

**Office for
Students**



Quality assessment report

**Business and management courses
at the University of East London**

November 2022 – February 2023

Reference OfS 2023.56

Enquiries to regulation@officeforstudents.org.uk

Publication date 12 October 2023

Contents

Summary	2
Introduction and background	4
Context	4
Assessment process	6
Information gathering	6
Assessment of matters relating to quality under ongoing conditions of registration B1, B2 and B4	7
Condition B1: Academic experience	7
B1 Conclusions	11
Condition B2: Resources, support and student engagement	11
B2 Conclusions	18
Condition B4: Assessment and awards	18
B4 Conclusions	19
Annex A: Ongoing conditions of registration	20
Condition B1: Academic experience	20
Condition B2: Resources, support and student engagement	23
Condition B4: Assessment and awards	27

Summary

Each year, the Office for Students (OfS) selects a number of higher education providers for investigation based on regulatory intelligence including, but not limited to, student outcome and experience data and relevant notifications. As part of these investigations, the OfS may commission an assessment team, including external academic experts, to undertake an assessment of quality. The quality assessment focuses on areas of potential concern indicated by the data or other regulatory intelligence, or by information obtained by the assessment team as part of the assessment.

The assessment involves a visit to a provider, after which the assessment team produces a report. This report represents the conclusions of the team as a result of its consideration of information gathered during the course of the assessment to 14 February 2023. The report does not take into account matters which may have occurred subsequent to that period.

In line with the risk-based approach of the OfS, the assessment team does not undertake a comprehensive quality assessment in respect of every requirement in each condition of registration, and therefore this report should not be read as the team having undertaken such an assessment.

This report does not represent any decision of the OfS in respect of compliance with conditions of registration.

1. The OfS requires all registered higher education providers' courses to meet a minimum set of requirements or conditions that relate to quality and standards. The detailed requirements of these conditions can be found in the OfS's regulatory framework.¹ In May 2022, as a result of its general monitoring, the OfS decided to open an investigation into the quality of business and management courses provided by the University of East London.
2. The University of East London offers business and management courses at both undergraduate and postgraduate level at the University Square Stratford and Docklands Campuses.
3. The OfS appointed an assessment team on 3 November 2022, which consisted of three academic expert assessors and a member of OfS staff. The team was asked to give its advice and judgements about the quality of the university's business and management courses.
4. The team considered a range of information. This included:
 - information already held by the OfS, such as data relating to student outcomes
 - information submitted to the OfS by the University of East London, including about student attendance and achievement

¹ See www.officeforstudents.org.uk/publications/securing-student-success-regulatory-framework-for-higher-education-in-england/.

- modules and other student and staff facing pages on the university's virtual learning environment (VLE).
5. The team visited the University of East London on two occasions in December 2022 and February 2023 during which time it met with staff and students and had a guided introduction to the university's VLE. The team also held online meetings with university staff in February 2023.
 6. During the assessment process, the team developed lines of enquiry. These focused on areas that potentially warranted further investigation and that were within the scope of ongoing conditions of registration:
 - B1: Academic experience
 - B2: Resources, support and student engagement
 - B4: Assessment and awards.
 7. The lines of enquiry were developed and updated between the two visits and both versions were shared with the university. This process followed the OfS's risk-based approach.
 8. The assessment team's investigation drew on multiple sources of information that are relevant to conditions B1, B2 and B4. The risk-based approach led the assessment team to consider in detail the following areas:
 - **Curriculum design and pedagogic approach:** The assessment team examined support available to staff in designing curriculum, and sought to understand strategy relating to the implementation of the school's pedagogic approach
 - **The educational experiences of students registered on BA (Hons) Tourism Management:** The assessment team reviewed the module marks for students registered on this course, considered the students' views of the course, and sought to understand how their feedback had been used to shape delivery of the course
 - **Academic Support:** The assessment team examined students' views of academic support, including the experiences of students actively seeking support, and of those experiencing proactive offers of support from the university
 - **Staffing Strategy:** The assessment team considered the provision of training support, resources, guidance, and required CPD (continuing professional development) available and mandated to staff.
 9. The assessment team did not identify any concerns from its review of this information relating to conditions B1: Academic experience, B2: Resources, support and student engagement, or B4: Assessment and awards.

Introduction and background

10. Each year, the OfS selects a number of higher education providers for investigation based on regulatory intelligence. This includes, but is not limited to, student outcomes and experience data and relevant notifications. As part of these investigations, the OfS may commission an assessment team, including external academic experts, to undertake an assessment of quality. The quality assessment focuses on areas of potential concern indicated by the data or other regulatory intelligence, or by information obtained by the team as part of the assessment.
11. The assessment involves a visit to a provider, after which the assessment team produces a report. In line with the risk-based approach of the OfS, it does not undertake a comprehensive quality assessment in respect of every requirement in each condition of registration, and therefore this report should not be read as the assessment team having undertaken such an assessment.
12. This report does not represent any decision of the OfS in respect of compliance with conditions of registration.
13. The OfS appointed a team in November 2022 to assess the quality of the business and management courses provided by the University of East London (i.e. those courses delivered by the University of East London, excluding courses delivered by partner organisations and transnational education). The assessment included matters that fall within the scope of the OfS's conditions of registration that concern quality and standards (specifically, ongoing conditions B1, B2 and B4²). The scope of the assessment, the information considered, and the findings of the assessment team are summarised in this report.
14. This report represents the conclusions of the team as a result of its consideration of information gathered during the course of the assessment to 14 February 2023. The report does not take into account matters that may have occurred subsequent to that period.
15. The OfS decided to open this investigation as part of its approach to general monitoring and in the context of its decision to focus on the quality of business and management courses. In opening the investigation, the OfS had regard to information it held relating to the University of East London, including student outcomes data, numbers of students, and any notifications received.

Context

16. Business and management courses at the University of East London are delivered through the Department of Business, Entrepreneurship and Finance, and the Department of Innovation and Management, both of which are part of the Royal Docks School of Business and Law.
17. Business and management courses are delivered at two physical locations, the University Square Stratford campus, where the majority of teaching takes place, and the Docklands

² See www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/regulation/registration-with-the-ofs-a-guide/conditions-of-registration/.

campus, which houses facilities for students studying the Master of Business Administration (MBA) programmes and some undergraduate programmes.

