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# Glossary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Acronym** | **Description** | **Note** |
| BoS | Board of Studies | Annex H, Annex I  Divisions may opt to have Boards of Studies. |
| DESEC | Divisional Education and UG Student Experience Committee | Annex H |
| DGSSEC | Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee | Annex I |
| DoS | Director of Studies | Annex H, Annex I |
| DQSSC | Divisional Quality and Standards Sub-Committee | Annex H, Annex I |
| EASC | University’s Education and Academic Standards Committee | Terms of Reference: https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/committees/easc/index.html |
| ESEB | University’s Education and Student Experience Board | Terms of Reference:  https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/committees/eseb/index.html |
| GRCB | University’s Graduate and Researcher College Board | Terms of Reference:  https://www.kent.ac.uk/graduateschool/gsboard/index.html |
| NSS | National Student Survey | Survey of final year UG students only.  Questions numbers refer to questions in 2023 survey. |
| PTES | Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey | Survey of PGT students, managed by Advance HE. |
| QAAM | Divisional Quality Assurance and Accreditation Manager | The title of this role may vary between Divisions. |
| QACO | Quality Assurance and Compliance Office | https://www.kent.ac.uk/education/quality-assurance-compliance-office |
| OfS | Office for Students | Higher Education Regulator |
| SVF | Student Voice Forum | Annex M |

# Introduction to Periodic Course Review

The periodic review of courses is part of the internal quality assurance system for taught courses.

The purpose of the internal quality assurance system, as set out in the relevant Regulations, Code of Practice, Credit Framework, and additional guidance, is to assure the quality and standards of all provision in line with external and internal expectations.

Externally, quality and standards are defined by the conditions of registration of the higher education regulator, the Office for Students.

Quality is defined in conditions B1, B2, B3 and B4. Standards are defined in condition B5.

Aspects of excellence in student experience and student outcomes are based on the TEF assessment framework.

The conditions set out the minimum baseline requirements that providers must meet to remain on the register of providers.

Compliance with the conditions of registration means that the minimum baseline requirements are met.

Periodic Course Review (PCR) provides an opportunity to assess and confirm the compliance of courses over a longer period of time, to identify any progress made and any emerging issues over time.

PCR provides confidence that the quality and standards are met continuously and across all higher education provision.

It also gives a longer-term view of enhancement and strategic changes.

PCR is also an important opportunity to involve external perspective – external confirmation that standards and quality are met.

PCR allows a more thorough review of the enhancement actions that are taken, for example as a result of continuous course monitoring, and their impact on improving the quality of education.

# Specific Aims

Periodic Course Reviews should

* confirm that quality and standards are met.
* confirm that course improvement action plans are implemented and have a positive impact on the course quality, standards, and student experience.
* enable courses to move towards further enhancement and excellence.
* review the Division’s management of the educational offer.
* provide information for the forward planning of the subject area for the next review cycle.
* include students as partners.
* be proportionate to risk.
* support external assessments by Professional, Statutory, and Regulatory Bodies where relevant.

# Scope

In line with the B conditions of regulation, the scope of this annex includes all taught provision.

Taught provision is defined as all courses or modules delivered by the university, or on behalf of the university leading to a university award.

It includes all taught provision at levels 4-8 and all provision at level 3 where the latter is integrated into a higher education qualification.[[1]](#footnote-2)

The processes defined in this annex should also be followed for provision offered through validated partners. Responsibilities allocated to specific units such as Divisions, Education Committees or Quality Committees should be implemented by the equivalent organisational unit of the partner.

# Relation to other quality assurance processes

Periodic Course Reviews tie in with the other quality assurance mechanisms in place as set out in the University’s Code of Practice. These are Annual Monitoring, External Examining, Student Evaluation, and Student Engagement (Annex E, Annex K, Annex N, Annex M).

## Continuous Course Monitoring

Continuous Course Monitoring is carried out in line with Annex E with the purpose of ensuring that quality and standards are always maintained for all courses and modules provided within a Division. It focuses on ensuring compliance and providing the university with assurance of compliance.

