 Ordinance requires all courses leading to the award of a non-local higher education qualification by a non-local institution to be registered with the Registrar of Non-local Higher and Professional Education Courses. The HKCAA advises the Registrar on the eligibility of non-local courses that have applied for registration. Registration is an assurance that the providing institution is a recognised body in its home jurisdiction; that the programme is of the same standard as the equivalent programme offered in the provider's home country, and is recognised as such by the relevant accreditation authorities and academic community. The registration requirement does not apply to courses conducted in collaboration with local higher education institutions; wholly distance-learning courses (those without the institutions or their agents being physically present in Hong Kong); and courses conducted solely by local registered schools or higher education institutions. Courses which fulfil one or more of these criteria may apply to be exempted from registration. Exempted courses are not subject to assessment by the HKCAA.

The background to the collaborative link

General background

10 The partnership is between Bristol and CityU. Formerly the City Polytechnic of Hong Kong, CityU became a self-accrediting university in 1994. The Commentary stated that it currently has 26,045 students on 145 programmes. The partnership with Bristol is one of 16 collaborations that CityU has established with overseas partners.

11 The origins of the partnership lie in personal contacts between Bristol and CityU staff, which led to a formal link being mooted in 1994 and the collaboration starting in 1995. The collaboration involves two programmes: a part-time Master's of Education (MEd), which began in 1995; and a part-time Doctor of Education (EdD), which began in 1997.

Building upon these two programmes and the close match between the mission of SCOPE at CityU and the GSoE at Bristol, the partners are currently considering a joint MSc in Asian and International Policy in Hong Kong.

12 The MEd and EdD programmes are provided in Bristol and Hong Kong. They share the same curricula, with the exception of two modules on the Hong Kong MEd, which have a greater focus on education in Hong Kong, and a slightly reduced choice of electives for Hong Kong EdD students. The provision is delivered and assessed by Bristol staff using the resources and facilities of SCOPE. The language of study and assessment is English. Senior educationalists in Hong Kong are using the MEd and EdD as vehicles for professional development, suggesting that the provision is well regarded and serving a clear need.

13 There were 58 students on the MEd and 150 on the EdD at the time of the audit. The EdD was the first of its type in Hong Kong and, despite the emergence of several equivalent programmes in recent years, the students whom the audit team met said that the Bristol programme continued to be the best of its kind, due to Bristol's international reputation and recommendations within Hong Kong.

14 Bristol has nine collaborative partnerships. Eight of these are within the UK; the partnership with CityU is its only international link. The Commentary described it as, '...representative of the policies and procedures that govern all of its educational partnerships'.

The UK institution's approach to overseas collaborative provision

15 Responsibility at Bristol for the standards of collaborative programmes and for the quality of the student learning experience lies with the Senate. Operationally, educational partnerships are overseen by the Education Committee. The latter has a Validation Group and a Programme Review Group. These are supported at faculty level by faculty quality assurance teams (FQATs). Departments and schools are responsible for the day-to-day management of collaborative links and must identify an

academic contact to liaise with partners. In the case of the CityU partnership, the liaison contact is the Director of Academic Development of the GSoE.

16 Bristol's Regulations and Guidelines for Educational Partnerships set out the formal policies and procedures to be applied in the approval of partners and programmes, annual and periodic review, and re-approval.

Public information, publicity, and promotional activity

17 Bristol's register of collaborative provision includes comprehensive information about the MEd and EdD programmes, although it does not state that the language of instruction and assessment is English. For the sake of completeness, the audit team would encourage Bristol to consider recording this information in the register.

18 The Commentary noted that Bristol collaborated closely with CityU on the production of student handbooks and publicity materials according to the terms of the Institutional Agreements. The Director of Academic Development in the GSoE at Bristol produces the student handbooks for both programmes in line with Bristol's standard procedures. CityU is then invited to update local details, which, in turn, are approved by the Director of Academic Development. A similar process applies to publicity materials; the Director produces the text, which CityU then formats for his approval before publication.