18. Departments within the Royal Docks School of Business and Law house subject-specific clusters. Cluster leads report to heads of department, who in return report to the dean of school. The dean of school reports to the university provost. The structure of the school changed in 2020 due to planned growth in student numbers on the MBA programme, which resulted in the creation of a strategy and leadership course delivery team under the Department of Innovation and Management.
19. The University of East London has students registered on 11 distinct undergraduate business and management courses, which include versions with foundation years, placements, and specialist pathways. The postgraduate taught portfolio has students registered on a portfolio of MBA programmes, which include placement and specialist pathway options, and nine other postgraduate taught programmes.
20. Undergraduate business and management degrees are delivered over three years full-time or six years part-time. Undergraduate courses are also offered with integrated foundation years, extending the duration to four and eight years respectively. Postgraduate taught programmes, including the MBA, are delivered over one year full-time or two years part-time. An optional placement year adds a year onto the duration of full-time undergraduate or postgraduate taught courses.
21. According to data provided by the university on 2 November 2022, the University of East London currently directly delivers business and management courses to 4,006 full-time equivalent (FTE) students, of whom 2,905 are studying postgraduate taught programmes and 1,058 are studying their first degree. The portfolio of MBA programmes accounts for 1,729 postgraduate FTE, and the MSc International Business Management programme accounts for 905 FTE. The largest undergraduate programme is BSc/BA (Hons) Business Management, with a current student FTE of 492.5.
22. Based on the latest available data from the OfS's 'Size and shape of provision data dashboard',³ the number of students on business and management courses provided by the University of East London has grown during the past three years. The numbers of FTE students (taught or registered headcount, not including offshore, transnational education or students mainly abroad) are as follows:
 - 2019-20: 2,580 including 1,390 full-time undergraduates and 1,060 full-time postgraduates
 - 2020-21: 3,710 including 1,620 full-time undergraduates and 1,920 full-time postgraduates
 - 2021-22: 5,180 including 2,030 full-time undergraduates and 2,990 full-time postgraduates.

³ See www.officeforstudents.org.uk/data-and-analysis/size-and-shape-of-provision-data-dashboard/data-dashboard/.

Assessment process

Information gathering

23. The assessment team gathered a range of evidence to determine whether there are possible concerns relating to the requirements as set out in conditions of registration B1, B2 and/or B4. The team gathered information through an initial request for data from the university (13 October 2022) and two site visits, to the University Square Stratford campus on 8 December 2022 and to the Docklands campus on 13 February 2023. Online meetings between the assessment team and university contacts were held on 14 February 2023.
24. During the site visits and online meetings, the assessment team undertook:
- a range of staff interviews (with academic and central university professional service staff)
 - student panel interviews (including students studying at Levels 4 to 7)
 - a guided introduction to the university's virtual learning environment (VLE) and digital systems used to monitor student engagement, progress, and their use of support.
25. The team was also granted access to the university's VLE from 2 December 2022 until 7 April 2023. It made further requests for information and data based on discussions with staff and students during both the initial and subsequent site visits, as well as arising from its analysis of information already provided. The university fulfilled all requests in a timely fashion and provided the additional information and data on 2 December 2022 and 30 January 2023.
26. The assessment team first reviewed general monitoring intelligence, including student outcomes data held by the OfS, and initial data provided by the university. From this it identified broad areas for further analysis, within the scope of conditions B1, B2 and/or B4. The initial information from these areas, in the assessment team's view, raised potential issues that the team then decided to focus on. These areas were then communicated to the university and updated, where relevant, as the assessment progressed to ensure transparency.

Assessment of matters relating to quality under ongoing conditions of registration B1, B2 and B4

Condition B1: Academic experience

27. The assessment team reviewed a range of evidence relevant to condition B1 (see Annex A for the full text of the condition) in seeking to understand whether students on the university's business and management courses receive a 'high quality academic experience'. This included a review of whether the business and management courses are 'up-to-date' (B1.3.a), provide 'educational challenge' (B1.3.b), are 'coherent' (B1.3.c), are 'effectively delivered' (B1.3.d) and require 'students to develop relevant skills' (B1.3.e).
28. The initial information provided by the university, and reviewed by the assessment team, included:
- course specifications for the business and management courses across Levels 3 to 7, and associated module specifications
 - programme handbooks covering the business and management courses across Levels 3 to 7
 - module attainment data for 15 Level 4 modules that contribute towards the business and management courses (for the academic year 2021-22)
 - eight student complaints and their outcomes (during the academic year 2021-22).
29. Alongside the initial information provided by the university, the assessment team reviewed National Student Survey (NSS) information (quantitative and qualitative) for 2019-20, 2020-21, and 2021-22. The team also reviewed student outcomes data, including measures on completion, continuation and progression.
30. This initial information is relevant to the courses under consideration being 'up-to-date', providing 'educational challenge', being 'coherent' and requiring 'students to develop relevant skills'.
31. During on-site visits and online meetings, the assessment team met with:
- students currently studying the business and management courses, across Levels 4 to 7
 - academic staff teaching on business and management courses
 - university staff responsible for setting pedagogic direction and supporting staff development in the area of curriculum design.
32. These meetings included discussion of topics relevant to courses being 'up-to-date', providing 'educational challenge', being 'coherent', being 'effectively delivered' and requiring 'students to develop relevant skills'.

33. The assessment team requested additional information from the university as detailed under 'Information gathering' above. (All data noted below was sourced from the university.) This included:
- course evaluation and development reports for five of the university's business and management courses (for the academic year 2020-21)
 - module evaluation and development reports for a selection of modules across Levels 4 to 7 (for the 2020-21 and 2021-22 academic years)
 - module performance statistics for 52 Level 4 to 7 modules on the business and management courses (for the academic year 2021-22)
 - course validation data including an internal approval report, and two course assessment strategies (for courses validated during the 2020-21 academic year).
34. This information is relevant to all aspects of condition B1.3, that students receive a 'high quality academic experience'.
35. The assessment team reviewed VLE sites, including samples of teaching resources, guidance to students, and organisation of the sites themselves. The team was granted access to 78 module sites, and selected individual elements of these for review using a risk-based approach. This information is particularly relevant to courses being 'up-do-date' (B1.3a), 'coherent' (B1.3.c) and 'effectively delivered' (B1.3.d).
36. The assessment team's investigation drew on multiple sources of information, as identified above, that are relevant to condition B1. Following a risk-based approach, the assessment team considered the areas set out below.