## Accreditation / PSRB

Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies carry out accreditation and other procedures to validate and approve higher education courses by defining standards for the entry to a specific profession.[[2]](#footnote-3)

PSRBs will want to know what the course has done to maintain the standards and criteria set out by them.

PSRB reports and the conclusions drawn from them, as well as any conditions or recommendations should therefore inform the periodic review.

# Responsibilities

## Divisions

Divisions have responsibility for the teaching, learning and assessment, and outcomes of the courses they offer. They ensure that the courses meet the quality and standards expectation.

### DESEC/DGSSEC

Divisional Education and Student Experience Committees and/or PG Committees as appropriate are expected to review the periodic course review reports and compile a Divisional level report where more than one suite of courses have been reviewed during an academic year. These Divisional reports provide a high-level confirmation that standards and quality are met across the Division. Divisional reports will be presented at EASC once per academic year for ratification.

If applicable, a Division can consider whether a report at School or Departmental level is helpful to bridge the gap between course and Divisional level. When School or Departmental level reports are produced, it is the responsibility of the respective Head of School or equivalent to compile these and present them to the DESEC/DGSSEC.

DESECs/DGSSECs can delegate the operational responsibility to a Divisional Quality and Standards Sub-committee (DQSSC), if applicable.

### PCR Panels

PCR review panels will be formed per group of courses from a related subject group, combining the respective UG and PG taught provision.

The Panels are composed of:

* A Chair from within the university but external to the courses under review, preferably from another School or subject area within the Division.
* An academic member of staff from another Division.
* Two reviewers external to the university, depending on the number of subjects/courses under review. They are either academics or representatives of the professional field of the courses under review. Current External Examiners cannot be part of the review panel.
* A student from the same Division but not from the courses under review, normally nominated by Kent Union.
* A Secretary to the Panel who is nominated by the Quality Assurance and Compliance Office.

Divisions make proposals for reviewers to QACO who will advise on the membership. The Divisional Director of Education and UG Student Experience and the Divisional Director of Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience will jointly approve the final panel membership.

It is expected that panel members participate in a briefing at the beginning of the process which will set out the purpose, scope and expected outcome of the review. Training will be prepared by QACO.

## Quality Assurance and Compliance Office

QACO manages the process for periodic course reviews.

QACO provides a summary of issues found and good practice identified during the reviews of an academic year. This report will be submitted to EASC during the last meeting of the academic year (summer term).

## Education and Academic Standards Committee (EASC)

EASC receives reports from each Division where a review has taken place.

# Process

The Periodic Course Review takes place on a rolling basis, every five years. The detailed schedule of reviews will be set up by QACO and approved by EASC once per academic year.

## Selection of courses

Subject areas which have a high level of engagement will be scrutinised with a lighter touch approach than those where issues have been found through continuous monitoring, external examining, an analysis of student life-cycle data against benchmarks, results of national surveys, etc.

Courses that have undergone a PSRB accreditation in the past 2 years can also undergo the lighter touch approach to minimise burden on the subject areas.

## Level of scrutiny

In the lighter touch approach, a desktop review is carried out. Courses that consistently meet all baseline requirements can focus more on enhancement and excellence. There is no need to repeat the information from the continuous monitoring reports as these are made available to the review panels.

The regular approach will include a visit with face-to-face (or remote) meetings by the panel with the stakeholders. In the first instance, these visits will serve to identify if courses meet the baseline requirements. Additional time will be allocated to identify further enhancements and progress.

## Documentation

The main document is the self-evaluation document (SED), with a focus on analysis, not description.

The self-evaluation report addresses the baseline expectations and/or features of excellence as set out in Appendix A.

It is recommended that the subject area under review carries out self-evaluation workshops involving different stakeholders from within the area: students, staff, externals such as employers (e.g. when higher and degree apprenticeships are concerned).

Supporting documentation may include:

* Continuous course monitoring reports and resulting action plans.
* Responses to External Examiner Reports where these are not included in the continuous course monitoring.
* PSRB / Accreditation Reports and resulting action plans.

### Evidence gathering / meetings

The review panel will seek evidence from the written documentation provided by the courses under review.