Formal procedures for establishing the link

Selecting and approving the partner institution

19 In its Commentary, Bristol noted that it shared similar aims and values to CityU and that City U's educational objectives were underpinned by structures and procedures similar to those operating at Bristol. The audit team enquired about these similarities during the UK visit and was informed that the

agreement was with SCOPE, which was a separate business unit within CityU. During its visit to CityU, the team was informed that the signatory on the agreements is the Director of SCOPE, under delegated authority from the President of CityU.

20 The link with CityU was established prior to the publication of the *Code of practice, Section 2*. The audit team saw the original documentation which confirmed that the procedures for approving partnerships in existence at that time were properly followed. The team also noted that Bristol's current procedures for the approval of partnerships reflected requirements for due diligence in financial and legal matters. Similarly, the team saw evidence that appropriate policies and procedures to approve partners were in place.

21 Both programmes are registered with the Hong Kong Education Bureau as exempt from registrations under the terms of the 1997 Non-local Higher and Professional Education (Regulation) Ordinance because they are being conducted in collaboration with a local institution of higher education. As such, they are not subject to local assessment or accreditation.

Programme approval

22 The MEd and EdD programmes at CityU were initially approved before the development of the Academic Infrastructure in the UK and the advent of Bristol's current approval procedures. According to the Commentary, approval of overseas programmes follows the same format as any new programme delivered at Bristol itself.

23 The audit team saw Bristol's Guidelines for New and Revised Programmes which indicated that Bristol had a range of policies and procedures for approving new programmes that made appropriate reference to the Academic Infrastructure.

24 The audit team also reviewed Bristol's policies and procedures for modifications to postgraduate programmes and noted that all proposals are sent to the Graduate Studies

Committee. Minor changes may be approved by the Graduate Studies Committee; major changes must be approved by the Validation Group and the Senate.

25 Programmes are re-approved every five years and the procedure involves the Education Committee convening the Programme Review Group to carry out a review and report. If this recommends continuation, and the Education Committee agrees, a new institutional agreement is drawn up.

26 The CityU partnership was last re-approved in February 2004. The audit team noted that the report produced was thorough and raised no serious issues relating to either standards or quality.

Written agreements

27 The audit team considered the Institutional Agreements for the MEd and the EdD to be thorough, although the team noted that there was no statement of residual obligations to students in the event of termination of the programmes. This was also identified as an issue in the 2004 audit report and raised during the team's visit to Bristol. The team would advise Bristol that a commitment to continuing students in the event of termination should be included in the Institutional Agreements.

Quality management of the link

Management of the link

28 The collaboration is managed by the Director of Academic Development in the GSoE at Bristol. The Director is responsible for recruitment and admissions, the content of handbooks and liaison with CityU. He is supported by several other staff who also liaise with their counterparts in Hong Kong. The communication between GSoE and SCOPE staff appears to be very effective. The audit team noted the evident commitment to managing the link properly and to upholding the quality of the student experience.

Annual monitoring and review

29 The Commentary stated that the procedure for annual review is set out in Guidelines for Annual Programme Review in the Handbook for Academic Quality and Standards. The Handbook describes two systems: one covering taught programmes (including the MEd); and the other research programmes (covering the EdD). The audit team concluded that these systems covered all the key areas, including external examiners' comments, assessment, teaching and learning, the analysis of data on student progression and achievement, and the analysis of student feedback.

30 In line with Bristol guidelines, the GSoE annually reviews the MEd and EdD programmes, including those taught at CityU. Until recently, the GSoE had considered data on all students, irrespective of place of study. However, following a recommendation in the Programme Review Report of 2004, it now reviews the data on the Hong Kong programmes separately.

31 The audit team found the annual programme reviews for 2005-06 to be comprehensive. The team noted that CityU did not take part in annual review. Bristol explained this was because CityU's involvement in the programme was confined to providing premises, library facilities and administrative support; and Bristol retained responsibility for rectifying any problems associated with these resources. Nevertheless, the team concluded that Bristol should consider sharing annual reports with the appropriate staff at CityU.

32 According to the Commentary, annual review reports go to the FQATs, which comprise academic staff from within the relevant faculty and supported by the Faculty Office. The FQATs review the reports and the evidence forms the basis for visits to schools on a rolling basis or special intervention, if serious problems are identified. The Commentary stated that the CityU programmes would fall within the purview of visits to the GSoE. The audit team enquired about this process, in particular whether the CityU programme was discussed in isolation from the rest of the provision and,

if so, what comparisons are made with the UK-based programmes. The team saw documentation on FQAT visits for 2005-06 which made no specific mention of the programmes delivered in CityU. During the visit to Bristol, the team was informed that, following a decision by the Education Committee, FQAT visits would include off-site partnerships. The team regarded this as a positive development.