Curriculum design and pedagogic approach

37. The team examined the support available to staff in designing the curriculum, developing coherent programmes, and scaffolding learning. The team also sought to understand the strategy relating to the implementation of the school's pedagogic approach. These matters are particularly relevant to the effective design and delivery of a course.
38. The assessment team decided to consider this area because in the assessment team's view the documents provided by the university, including the university's learning, teaching and assessment strategy, and accessible web content relating to curriculum design and pedagogic approaches did not provide a comprehensive overview of teaching and learning approaches at the university.
39. The assessment team also decided to explore areas that were not fully explained in the information provided. These included an overview of staff training, numbers of staff who have achieved a teaching qualification such as Higher Education Academy (HEA) Fellow or Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PGCAP), the nature of support for staff to undertake training, and how time to undertake training is allocated to staff within their workloads. The assessment team also sought to understand how the university articulates its curriculum priorities and strategies to staff. It was not clear, for example, how curriculum design principles were taken from strategy to implementation by heads of school and their teams.

40. The assessment team's initial meetings with staff highlighted a lack of clear articulation of pedagogical drivers (the rationale for the provider's choice of pedagogic approach) relating to curriculum design and policy. The assessment team queried several groups of staff in relation to pedagogical justifications across curricula, such as assessment design, programmatic design, research-rich approaches, and authentic learning. Responses to these queries were often indirect, incomplete, or simplistic. These factors initially made it difficult for the assessment team to understand how suitably qualified the university's staff are about pedagogy and practice.
41. The assessment team agreed that if the university were found to have poorly delivered or communicated curriculum design and pedagogic approaches, this would have the potential to result in students registered on the business and management courses not receiving a high quality academic experience. If curriculum design at the university were found to be poor, this may have resulted in students not understanding how learning relates to assessment, courses being incoherent with unconnected units, or course content not aligning to the stated learning aims or skills development opportunities.
42. The assessment team's meetings with senior staff and teaching teams, including PhD students who teach, provided clarity on these potential concerns. The assessment team received robust, detailed responses and verbal evidence relating to any areas of potential concern. For example, the university ran an annual week-long pedagogy training event that was attended by all staff. The university issued regular email communications covering curriculum priorities and strategy, and training opportunities. PhD students with teaching responsibilities were appropriately supported to develop teaching skills and receive pedagogical training. Protected staff time for training was accounted for through workload allocation. The university provided clear numbers of the levels of staff members undertaking training and the levels of those who had achieved teaching qualifications.
43. The assessment team was satisfied that the university supports and rewards its staff in the pursuit of pedagogic success. Likewise, teaching teams, including staff who lead subject clusters, provided verbal evidence of how they ensure delivery of a cohesive curriculum. Staff articulated the steps taken to implement strategies, notably the delegation of responsibility to heads of department and thereafter through regular devolved local communication channels and CPD opportunities, such as the whole institution training week, which was inclusive of hourly paid lecturers (HPLs). The range of approaches combined with the organisational culture demonstrated a cohesive institutional approach and appropriate prioritisation of staff development in this area.
44. Further discussions with staff demonstrated that unit-based quality assurance processes and evaluation were rigorous and fit for purpose and inclusive of feedback from students. Staff articulated the steps taken by relevant colleagues to perform quality assurance processes to a good standard, including the embedding of opportunities for student contributions to these activities, and effectively implementing improvements in future unit deliveries. Evidence of regular evaluation reports with teaching teams was also reviewed by the assessors. These reports demonstrated that evaluation and continuous improvements were embedded into regular quality review processes. The reports also showed that suggestions from staff and students on how to address issues and improve units and courses were noted as future actions for teaching teams. These discussions provided reassurance that the university's quality

assurance processes were robust, and would assist it with the identification of potential issues with curriculum design, or staff development linked to effective delivery.

45. Overall, the assessment team was satisfied with the support offered to staff in designing the curriculum and developing programmes, and with the implementation of the university's pedagogic strategy as it related to business and management courses. Discussions with university staff at a number of levels demonstrated that appropriate training, guidance and quality assurance mechanisms were in place to deliver effective design and pedagogic implementation of business and management courses.

Educational experiences of students registered on BA (Hons) Tourism Management

46. The assessment team reviewed the module marks for students registered on this course, and considered the students' views of the course. The team also sought to understand the nature of feedback received by the course team, university evaluation of this feedback, and how it had been used to shape current and future delivery of the course.
47. The assessment team decided to consider this area because the data provided for the BA (Hons) Tourism Management course (2021–22) indicated that this group of students may have been having a different experience from the wider student body. This was evidenced by the tourism students performing worse than those studying on other courses in the same suite of undergraduate courses in five of the six modules at Level 4. The average marks of the Level 4 shared modules were lower, and module pass rates were lower for students studying BA (Hons) Tourism Management when compared to their peers.
48. The assessment team agreed that the information it had gathered about this course raised a potential concern that the students registered on this course may not have been receiving a high quality academic experience. The team's initial view was that the lower student marks in comparison to other undergraduate business and management courses at the university may have indicated incoherent design or ineffective delivery of the BA (Hons) Tourism Management course.
49. During a meeting with the assessment team, staff teaching this course noted the effect that the coronavirus pandemic had had on this group of students. They commented on the fact that there was a higher number of tourism students who did not engage with their course during the time of public health restrictions related to the coronavirus. These students then returned the following year to complete their studies but their lack of previous engagement meant that pass marks were negatively affected. The teaching staff also discussed examples of how student engagement with employers was facilitated (across all sectors of employment that are covered by modules shared across undergraduate courses). They confirmed that tourism students were paired with employers working in the relevant sector. This had proven more difficult during the coronavirus pandemic due to the wider loss of activity in the tourism industry.
50. The course team spoke about the interventions that had been put in place during the last 12 months to support the tourism students. The tourism course typically had a higher proportion of mature students, who were more likely to have caring responsibilities, or be undertaking study alongside full-time employment. These interventions included additional guest speakers from the tourism sector, changes to timetabling to suit this student demographic, and more proactive signposting of central support services. Staff noted that levels of assignment submission on

some modules had risen by as much as 30 per cent during the 2022-23 academic year when compared to 2021-22.

51. The assessment team spoke to some of the students studying this course. They were very positive about the overall academic experience and felt that they were well supported in achieving good academic outcomes. The only issue raised was the low number of tourism examples used in class and this they agreed, across all levels, made their assessments more difficult. When asked about this, the staff felt there was parity across the examples in the subject areas, and there were additional opportunities in small group teaching to focus on tourism. The course team stated that these would be continued areas of focus for the development of this course moving forward. The assessment team's view is that the steps taken by the teaching team were appropriate and were likely to improve the experience of students on this course. The team also noted that the number of students studying this course was growing, adding to the importance of including a greater number of specific examples in future.
52. The assessment team noted that due to the time periods covered, much of the data reviewed before site visits did not account for recent changes and improvements to the delivery of this course, as outlined above. Therefore it was too soon to fully assess the impact of these changes and improvements on the academic experience.
53. Overall the assessment team did not identify any concerns in relation to the quality of the academic experience that students registered on the BA (Hons) Tourism Management course were receiving. The course team had been proactive in identifying issues that affected the experience of students during the public health restrictions related to the coronavirus pandemic. They had acted on relevant data and feedback to make improvements to the course. These improvements and the team's future plans appeared well-reasoned and credible.