For the regular approach, feedback will be sought through meetings and discussions with stakeholders. These include teaching staff, students and professional staff as well as School/Division Leadership.

A two-day event will be organised by the subject area under review in collaboration with QACO. The details of the event will be based on the initial assessment of the written documentation submitted.

Meetings will normally include:

* Head of Division
* Head of School or equivalent
* Meeting with students from the courses under review
* Meeting with course directors/course convenors etc.
* Meeting with professional staff, including student support
* Meeting with external stakeholders such as employers
* Private meetings of the review panel
* Feedback to the subject area under review

Meeting timetables are adjusted depending on the specific provision reviewed and are agreed between QACO and the Division.

The agenda should include sufficient time for initial feedback meetings of the panel to agree the areas of focus for the meetings and to define the lead questions.

### Timelines

The whole process should be completed within 6 months.

The process is divided into three phases:

* Months 1-4 Self-evaluation and compilation of documents
* Month 5 Review and report writing
* Month 6 Reporting and decision making

### Review Report

The secretary drafts a report on behalf of the review panel using the template in Appendix B. The wording of the report is agreed by the panel before it is sent to the Division for checking for factual errors.

The report contains an analysis and assessment of the findings by the panel.

The report contains recommendations for:

* Suggested actions to meet baseline requirements (B Conditions)
* Achieving excellence (Educational Enhancement)

# Outcome of Periodic Course Review

The Periodic Course Review results in a report providing assurance where courses are found to comply with quality and standards expectations. Where an area is found to be non-compliant, the review report includes recommendations for improvement.

The review report also shows areas where courses exceed the baseline expectations, where educational excellence is met and where there is room for further enhancement.

Period Course Review may result in the following outcomes, based on the analysis and judgement made by the review panel:

* Good practice: areas where courses meet or exceed expectations and show features of excellence.
* Essential recommendations: areas where courses may need to improve to meet baseline requirements.
* Suggested additional recommendations for enhancement: areas where courses are on path to excellence but may need to take some further actions to achieve it.

Where recommendations are made, Divisions are expected to follow these up and include them in the continuous monitoring with clear action plans.

QACO shall identify common areas of recommendations or enhancement and propose further actions to EASC.

Based on the reports received, EASC may also determine overarching areas or themes for the enhancement of the teaching provision across the university.

## 7.1 Outcomes for Validated Institutions

In case of a Periodic Review for Validated Institutions, the Panel will also make an additional recommendation whether the partnership arrangement should continue, and the Validated Institution be permitted to continue to deliver the programmes under scrutiny.

Following on from Divisional consideration, by all relevant cognate Divisions, the recommendation will be submitted to the next meeting of EASC.

# Baseline Expectations for Courses

These expectations are identical to those used in continuous monitoring.

The following table sets out the requirements for courses based on the B conditions and the definitions of the conditions given by the Office for Students.

## Student Outcomes (B3)

| **Baseline** | **Definition** | **How do we know?** | **What do we expect?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Continuation | Extent to which, for each combination of mode and level of study, students achieve positive outcomes in respect of continuing in their studies. | OfS Dashboard | Above the OfS threshold per indicator, as relevant to the mode and level of study. |
| Completion | Extent to which, for each combination of mode and level of study, students achieve positive outcomes in respect of completing their studies. | OfS Dashboard | Above the OfS threshold per indicator, as relevant to the mode and level of study. |
| Progression | Extent to which, for each combination of mode and level of study, students achieve positive outcomes in respect of progressing into managerial or professional employment, or further study. | OfS Dashboard | Above the OfS threshold per indicator, as relevant to the mode and level of study. |