Periodic review

33 The review of collaborative provision at Bristol is incorporated in the normal review process. The Commentary indicated that Bristol has a rolling, five-year cycle of periodic departmental review covering teaching, research, staff, and financial management and administration. According to Bristol's Guidelines for University Departmental Review, review teams are appointed by the Vice-Chancellor and include the dean of the faculty, an academic member of another faculty, a senior member of Support Services nominated by the Registrar, a member of the Teaching Support Unit nominated by the Director, and normally two external reviewers. Review is based upon a self-evaluation document provided by the school or department, followed by a two-day visit that includes meetings with staff and students.

34 The review culminates in a report which is considered by the University Policy and Resources Committee. If the Committee approves the review report, the dean and appropriate head of school or department are responsible for implementing any recommendations arising from it, and the report is copied to the education and research committees. The department is asked to report on implementation after one year.

35 The most recent review of the GSoE was in April 2005. The audit team noted that the self-evaluation document produced for the review gave an overview of the EdD and identified a number of proposed future developments. The team also read the review report and the subsequent progress report by the School, but found no mention of the MEd or EdD programmes delivered in Hong Kong.

In its Commentary, Bristol explained that, '...Departmental reviews cover all programmes offered by the department/school but do not go into any detail unless there is a problem with a specific programme'. Nevertheless, the team concluded, given the inherent risks associated with this type of provision, that Bristol might wish to consider encouraging periodic review panels to investigate and report on collaborative provision as a matter of course.

Staffing and staff development

36 The Commentary noted that all the teaching is done by Bristol staff based in the UK, with the exception of two modules on the MEd delivered by a local tutor who is a graduate of the programme. The local tutor has been designated a 'special lecturer' with Bristol academic status, following the submission of a curriculum vitae (CV) and approval by the Faculty. This lecturer did not have any formal induction or staff development on appointment. The audit team would suggest that Bristol considers requiring some formal staff development for such staff.

37 The audit team recognised that the GSoE's focus upon international education, and the research record of its staff, meant that it was well placed to deliver the programmes. The students whom the team met in Hong Kong welcomed the global perspectives of the teaching staff. The team met a number of the staff engaged in teaching the programme, both in the UK and in Hong Kong, and noted their evident commitment to, and enthusiasm for, working with students based in Hong Kong.

38 The audit team enquired about arrangements for the supervision of EdD students and was told that supervisors were required to have a doctoral degree or equivalent research experience; that there were mentoring arrangements in place for new supervisors; development opportunities were available to supervisors through training or participation in away days; and there was a policy of team supervision. The team also heard that research students in Hong Kong were afforded similar opportunities to their

counterparts in the UK with regard to training, both in general and specifically in relation to preparation for the oral examination.

Student admissions

39 According to the Commentary, applicants for the MEd must have a UK honours degree or equivalent, or the Bristol Diploma in Advanced Studies in Education or equivalent, plus at least one year's post-qualification experience. Applicants for the EdD should hold a master's degree or equivalent and three year's post-qualification experience. For those applicants whose first language is not English and whose previous degree was not taught or assessed in English, the requirement is at least International English Language Testing Service 6.5 or equivalent.

40 Admissions and induction are managed by the Director of Academic Development and his staff in the same way as for Bristol-based programmes. Applications are received by SCOPE and transmitted via secure electronic means so that the Director of Academic Development can provide a rapid provisional decision. This is subsequently confirmed at Bristol and an offer letter sent from Bristol. Many students are mature professionals returning to education after a lengthy break, and they particularly welcomed the induction which reflected their specific needs. The audit team was told by students it met in Hong Kong that many of them had applied to the programmes following recommendations from current students and alumni.

Assurance of academic standards

Assessment

41 The frameworks for the assessment of the MEd and the EdD are the same as for the Bristol-based programmes. The frameworks are described in the programme specifications. All assessment is carried out by Bristol staff with the addition, in the case of EdD dissertations, of an external examiner for the examination of the thesis.