B1 Conclusions

54. The assessment team's investigation drew on multiple sources of information, as identified above, that are relevant to condition B1. Following a risk-based approach, it did not identify any concerns relating to condition B1 from reviewing this information.

Condition B2: Resources, support and student engagement

55. The assessment team reviewed a range of evidence relevant to condition B2 (see Annex A for the full text of the condition). The assessment team reviewed information relevant to the issue of whether the university has taken all reasonable steps to ensure that for each cohort of students registered on the university's business and management courses is receiving 'resources and support' (B2.2.a) which are sufficient for the purpose of ensuring a high quality academic experience for those students, and that those students succeed in and beyond higher education.
56. In addition, the assessment team sought to understand whether the university has taken all reasonable steps to ensure 'effective engagement' (B2.2.b) with each cohort of students registered on the business and management courses, sufficient for the purpose of ensuring a

high quality academic experience for those students, and that those students succeed in and beyond higher education.

57. The assessment team also particularly noted the clarification articulated within requirement B2.3, that 'significant weight' should be placed on '(i.) the particular academic needs of each cohort of students based on prior academic attainment and capability; and (ii.) the principle that the greater the academic needs of the cohort of students, the number and nature of the steps needed to be taken are likely to be more significant'.
58. The initial information provided by the university, and reviewed by the assessment team, included:
- programme handbooks covering the business and management courses across Levels 3 to 7
 - information provided to students at the beginning of each academic year which set out the university's approach to the provision of physical and digital learning resources, including information on the university's teaching spaces
 - four relevant student complaints and where available, their outcomes (during the academic year 2021-22)
 - information provided to students at the beginning of each academic year which set out the university's approach to the provision of support to students and how students may access that support. This included information on wellbeing support and the system used to track student's engagement and progress.
59. Alongside the initial information provided by the university, the assessment team reviewed National Student Survey (NSS) information (quantitative and qualitative) for 2019-20, 2020-21, and 2021-22. The team also reviewed student outcomes data, including measures on completion, continuation and progression.
60. This initial information is relevant to whether the university has taken all reasonable steps to ensure that students on business and management courses are receiving 'resources and support', and to ensure 'effective engagement' with these students.
61. During on-site visits and online meetings, the assessment team met with academic teaching staff, and faculty and university leadership staff. These meetings included discussion of topics relevant to the students receiving 'resources and support' and opportunities for 'effective engagement'.
62. During on-site visits, the assessment team met with students currently studying the business and management courses, across Levels 4 to 7. These meetings included discussion of topics relevant to the students receiving 'resources and support' and opportunities for 'effective engagement'.
63. The assessment team requested additional information from the university, as detailed under 'Information gathering' above (all data noted below was sourced from the university). This included:

- access to staff development resources, including the Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT) SharePoint site, and the most recent staff handbook
- data on staff engagement with training and development opportunities, including types of activity and the profile of staff attending
- results of student feedback surveys for five business and management courses and their associated modules (for the academic years 2020-21 and 2021-22, where available).

64. This information is relevant to all aspects of condition B2.2.

65. The assessment team reviewed module VLE sites and internet resources, including signposting to and details of the university's academic support services, specifically employability support, study skills, IT skills and support, and library services. This information is particularly relevant to students receiving resources and support (B2.2.a).

66. The assessment team considered the arrangements for student engagement relevant to condition B2.2.b: student involvement in relevant committees, appropriate student voice mechanisms (such as module evaluations), and opportunities for students to contribute to course design through their feedback. Based on the evidence reviewed, within the scope of this quality assessment, the assessment team regarded student engagement processes and practice to be appropriate and therefore did not identify any concerns in relation to condition B2.2.b.

67. The assessment team's investigation drew on multiple sources of information, as identified above, that are relevant to condition B2.2a. Following a risk-based approach, the assessment team considered the areas set out below.

Academic support

68. The assessment team sought to understand student views of academic support, including the experiences of students actively seeking support, and of those receiving proactive offers of support from the university.

69. The assessment team determined to explore access to academic support in the form of careers advice and support, and support for students with specific learning needs. Organisation and communication of academic support were also identified as areas for exploration. The assessment team decided to consider these areas as, in isolation, the initial information provided did not provide reassurance that students registered on the business and management courses were receiving appropriate academic support.

70. The assessment team reviewed progression data supplied by the OfS⁴, which showed that progression rates for full-time first degree business and management students at the university averaged 52.3 per cent over three years (for students qualifying from 2017-18 to 2019-20). This is below the B3 numerical threshold of 60 per cent.⁵ The sector average was 66.7 per cent

⁴ Source: OfS published progression measures within the student outcomes dashboard from September 2022 using the 'Taught' view of a provider's student population, available at www.officeforstudents.org.uk/data-and-analysis/student-outcomes-data-dashboard/get-the-data/. The subject area 'business and management' is defined by the Common Aggregation Hierarchy Level 2 (CAH2).

⁵ See [Setting numerical thresholds for condition B3 - Office for Students](#).

during the same time period. The assessment team felt that this may have indicated that students were not receiving sufficient support, such as careers advice, to help them progress.