## Course Design (B1)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | **Definition based on OfS B Conditions** | **How do we know?** | **What do we expect?** |
| Is up to date | * Representative of current thinking and practices. * Appropriately informed by recent: * subject matter developments; * research, industrial and professional developments; * developments in teaching and learning, including learning resources. | **Quantitative**:  When was the curriculum last updated?  When is the next update planned?  How many modules within the course have been updated in the last/current academic year?  **Qualitative**:  Has PSRB accreditation been achieved? Is it still valid?  What developments have been made in the subject area and when will they be implemented into the course? | Review and update when Subject Benchmarks are updated.  Continuous accreditation where applicable. |
| Provides educational challenge | * No less than the minimum level of rigour and difficulty reasonably expected. | **Quantitative**: NSS[[3]](#footnote-4) Teaching on my course (questions 3,4)  Equivalent question from PGT survey | Above benchmark |
| **Qualitative**: EE comment | Positive comments |
| Is coherent | * Appropriate balance between breadth and depth of content; * Subjects and skills are taught in an appropriate order and, where necessary, build on each other throughout the course; and * Key concepts are introduced at the appropriate point in the course content. | Quantitative: NSS Learning Opportunities (questions 5, 6,) | Above benchmark |
| Qualitative: EE comment | Positive comments |
| Effectively delivered | Taught, supervised and assessed (both in person and remotely) to ensure:   * an appropriate balance between delivery methods, for example lectures, seminars, group work or practical study, as relevant to the content of the course; and * an appropriate balance between directed and independent study or research, as relevant to the level of the course. | Quantitative: NSS learning opportunities (question 7, 8)  Student drop-out rates within the course.  Student pass rates on modules within the course  Number of appeals on course. | Above benchmark  Below OfS threshold  Above OfS continuation threshold  Need to gather data year on year, then establish a PI. |
| Qualitative:  Any issues raised in Student Voice Forum. | Action plans defined. |
| Develop relevant skills | * Knowledge and understanding relevant to the subject matter and level. * Other skills relevant to the subject matter and level including, but not limited to, cognitive skills, practical skills, transferable skills and professional competences. | Quantitative: NSS learning opportunities question 9)  Graduate Outcome question (“I am utilising what I learned”): <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/data-and-analysis/graduates/table-8> | Above benchmark |
| Qualitative :  EE comment | Positive comment |

## Assessments (B4)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | **Definition** | **How do we know?** | **What do we expect?** |
| Testing relevant skills | * Knowledge and understanding relevant to the subject matter and level of the higher education course; and * 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. | Quantitative: NSS Marking and assessment (question 12) | Above benchmark |
| Qualitative: EE comment | Positive comment |
| Valid and Reliable | * 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. * 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. | Quantitative : NSS Marking and assessment (questions 11, 12) | Above benchmark |
| Qualitative: EE comment  Moderation process reports | Positive comment  No issues arisen |
| Effective | * Assessed in a challenging and appropriately comprehensive way, by reference to the subject: * providing stretch and rigour consistent with the level of the course; and * designed in a way that minimises the opportunities for academic misconduct and facilitates the detection of such misconduct where it does occur. | Quantitative: Number of pass, fail, resit  For apprenticeships: Timely completion of EPAs.  Number of academic misconduct cases.  Number of extension requests.  NSS question 12 | No increase in number of fails.  Decrease in case numbers over time.  Decrease in request numbers.  Above benchmark |
| Qualitative:  EE comment on range of subject matter; assessment variety. | Positive comments |
| Technical proficiency in English | * Effective assessment of technical proficiency in the English language in a manner which appropriately reflects the level and content of the course. | Included in assessment criteria. | Evidence of testing and marking. |
| Feedback | * Feedback on students’ performance is given before a final essay or exam. * Feedback is returned in time for students to learn from it before the next assessment. | Quantitative:  NSS marking and assessment (questions 13, 14).  Number of modules where feedback was not provided in due time. | Above benchmark  No such modules |
| Marking | * Marking is based on criteria in line with the sector-recognised standards for the relevant level of the course. * Marking is in line with the Assessment Regulation Framework. | Quantitative:  NSS marking and assessment (questions 10, 11). | Above benchmark |
| Qualitative:  EE comment on marking criteria.  EE comment on consistency of marking.  Positive moderation reports. | Positive comments |