42 The audit team learned that the assessment of taught elements of both programmes is by coursework, which is submitted electronically to Bristol through its virtual learning environment (VLE). Formative feedback is given by Bristol staff on visits to Hong Kong and by telephone, the VLE and email, allowing for rapid feedback. The students whom the team met in Hong Kong commented favourably on the quality and timeliness of such feedback. In Hong Kong the team received a demonstration of the VLE, which is also used for module materials; reviewing assignments by first and second markers; recording student progress; announcements and reminders to students, and for the making of student appointments with visiting Bristol staff. The team was informed about planned extensions of its use to include, for example, electronic plagiarism detection. CityU has adopted the same VLE system as Bristol and administrative staff at SCOPE are fully trained in its use.

43 The audit team asked how students were informed about issues relating to plagiarism and copying. It learnt that these matters were covered in the student handbooks and also discussed in tutorials. Students whom the team met in Hong Kong said that they were well informed about issues of plagiarism and copying. Furthermore, students are advised directly by their supervisors by email and telephone. Students expected, and felt prepared, to study in English and were supported in the use of academic English and references by their supervisors.

44 The audit team saw the records of recent GSoE Boards of Examiners at which assessment and student achievement were considered. It confirmed that all relevant matters, including reports from external examiners, were considered and appropriate action taken. The team noted that the Examination Board for the EdD had recently instituted a policy of comparing the achievements of students in Bristol and Hong Kong with a view to identifying any discrepancies, and heard that this was planned for the MEd as well.

45 In addition to coursework for the taught modules, the EdD requires the production and examination of a thesis. All EdD students are required to undergo oral examinations. These examinations are conducted locally for students in Hong Kong, although they have the option of conducting it in Bristol. Students whom the audit team met in Hong Kong felt well prepared for such examination.

External examiners

46 External examiners for the taught elements of programmes are appointed using standard Bristol criteria and processes. They examine the work of all students taking the MEd or taught components of the EdD programmes, irrespective of whether they are based in the UK or Hong Kong.

47 The audit team saw the reports of external examiners for the MEd and the taught element of the EdD, which confirmed that the procedure was robust. The reports were complimentary about the high standards set by Bristol and achieved by students.

48 External examiners' reports on taught programmes are discussed and disseminated according to the Guidelines for External Examining of taught programmes at the University of Bristol. Reports are formally sent to the Vice-Chancellor, but in practice they are read by the Pro Vice-Chancellor for Education and copied to the Teaching Support Unit. The Teaching Support Unit forwards reports to departments and schools for a response, and the report and the response are forwarded to the Pro Vice-Chancellor for Education and copied to the relevant FQAT Chair. While the audit team was satisfied that Bristol had acted upon any issues raised by external examiners regarding the resources provided in Hong Kong in consultation with SCOPE, the team would suggest that a copy of the relevant external examiner's report is sent to the Director of SCOPE directly.

49 The appointment of examiners for the EdD thesis follows the standard Bristol regulations for examiners of research degrees.

The supervisor consults with the candidate about the possible choice of examiners, and suggests names to the Head of School. Nominees are not required to have a higher degree, but they must be competent and respected in their areas of study. They submit a brief CV to the Head of School who is then responsible for making a recommendation to the relevant Dean. The audit team heard that, while many nominees were from UK institutions, some examiners were from overseas, in which case the GSoE required that examiners should be conversant with UK higher education. The team was informed that Bristol was in the process of extending its generic guidance for examiners to include criteria specific to different research degrees, including the EdD, and that this would be completed in 2007-08.

50 Once examination has been completed, reports are signed by both examiners and the Head of School, and submitted via the Postgraduate Examinations Office to the Research Degrees Examination Board.

Certificates and transcripts

51 At the audit visit, the audit team saw certificates and transcripts for both degrees which did not record the name of the partner. The team was subsequently informed that Bristol had decided to record the name of the partner on the transcript. It is clear that both MEd and EdD students consider themselves to be Bristol students studying at SCOPE within CityU.