71. The assessment team also reviewed NSS free-text comments relating to student support. These responses contained individual concerns specifying disorganisation, misleading communication, slow communication and last-minute changes that were poorly publicised. NSS comments and one student complaint included mentions of poor career advice and poor support for career development. NSS comments also stated that some staff did not meet disability needs, specifically those relating to dyslexia.
72. The assessment team agreed if the university were found to have poorly communicated or delivered academic support, this would have the potential to result in students registered on the business and management courses not receiving a high quality academic experience, or succeeding in and beyond higher education. If academic support at the university were found to be poor, this may have detracted from students' abilities to engage with opportunities, and therefore to succeed in their education. Poor academic support may have also resulted in a lack of trust and, therefore further hindered student engagement with offers of support.
73. The assessment team reviewed data relating to tutoring, including the 'Super Academic Advisor' system, a new role at the university focused on building academic advising practice and identifying additional student support needs. Staff consulted confirmed that in addition to this role, academic advisers were supported by staff in the student engagement and retention team (SERT) and other professional service staff. The SERT team assisted in reconnecting with disengaged students. Availability of and student engagement with academic advisers was monitored well by cluster leads. This included appropriate record keeping and reporting to ensure that adequate support was provided to students while staff were not overburdened with high workloads. Availability of academic advisers was in addition to support offered by course and module leaders, with oversight provided by the relevant dean. The assessment team noted that academic advisers were required to undertake online training with respect to equality, diversity and inclusion.
74. The assessment team discussed the NSS comments in relation to careers advice and support with university staff. Staff consulted explained how staffing in the careers team had grown in line with a growth in student numbers, specifically the number of placement officers. The assessment team noted that careers support was integrated effectively across the business and management courses, including through the university's 'mental wealth' modules. These were mandatory modules included in each course focused on employability-led soft and practical skills. Careers support was further bolstered through four careers outreach campaigns a year. Assessment centres were integrated within these outreach campaigns, during which external industry professionals were invited to work with students on careers activities and challenges based on real-world scenarios. This provided students with opportunities to engage with professionals working in their chosen career area, and to receive feedback related to professional development. Students interviewed were enthusiastic about the success of these encounters and the positive impact on their studies and prospects.
75. The assessment team noted the provision of support for students with long-term physical and/or mental health conditions and learning requirements via the Disability and Dyslexia Team (DDT). Staff consulted noted that students who required such support were identified by the course leader, and that referral mechanisms appeared appropriate and robust.

76. Staff consulted noted several systems to support disengaged students, including identification via tutors, calling campaigns conducted by SERT, and follow up advice and support provided by student advisors. The assessment team felt that the efforts demonstrated by the university were genuine, and showed a consistent commitment to keeping students engaged, or re-engaging with them. The team also noted the provision of extensions, extenuation processes, 'catch-up' support, and assessment resits.
77. Students consulted in focus groups reported consistently receiving high quality, rapid and personalised support. Students noted that any issues raised were flagged and responded to swiftly by staff and administrative teams. Students praised staff for their level of enthusiastic support and noted that the Moodle VLE was a core tool in accessing support with ease. Students noted that Track My Future was a useful digital system that allowed them to easily find information relating to support. They noted that the careers zone was a good means of support in finding internships and placements. Students liked how the job centre allowed for one-to-one opportunities for feedback and guidance for their careers.
78. The assessment team reviewed module evaluation forms that evidenced strong communications regarding flagging and resolving student concerns. The assessment team was reassured that module evaluation processes were transparent and effective. Where problems arose, these appeared to be individualised outliers to the overall data presented, evidenced by a review of regular evaluation documentation across modules and programmes.
79. Staff consulted clearly articulated how signposting to student support mechanisms was embedded into their practice. This signposting was robustly demonstrated across programmes and communicated well to students in one-to-one meetings, group settings and through digital communications. Staff were familiar with all venues of student support and were thus able to accurately signpost to the most appropriate service. The VLE also provided clear signposting to support services for students.
80. The assessment team noted that due to the time periods covered, much of the data reviewed before site visits did not account for recent changes and improvements to student support provision. These included the introduction of the super academic advisers, the Track My Future system, and an increase in staff working in central support teams to support the growing student cohort. The assessment team recognised that these initiatives had been introduced in direct response to historical issues, and felt them to be credible additions to the university's support infrastructure.
81. The assessment team noted that students who failed modules were provided with all of the required information and timescales in order to retake their assessments. However, the assessment team's view was that there may have been room for improvement in proactive offers of support for students retaking assessments. The team felt that while adequate, the suite of support offered was not always as comprehensive as that provided to students undertaking their first sit of an assessment.
82. Overall, based on the information considered the assessment team was satisfied with the academic support the university offered to its students. The university identified several areas of support required by students, effectively tailored it to the student demographic, and had successfully scaled their support mechanisms. There was demonstrable evidence of improvement and this resulted in current systems of support being fit for purpose. In particular,

student feedback was positive about the speed of personalised or tailored support they received to requests for assistance, and lauded staff for their dedication to providing support.

Staffing strategy

83. The assessment team considered the provision of training support, resources, guidance, and required CPD available and mandated to staff. The team reviewed support for academic staff development, including mentoring, teaching support and development opportunities for sessional lecturers, hourly paid lecturers, and academic staff joining from industry. The team also sought to understand the university's plans to ensure appropriate expertise and capacity as its student numbers increased.
84. The assessment team decided to explore this area after a review of free-text comments submitted via the NSS. These comments specified some quality of teaching concerns, including a perceived lack of professionalism and a lack of adequate knowledge among some staff.
85. Upon review of the university's staffing profile, the assessment team felt that there may have been a significant reliance on two types of teaching staff: visiting lecturers from industry; and Hourly Paid Lecturers (HPLs). Pre-visit data did not evidence any requirements for teaching and learning training for these types of staff. This raised a potential concern that these staff may not have been equipped with relevant knowledge and skills to deliver a high-quality academic experience to students.
86. The assessment team reviewed the university's staff resources on the CELT website, and formed the view that the resources provided were limited. The team felt that the focus was on providing orientation on policies, procedures, the practicalities of compiling handbooks, and developing consistent VLE sites, but that only surface-level guidance was provided on good teaching and learning practice, and that overall there were limited pedagogical resources. Some links on the CELT website were inaccessible to the assessment team, or appeared to contain hyperlinks that did not work. A short online course on teaching and learning and an assessment toolkit (covering assessment design, marking criteria and rubric design) were provided.
87. While staff profiles indicated that the university provides support for achieving Advance HE Fellowship status, the assessment team were unable to access any guidance on how to obtain this on the CELT website, and this was not provided in any documentation reviewed by the assessors (outside of ambitions noted in the strategy).
88. As stated above under condition B1, the university staff spoken to by the assessment team initially seemed unable to clearly articulate the pedagogical drivers relating to curriculum design and policy. The assessment team queried several groups of staff in relation to pedagogical justifications across curricula, such as assessment design, programmatic design, research-rich approaches, and authentic learning. Responses to these queries were often indirect, incomplete, or simplistic. These factors initially made it difficult for the assessment team to understand how suitably qualified the university's staff were about pedagogy and practice.
89. The assessment team agreed that the information it had gathered about this matter raised a potential concern that students registered on the business and management courses may not have been receiving a high quality academic experience. This is because evidence was not

readily available to confirm that staff, especially visiting lecturers and HPLs, were suitably qualified and had relevant knowledge and skills to deliver a high quality academic experience and support students to succeed. In addition, university resources to support staff in developing relevant knowledge and skills did not appear to be comprehensive.