## Awards (B4, B5)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** |  | **How do we know?** | **What do we expect?** |
| Credible | Relevant awards reflect students’ knowledge and skills:   * 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. * Any actions 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. * Reasons for any changes in the classifications over time or differences with other providers. | Quantitative:  Proportion of Upper Seconds and Firsts. | No increase in classifications (unless explained). |
| Award at relevant level = Meets qualification descriptors | Defined in the Sector-recognized standards[[4]](#footnote-5), part A.3 | Degree outcome data. | Trend towards level of 2018/19.  Shows no unexplained inflation. |
| Level 6 awards at right classification level |  | Qualitative: comment by EE that assessment criteria for level 6 achieved. | Positive comments |

## Staff resources (B2)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | **Definition** | **How do we know?** | **What do we expect?** |
| Sufficient in number | * The larger the cohort size of students, the greater the number of staff and amount of staff time should be available to students. * There is sufficient financial resource to recruit and retain sufficient staff. * Appropriate financial resource allocated to ensuring staff are equipped to teach courses. * Courses have an adequate number of staff, and amount of staff time. * The impact on students of changes in staffing is minimal. | How many modules w/in a course could not be taught due to staff shortages?  How many modules with only one staff member available to teach? | No such modules.  None, otherwise clear plan for cover. |
| Appropriately qualified | Staff have and maintain:   * xpert knowledge of the subject they design and/or deliver; * teaching qualifications or training, and teaching experience appropriate for the content and level of the course; * the relevant knowledge and skills required to effectively deliver their course. | Ratio of new, inexperienced teaching staff in any course  Participation of teaching staff in subject conferences, research. | To be defined |
| Deployed effectively | N/A | Quantitative: students per pathway (Hypergene).  How many sessions could be run as planned (how many sessions could not be run).  NSS organisation and management (questions 17-18) | To be defined by ASPP  Above benchmark |
| Qualitative  Feedback from students on course organisation. | Positive feedback |

## Physical and digital resources (B2)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** |  | **How do we know?** | **What do we expect?** |
| Sufficient physical resources | Sufficient teaching rooms, studios, laboratories etc. | Quantitative:  NSS Learning resources questions 19-21  No of rooms available  Any issues of labs > size of lab groups | Above benchmark |
| Qualitative: feedback from SVF | Action taken for any identified issues |
| Sufficient library resources | Sufficient books and digital resources. | Quantitative  NSS question 20 | Above benchmark |
| Qualitative: feedback from SVF | Action taken for any identified issues |
| Sufficient technical infrastructure | Sufficient computers, hardware and software. | Quantitative  NSS question 19 | Above benchmark |
| Qualitative: feedback from SVF | Action taken for any identified issues |
| Sufficient specialist resources | Sufficient specialist equipment, software and research tools. | NSS question 21 | Above benchmark |
| Feedback from SVF  Feedback from module surveys | Action taken for any identified issues |

## Student support (B2)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | **Definition** | **How do we know?** | **What do we expect?** |
| Academic support | Support to help students with course content or placements, to identify and address knowledge or skills gaps, make decisions about future study choices, and support for disabled students. | Quantitative / qualitative: Participation rates in personal academic tutor meetings.  NSS Academic support (questions 15-16).  Responses from induction survey.  Indication of how students from different backgrounds are progressing (see also B3).  Students contacting the Divisional Student Support Teams.  Students referred to SSW, receiving ILPs | Any recurring issues identified  Above benchmark  Numbers to be tracked year on year for comparison. |
| Qualitative: comments from SVF.  Indication of different support for different student groups. | Communication to students on Moodle, course handbooks. |
| Support for teaching and learning | Including support to help students make the best use of digital learning. | Quantitative:  Number of support requests to library, IS, SLAS. | To be defined |
| Qualitative:  Feedback through SVF, other surveys. | Positive feedback |
| Support to avoid academic misconduct | Support relating to understanding, avoiding and reporting academic misconduct, including support for essay planning, accurate referencing, and advice about the consequences of academic misconduct | Quantitative:  Number of students doing module DP1025: Understanding and Avoiding Plagiarism.  Number of referrals.  Number of cases with penalty. | Any outlier modules identified.  Benchmarks to be set once year on year data is available. |
| Careers support | Information, advice and guidance students need to identify their capabilities and the way in which these may be suited to particular careers, and how to articulate these in a way likely to result in successful job applications. | Quantitative:  Number of engagements from careers staff.  Students in professional employment from Graduate Outcomes.  Progression data from B3. | Engagement opportunity for all students on all courses documented.  Above threshold  Above threshold |