Quality of information and support for students

Student information

52 The pre-application information for the MEd and for the EdD does not make it clear that all teaching and assessment is conducted in English or that there are English language requirements for the programmes. The audit team pursued this during the UK visit and was informed that the GSoE considered that potential students would be fully aware of these matters and that there was no point in making

them explicit. Students whom the team met in Hong Kong confirmed that they expected to be taught in English.

53 The audit team saw the student handbooks for the two programmes. The team noted that neither handbook explained complaints and appeals procedures. The team was therefore interested to understand how students were made aware of these procedures. At its UK visit, the team heard that students were made aware of Bristol's complaints and appeals procedures at induction. During the Hong Kong visit, the team heard that there had been a few complaints and that these had been dealt with locally, according to CityU's complaints and appeals procedures. The fact that students enjoy frequent contact with their tutors appears to have allowed them to discuss and resolve any areas of concern before they manifest themselves as formal complaints. Nonetheless, the team concluded that information on Bristol's formal procedures for making complaints and appeals should be included in student handbooks. The team was subsequently informed by Bristol that it had decided to amend the student handbooks to include this information.

Student support arrangements

54 The audit team was informed that the Director of Academic Development acted as personal tutor to the MEd students. The students also had access to a Bristol staff member resident in Hong Kong. Students whom the team met in Hong Kong stated that the staff member resident in Hong Kong did not need to fulfil a tutoring role since the Director of Academic Development was so accessible.

55 For the EdD each intake has an 'Intake Coordinator' appointed from the teaching team who acts as personal tutor to a cohort of students. Cohorts are encouraged to bond at the start of the programme, '...when new friendships are being made and the demands and expectations of a doctoral programme are new to all involved' and to continue to support each other over its duration. The feeling of belonging to a cohort, and the peer support

which this facilitates, was confirmed when the audit team met students in Hong Kong. The team was informed that the success of this approach was such that Bristol was considering it for its Bristol-based students.

56 Along with the Intake Coordinator, EdD students also have access to the Director for Academic Development on his frequent visits to Hong Kong, as well as other staff teaching on the programme. The frequency and duration of visits by senior management and leading research academics was greatly appreciated by all students and staff at SCOPE. Visiting academic staff teach over the weekends but typically stay in Hong Kong until midweek to fulfil a pastoral and academic tutoring role. Visiting staff are provided with secure office facilities by SCOPE.

57 Students whom the audit team met in Hong Kong also appreciated the extra support afforded them by administrative staff at SCOPE, which was over and above what would be expected from the Agreements.

58 Students regarded their access to library resources, and particularly electronic journals, as a positive feature of being a Bristol student. Bristol students have only the same limited access to CityU library facilities as SCOPE students. This differential access had led to some frustration among the MEd students. SCOPE has provided a learning resource centre specifically for EdD students.

Student input into quality management

59 Bristol has clear guidelines for soliciting direct feedback from students through questionnaires, the personal tutor system, student forums or similar events, informal feedback, and staff-student committees. The audit team confirmed that, in most respects, these guidelines were being followed. Evaluation questionnaires were administered for each module and the results were considered at annual programme reviews. The team would suggest that the outcomes of these processes might be fed back to students in a more formal

way. There were several examples of comments raised in personal tutor meetings, and in other informal forums, leading to changes in the programme, including the introduction of a VLE, assignments tailored to local conditions, and the provision of course materials.

60 Institutional guidelines relating to a formal staff-student committee with student representatives were not being followed in Hong Kong. The audit team was told that such a formal structure was inappropriate in a context where students are mature, senior and highly qualified professionals who engage in a continuous dialogue with teachers and tutors about the quality of their learning experiences. After discussing this matter with students in Hong Kong, the team accepted the rationale for the deviation from the institutional guidelines.

Conclusions

61 In considering the partnership, the audit team identified the following positive features:

- the fact that senior educationalists in Hong Kong are using the programmes as vehicles for professional development, suggesting that the programmes are well regarded and serving a clear need (paragraph 12)
- careful stewardship of standards and the clear leadership and ownership demonstrated by Bristol staff through the commitment to the partnership of those engaged in managing and teaching the programme (paragraphs 28; 37)
- effective liaison and communication between GSoE and SCOPE staff and the administrative support provided in Bristol and Hong Kong for management and teaching staff, and students (paragraph 28)
- clarity of the respective roles of all staff, both in Bristol and Hong Kong, which stems from a mature relationship. A strength of the relationship is the mutual respect of staff and students involved in the partnership at both institutions (paragraph 28).