90. Pre-visit information reviewed by the assessment team cited instances of a lack of professionalism. It was unclear from this documentation if these were isolated instances or part of a larger institutional culture. Following verbal discussion with students and staff, and on review of further regular evaluation data, the team determined that any such issues were indeed rare and isolated, and that expectations in relation to professional behaviours were made clear to staff.
91. Consultation with HPLs and visiting guest lecturers from industry evidenced that the university provided this group with an appropriate level of training and support. All HPLs and guest lecturers were paired with more experienced teaching staff at the university, who oversaw their professional development for teaching and learning. In verbal discussions, this cohort of lecturers described considerable rigour in their training provision and expectations on the quality of their delivery. Individualised inductions were complemented by teaching team inductions, online learning resources, in-person pedagogic training by internal teaching-focused staff, and inclusion within the institution-wide training week. This group of staff proved highly articulate on pedagogy in discussion with assessors.
92. The assessment team's meetings with CELT staff, and with staff who undertook training by CELT, evidenced adequate support and training provision by the university. This included teaching and learning training. A high number of staff were supported to achieve teaching qualifications that included Advance HE Fellowship status, through multiple routes, and Postgraduate Certificates in Academic Practice. Staff were suitably supported to achieve these qualifications, if they had not done so already. Leadership prioritised this qualification for existing staff and as part of recruitment for new staff. CELT worked with heads of clusters, heads of school and other staff to ensure that strategic curriculum priorities were implemented in practice. CELT organised an annual all-staff training week. All permanent staff were required to attend, and all hourly paid lecturers were paid to attend. The assessment team concluded that staff were appropriately guided and supported to develop relevant skills for teaching and learning. As a result, the assessors were confident that staff were suitably qualified. This evidence was not obvious from data provided by the institution pre-visit, but was robustly evidenced on site in verbal discussions with staff.
93. The assessment team also reviewed module evaluations that captured any issues with teaching, which were thereafter redressed via cluster leads. Module evaluation reports provided valuable insight into the regular embedded quality control and oversight mechanisms for teaching and learning. Coupled with discussions with cluster leads, the assessors were satisfied with the university's provision in this area.
94. The assessment team noted that the staff data provided pre-visit, including handbooks and information on the highest qualifications held, did not adequately convey the level of training staff had undertaken. This created a false impression. This included the exclusion of data relating to the number of staff holding or embarking on HEA Fellowship (of any level). The assessment team also noted that there was a reliance on email communication in notifying staff of training opportunities and this was difficult to evidence retrospectively.

95. Evidence provided reassurance that there were quality assurance processes providing effective oversight of staff training to a suitable level. Some staff did not articulate clearly how their curriculum was successfully delivered, but they were still effective in practice. The assessors concluded that fluency in pedagogy terminology was a weakness for some staff, but this did not detract from their ability to deliver well.
96. Overall, the assessment team was satisfied that university staff were adequately qualified to teach. The university also promoted an organisational culture that encouraged pedagogical excellence, and provided mechanisms to support that ambition. It was evident that staff were dedicated to and enthusiastic about teaching and learning success. Students also provided positive reviews of staff expertise and their enthusiasm for teaching in support of student success.

B2 Conclusions

97. The assessment team's investigation drew on multiple sources of information, as identified above, that are relevant to condition B2. Following a risk-based approach, it did not identify any concerns relating to condition B2 from reviewing this information.

Condition B4: Assessment and awards

98. In the course of its investigation the assessment team reviewed a range of evidence relevant to condition B4 (see the full text in Annex A). The team reviewed information relevant to whether students on the university's business and management courses are 'assessed effectively' (B4.2.a), that each assessment is 'valid and reliable' (B4.2.b), that academic regulations 'are designed to ensure that relevant awards are credible' (B4.2.c) and that 'relevant awards granted to students are credible' (B4.2.e).
99. The initial information provided by the university, and reviewed by the assessment team, included:
- module specifications and handbooks for the business and management courses across Levels 3 to 7, including assessment methods
 - module attainment data for 15 Level 4 modules that contribute towards the business and management courses (for the academic year 2021-22)
 - eight student complaints (during the academic year 2021-22).
100. Alongside the initial information provided by the university, the assessment team reviewed National Student Survey (NSS) information (quantitative and qualitative) for 2019-20, 2020-21, and 2021-22. The team also reviewed student outcomes data, including measures on completion, continuation and progression.
101. This initial information is relevant to students on the courses under consideration being 'assessed effectively' (B4.2.a) and assessments being 'reliable' (B4.2.b).
102. During on-site visits, the assessment team met with students currently studying the courses under consideration, across Levels 4 to 7, and with academic staff teaching on these courses. These meetings included discussion of topics relevant to assessments being

'effective' (B4.2.a) and 'valid' (B4.2.b) (i.e. that assessments 'in fact take place in a way that results in students demonstrating knowledge and skills in the way intended by the design of the assessment'). The assessment team did not identify any concerns relating to condition B4 during the course of its on-site visits.

103. The assessment team also requested additional information from the university regarding the courses being considered, as detailed under 'information gathering' above. This included:
- module performance statistics for 52 Level 4 to 7 modules on the business and management courses (for the academic year 2021-22)
 - access to the university's staff-facing online assessment toolkit
 - assessment strategies for a sample of business and management courses.
104. This information is relevant to all aspects of condition B4.2. The assessment team did not identify any concerns relating to condition B4 from this information.
105. The assessment team reviewed assessment briefs and samples of exam papers, as well as assessment tasks, via module VLE sites, across Levels 3 to 7. This information is particularly relevant to students being 'assessed effectively' (B4.2.a) and that assessments are 'valid and reliable' (B4.2.b). The assessment team did not identify any concerns relating to B4 from these reviews.

B4 Conclusions

106. As the assessment team's investigation progressed, it drew on multiple sources of information, as identified above, that are relevant to condition B4. Following a risk-based approach the assessment team did not identify any concerns relating to condition B4 from reviewing this information.

Annex A: Ongoing conditions of registration

Condition B1: Academic experience

Scope

B1.1 This condition applies to the quality of higher education provided in any manner or form by, or on behalf of, a provider (including, but not limited to, circumstances where a provider is responsible only for granting awards for students registered with another provider).

Requirement

B1.2 Without prejudice to the principles and requirements provided for by any other condition of registration and the scope of B1.1, the provider must ensure that the students registered on each **higher education course** receive a high quality academic experience.