## Student Engagement (B2)

| **Baseline** | **Definition** | **How do we know?** | **What do we expect?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Opportunities to provide survey responses | Opportunities, either individually or collectively, for students to provide feedback on their course and the way it is delivered. | Survey response rates to NSS, PTES.  Engagement with module evaluations.  NSS Student Voice (questions 22-24). | Above 30% of the cohort  Above benchmark |
| Participation in course development | Student membership of, and effective contribution to, learning and teaching committees, or course-level committees, in a subject area, or department. | Qualitative:  engagement in SVF  engagement in course development and course change processes. | Participation in all processes. |
| Membership of Divisional education committee and/or Board of Studies | Student membership of, and effective contribution to, committees responsible for academic governance and learning and teaching. | Qualitative:  Evaluation of engagement in respective meetings. | Participation in all meetings. |

# Features of Enhancement and Excellence

In addition to the baseline requirements, the following indicators and features are also considered in the periodic review:

## Positive outcomes

|  |
| --- |
| **Requirement** |
| Continuation is above benchmark |
| Completion is above benchmark |
| Progression is above benchmark |

## Educational Gain

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Requirement** | **Course Performance** |
| Academic development | *For example, gains relating to the*  *development of:*   * *subject knowledge* * *academic skills, e.g.* * *critical thinking* * *analytic reasoning* * *problem solving* * *academic writing* * *research and referencing skills* |
| Personal development | *For example, gains relating to the development of:*   * *student resilience,* * *motivation* * *confidence* * *soft skills, e.g.* * *communication* * *presentation* * *time management* * *networking and interpersonal skills* |
| Work readiness | *For example, gains relating to the development of*   * *employability skills, e.g.:* * *teamworking* * *commercial awareness* * *leadership and influencing* |

## Academic Experience and Assessment

|  |
| --- |
| **Requirement** |
| Teaching Indicator is at or above benchmark (UG). |
| PTES questions above benchmark. |
| Assessment and Feedback Indicator is above benchmark (UG). |
| PTES questions above benchmark. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Enhancement and Excellence features** |
| Outstanding teaching practices that are highly effective and tailored to supporting its students' learning, progression, and attainment. |
| Course content and delivery inspire the provider’s students to actively engage in and commit to their learning. |
| Course content and delivery stretch students to develop knowledge and skills to their full potential. |
| Use of research in relevant disciplines, innovation, scholarship, professional practice and/or employer engagement to contribute to outstanding academic experience. |

## Resources, support, and student engagement

|  |
| --- |
| **Requirement** |
| Learning Resources Indicator is above benchmark (UG). |
| PTES questions above benchmark. |
| Academic support Indicator is above benchmark (UG). |
| PTES questions above benchmark. |
| Student Voice Indicator is above benchmark (UG). |
| PTES questions above benchmark. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Enhancement and Excellence features** |
| Outstanding support for staff professional development and excellent academic practice is embedded across the university. |
| Supportive learning environment. Students have access to a wide and readily available range of outstanding quality academic support tailored to their needs. |
| Physical and virtual learning resources are tailored and used effectively to support outstanding teaching and learning. |
| Engagement with students is embedded, leading to continuous improvement to the experiences and outcomes of its students. |

1. Higher education qualifications are defined by the [Sector-recognized Standards](https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/media/53821cbf-5779-4380-bf2a-aa8f5c53ecd4/sector-recognised-standards.pdf), Table 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. QAA, Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies, Available at: <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/about-us/who-we-work-with/professional-statutory-and-regulatory-bodies> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Note: where reference to the NSS is made, equivalent questions from PGT surveys should be used, where available [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/media/53821cbf-5779-4380-bf2a-aa8f5c53ecd4/sector-recognised-standards.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-5)