62 The audit team also identified the following points for consideration by Bristol:

- while recognising the clear commitment of both institutions to the students, the formal agreements for both programmes should set out the residual responsibilities of both partners in the event of termination (paragraph 27)
- the desirability of dealing with collaborative provision separately within departmental review, and the subsequent communication of review outcomes to SCOPE (paragraph 35)
- the inclusion of information on Bristol's formal complaints and appeals process in student handbooks (paragraph 53).

Annex A

Commentary on the overseas quality and audit report by the University of Bristol

The University welcomes the findings of its collaborative audit and the positive report of the audit team. In particular, the University notes that the commitment of its staff to managing the relationship with CityU has been commented upon favourably. This recognition reaffirms the University's belief that the dedication and enthusiasm of its staff ensure that the quality of the student experience in Hong Kong is equivalent to that of any other University of Bristol programme.

The University actively seeks to share best practice and refine its internal quality assurance mechanisms regularly, in order to assure the quality of the students' experience. We therefore take very seriously the recommendations in the report. We welcome those areas that the audit team has identified for consideration and will address them as part of the University's wider review of its collaborative arrangements. Action has already been taken with regard the audit team's programme-level suggestions. For example, arrangements have been made to share the Annual Programme Review report with relevant staff at CityU and the incoming MEd local tutor was formerly a Professor at Bristol and is fully acquainted with the University's Handbook for Academic Quality and Standards.

Annex B

Student statistics as of September 2007

Master of Education (MEd) in Education Management

Cohort 1 1995 - 20 students started the programme and 17 students graduated.

Cohort 2 1996 - 22 students started the programme and 20 students graduated.

Cohort 3 1997 - 13 students started the programme and 10 students graduated.

Cohort 4 1998 - 18 students started the programme and 16 students graduated.

Cohort 5 1999 - 13 students started the programme and 12 students graduated.

Cohort 6 2000 - 19 students started the programme and 16 students graduated.

Cohort 7 2001 - 21 students started the programme and 18 students graduated.

Cohort 8 2002 - 21 students started the programme, 13 students have graduated and 2 students will be made awards in 2007.

Cohort 9 2003 - 19 students started the programme, 10 students have graduated and 5 students are currently still on the programme.

Cohort 10 2004 - 16 students started the programme, 6 students have graduated and 7 students are currently still on the programme.

Cohort 11 2005 - 24 students started the programme, 4 students will be made awards in 2007 and 18 students are currently still on the programme.

Cohort 12 2006 - 22 students started the programme, all are currently still on the programme.

Cohort 13 2007 - 15 students started the programme, all are currently still on the programme.

Doctor of Education (EdD)

Cohort 1 1997 - 23 students started the programme, 15 students have graduated and 3 students are currently still on the programme.

Cohort 2 1998 - 20 students started the programme, 10 students have graduated and there are currently still 6 students on the programme.

Cohort 3 1999 - 22 students started the programme, 8 students have graduated and 10 students are currently still on the programme.

Cohort 4 2000 - 24 students started the programme, 4 students have graduated and 9 students are currently still on the programme.

Cohort 5 2001 - 25 students started the programme, 2 students have graduated and 17 students are currently still on the programme.

Cohort 6 2002 - 27 students started the programme, 8 students have graduated and 19 are currently still students on the programme.

Cohort 7 2003 - 23 students started the programme, 3 students have graduated and there are currently still 20 students on the programme.

Cohort 8 2004 - 26 students started the programme, 1 student has graduated and there are currently still 23 students on the programme.

Cohort 9 2005 - 23 students started the programme and there are currently still 19 students on the programme.

Cohort 10 2006 - 25 students started the programme and there are currently still 22 students on the programme.

Cohort 11 2007 - 25 students started the programme, all are currently still on the programme.

The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education

Southgate House
Southgate Street
Gloucester
GL1 1UB

Tel 01452 557000
Fax 01452 557070
Email comms@qaa.ac.uk
Web www.qaa.ac.uk