B1.3 For the purposes of this condition, a high quality academic experience includes but is not limited to ensuring all of the following:

- a. each **higher education course** is **up-to-date**;
- b. each **higher education course** provides **educational challenge**;
- c. each **higher education course** is **coherent**;
- d. each **higher education course** is **effectively delivered**; and
- e. each **higher education course**, as appropriate to the subject matter of the course, requires students to develop **relevant skills**.

B1.4 Insofar as **relevant skills** includes technical proficiency in the English language, the provider is not required to comply with B1.3.e to the extent that it is able to demonstrate to the OfS, on the balance of probabilities, that its English language proficiency requirements, or failure to have English language proficiency requirements, for one or more students, are strictly necessary as a matter of law because compliance with B1.3.e in respect of that student, or those students:

- i. would amount to a form of discrimination for the purposes of the Equality Act 2010; and
- ii. cannot be objectively justified for the purposes of relevant provisions of that Act; and
- iii. does not fall within an exception or exclusion provided for under or by virtue of that Act, including but not limited to provisions of the Act that relate to competence standards.

Definitions

B1.5 For the purposes of this condition B1:

- a. “**appropriately informed**” will be assessed by reference to:
 - i. the time period within which any of the developments described in the definition of **up-to-date** have been in existence;
 - ii. the importance of any of the developments described in the definition of **up-to-date** to the subject matter of the **higher education course**; and

iii. the time period by which it is planned that such developments described in the definition of **up-to-date** will be brought into the **higher education course** content.

b. “**coherent**” means a **higher education course** which ensures:

- i. there is an appropriate balance between breadth and depth of content;
- ii. subjects and skills are taught in an appropriate order and, where necessary, build on each other throughout the course; and
- iii. key concepts are introduced at the appropriate point in the course content.

c. “**educational challenge**” means a challenge that is no less than the minimum level of rigour and difficulty reasonably expected of the **higher education course**, in the context of the subject matter and level of the course.

d. “**effectively delivered**”, in relation to a **higher education course**, means the manner in which it is taught, supervised and assessed (both in person and remotely) including, but not limited to, ensuring:

- i. an appropriate balance between delivery methods, for example lectures, seminars, group work or practical study, as relevant to the content of the course; and
- ii. an appropriate balance between directed and independent study or research, as relevant to the level of the course.

e. “**higher education course**” is to be interpreted:

- i. in accordance with the Higher Education and Research Act 2017; and
- ii. so as to include, for the avoidance of doubt:
 - A. a course of study;
 - B. a programme of research;
 - C. any further education course that forms an integrated part of a higher education course; and
 - D. any module that forms part of a higher education course, whether or not that module is delivered as an integrated part of the course.

f. “**relevant skills**” means:

- i. knowledge and understanding relevant to the subject matter and level of the **higher education course**; and
- ii. other skills relevant to the subject matter and level of the **higher education course** including, but not limited to, cognitive skills, practical skills, transferable skills and professional competences.

g. “**up-to-date**” means representative of current thinking and practices in the subject matter to which the **higher education course** relates, including being **appropriately informed** by recent:

- i. subject matter developments;
- ii. research, industrial and professional developments; and
- iii. developments in teaching and learning, including learning resources

Condition B2: Resources, support and student engagement

Scope

B2.1 This condition applies to the quality of higher education provided in any manner or form by, or on behalf of, a provider (including, but not limited to, circumstances where a provider is responsible only for granting awards for students registered with another provider).

Requirement

B2.2 Without prejudice to the principles and requirements provided for by any other condition of registration and the scope of B2.1, the provider must take all reasonable steps to ensure:

a. each **cohort of students** registered on each **higher education course** receives **resources** and **support** which are sufficient for the purpose of ensuring:

- i. a high quality academic experience for those students; and
- ii. those students succeed in and beyond higher education; and

b. effective **engagement** with each **cohort of students** which is sufficient for the purpose of ensuring:

- i. a high quality academic experience for those students; and
- ii. those students succeed in and beyond higher education.

B2.3 For the purposes of this condition, “all reasonable steps” is to be interpreted in a manner which (without prejudice to other relevant considerations):

a. focuses and places significant weight on:

- i. the particular academic needs of each **cohort of students** based on prior academic attainment and capability; and
- ii. the principle that the greater the academic needs of the **cohort of students**, the number and nature of the steps needed to be taken are likely to be more significant;

b. places less weight, as compared to the factor described in B2.3a., on the provider’s financial constraints; and

c. disregards case law relating to the interpretation of contractual obligations.

Definitions

B2.4 For the purposes of this condition B2:

a. “**academic misconduct**” means any action or attempted action that may result in a student obtaining an unfair academic advantage in relation to an **assessment**, including but not limited to plagiarism, unauthorised collaboration and the possession of unauthorised materials during an **assessment**.

b. “**appropriately qualified**” means staff have and maintain:

- i. expert knowledge of the subject they design and/or deliver;
- ii. teaching qualifications or training, and teaching experience, appropriate for the content and level of the relevant **higher education course**; and
- iii. the required knowledge and skills as to the effective delivery of their **higher education course**.

c. “**assessment**” means any component of a course used to assess student achievement towards a **relevant award**, including an examination and a test.

d. “**cohort of students**” means the group of students registered on to the **higher education course** in question and is to be interpreted by reference to the particular academic needs of those students based on prior academic attainment and capability.

e. “**engagement**” means routine provision of opportunities for students to contribute to the development of their academic experience and their **higher education course**, in a way that maintains the academic rigour of that course, including, but not limited to, through membership of the provider’s committees, opportunities to provide survey responses, and participation in activities to develop the course and the way it is delivered.

f. “**higher education course**” is to be interpreted:

- i. in accordance with the Higher Education and Research Act 2017; and
- ii. so as to include, for the avoidance of doubt:
 - A. a course of study;
 - B. a programme of research;
 - C. any further education course that forms an integrated part of a higher education course; and
 - D. any module that forms part of a higher education course, whether or not that module is delivered as an integrated part of the course.

g. “**physical and digital learning resources**” includes, as appropriate to the content and delivery of the **higher education course**, but is not limited to:

- i. physical locations, for example teaching rooms, libraries, studios and laboratories;
- ii. physical and digital learning resources, for example books, computers and

software;

iii. the resources needed for digital learning and teaching, for example, hardware and software, and technical infrastructure; and

iv. other specialist resources, for example specialist equipment, software and research tools.

h. “**relevant award**” means:

i. a **research award**;

ii. a **taught award**; and/or

iii. any other type of award or qualification in respect of a **higher education course**, including an award of credit granted in respect of a module that may form part of a larger **higher education course**, whether or not granted pursuant to an authorisation given by or under the Higher Education and Research Act 2017, another Act of Parliament or Royal Charter.

i. “**research award**” and “**taught award**” have the meanings given in section 42(3) of the Higher Education and Research Act 2017.

j. “**resources**” includes but is not limited to:

i. the staff team that designs and delivers a **higher education course** being collectively **sufficient in number, appropriately qualified** and deployed effectively to deliver in practice; and

ii. **physical and digital learning resources** that are adequate and deployed effectively to meet the needs of the **cohort of students**.

k. “**sufficient in number**” will be assessed by reference to the principle that the larger the cohort size of students, the greater the number of staff and amount of staff time should be available to students, and means, in the context of the staff team:

i. there is sufficient financial resource to recruit and retain sufficient staff;

ii. the provider allocates appropriate financial resource to ensuring staff are equipped to teach courses;

iii. **higher education courses** have an adequate number of staff, and amount of staff time; and

iv. the impact on students of changes in staffing is minimal.

l. “**support**” means the effective deployment of assistance, as appropriate to the content of the **higher education course** and the **cohort of students**, including but not limited to:

i. academic support relating to the content of the **higher education course**;

ii. support needed to underpin successful physical and digital learning and teaching;

iii. support relating to understanding, avoiding and reporting **academic misconduct**; and

iv. careers support, but for the avoidance of doubt, does not include other categories of non-academic support.

Condition B4: Assessment and awards

Scope

B4.1 This condition applies to the quality of higher education provided in any manner or form by, or on behalf of, a provider (including, but not limited to, circumstances where a provider is responsible only for granting awards for students registered with another provider).

Requirement

B4.2 Without prejudice to the principles and requirements provided for by any other condition of registration and the scope of B4.1, the provider must ensure that:

- a. students are **assessed effectively**;
- b. each **assessment** is **valid** and **reliable**;
- c. **academic regulations** are designed to ensure that **relevant awards** are **credible**;
- d. subject to paragraph B4.3, in respect of each **higher education course**, **academic regulations** are designed to ensure the effective assessment of technical proficiency in the English language in a manner which appropriately reflects the level and content of the applicable **higher education course**; and
- e. **relevant awards** granted to students are **credible** at the point of being granted and when compared to those granted previously.

B4.3 The provider is not required to comply with B4.2d to the extent that:

- a. a **higher education course** is assessing a language that is not English; or
- b. the provider is able to demonstrate to the OfS, on the balance of probabilities, that its **academic regulations**, or failure to have any **academic regulations**, for assessing technical proficiency in the English language for one or more students are strictly necessary as a matter of law because compliance with B4.2d in respect of that student, or those students:
 - i. would amount to a form of discrimination for the purposes of the Equality Act 2010; and
 - ii. cannot be objectively justified for the purposes of relevant provisions of that Act; and
 - iii. does not fall within an exception or exclusion provided for under or by virtue of that Act, including but not limited to provisions of the Act that relate to competence standards.

Definitions

B4.4 For the purposes of this condition B4:

a. “**academic misconduct**” means any action or attempted action that may result in a student obtaining an unfair academic advantage in relation to an **assessment**, including but not limited to plagiarism, unauthorised collaboration and the possession of unauthorised materials during an **assessment**.

b. “**academic regulations**” means regulations adopted by the provider, which govern its **higher education courses**, including but not limited to:

- i. the assessment of students’ work;
- ii. student discipline relating to academic matters;
- iii. the requirements for **relevant awards**; and
- iv. the method used to determine classifications, including but not limited to:
 - A. the requirements for an award; and
 - B. the algorithms used to calculate the classification of awards.

c. “**assessed effectively**” means assessed in a challenging and appropriately comprehensive way, by reference to the subject matter of the **higher education course**, and includes but is not limited to:

- i. providing stretch and rigour consistent with the level of the course;
- ii. testing **relevant skills**; and
- iii. **assessments** being designed in a way that minimises the opportunities for **academic misconduct** and facilitates the detection of such misconduct where it does occur.

d. “**assessment**” means any component of a course used to assess student achievement towards a **relevant award**, including an examination and a test.

e. “**credible**” means that, in the reasonable opinion of the OfS, **relevant awards** reflect students’ knowledge and skills, and for this purpose the OfS may take into account factors which include, but are not limited to:

- i. the number of **relevant awards** granted, and the classifications attached to them, and the way in which this number and/or the classifications change over time and compare with other providers;
- ii. whether students are **assessed effectively** and whether **assessments** are **valid** and **reliable**;
- iii. any actions the provider has taken that would result in an increased number of **relevant awards**, and/or changes in the classifications attached to them, whether or not the achievement of students has increased, for example, changes to assessment practices or **academic regulations**; and
- iv. the provider’s explanation and evidence in support of the reasons for any changes in the classifications over time or differences with other providers.

f. “**higher education course**” is to be interpreted:

- i. in accordance with the Higher Education and Research Act 2017; and
- ii. so as to include, for the avoidance of doubt:

A. a course of study;

B. a programme of research;

C. any further education course that forms an integrated part of a higher education course; and

D. any module that forms part of a higher education course, whether or not that module is delivered as an integrated part of the course.

g. “**relevant award**” means:

i. a **research award**;

ii. a **taught award**; and/or

iii. any other type of award or qualification in respect of a **higher education course**, including an award of credit granted in respect of a module that may form part of a larger **higher education course**, whether or not granted pursuant to an authorisation given by or under the Higher Education and Research Act 2017, another Act of Parliament or Royal Charter.

h. “**relevant skills**” means:

i. knowledge and understanding relevant to the subject matter and level of the **higher education course**; and

ii. other skills relevant to the subject matter and level of the **higher education course** including, but not limited to, cognitive skills, practical skills, transferable skills and professional competences.

i. “**reliable**” means that an **assessment**, in practice, requires students to demonstrate knowledge and skills in a manner which is consistent as between the students registered on a **higher education course** and over time, as appropriate in the context of developments in the content and delivery of the **higher education course**.

j. “**research award**” and “**taught award**” have the meanings given in section 42(3) of the Higher Education and Research Act 2017.

k. “**valid**” means that an **assessment** in fact takes place in a way that results in students demonstrating knowledge and skills in the way intended by design of the assessment.



© The Office for Students copyright 2023

This publication is available under the Open Government Licence 3.0 except where it indicates that the copyright for images or text is owned elsewhere.

www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/