UK Quality Code Review

25th May 2023
14:00 – 16:00
Online
Aims

- To offer an update of the review of the UK Quality Code
- To report the key headings from feedback received so far
- To present proposed approaches for the quality code
- To seek feedback on content for the Code and initial thoughts on the Advice and Guidance
- To hear about the next steps for the review
Introduction to the review and summary of feedback so far

Dr Andy Smith, Quality and Standards Manager
**What have we been doing?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector Bodies</th>
<th>Sector Groups and Committees</th>
<th>Roundtable Sessions (Jan x2, Feb March 2023)</th>
<th>QAA Groups and Networks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Association of Colleges</td>
<td>ARC QPG</td>
<td>England: 95 individual institutions</td>
<td>PVC Strategy Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GuildHE (Quality Managers)</td>
<td>QSN (Exec)</td>
<td>Scotland: 9 individual institutions</td>
<td>College HE Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEFCW</td>
<td>QASHE</td>
<td>Wales: 3 individual institutions</td>
<td>Specialist and Independent Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFC</td>
<td>Russell Group Quality Practitioners</td>
<td>Northern Ireland: 11 individual institutions</td>
<td>Strategic Student Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAA Staff</td>
<td>Independent HE <em>(date TBC)</em></td>
<td>Colleges: 15 individual institutions</td>
<td>Student Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sector Bodies/Agencies: 5</td>
<td>PSRB Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>International Insights Policy and Practice Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wales Quality Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Quality Forum (Scotland)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key headlines from scoping exercise - overarching

- Providers tend to map to the Expectations and Core and Common Practices of the Code for reporting and at a strategic/managerial level.

- There is support for a revised Code to have an enhancement ethos, although there were differing views as to where enhancement should sit within it.

- There was also consensus that the Code applies across the UK regardless of the regulatory systems in place in each nation.

- A revised Code structure will need greater flexibility as it accommodates different operating models across the UK.
Key headlines from scoping exercise - structure

- The brevity of the current Code made it more accessible and useful to new members of staff and students and it offered a welcome change from the previous longer version.

- There was some support to keep the Expectations, which some providers use for reporting and high-level mapping. However, others noted they do not use them as they were too vague to be of any use.

- There was very strong support to merge the Core and Common practices, with revised Practices replacing Expectations.

- Additions to the Core Practices included:
  → dual responsibilities of partnerships
  → partnership with students
  → transitions
  → Academic integrity
Key headlines from feedback engagement - content

- The Advice and Guidance themes are used on a more frequent basis compared to the use of the Core and Common Practices. Is there a way they can be made more integral to the Code?

- Navigation between the different elements of the Code needs to be improved for mapping purposes and that the relationship between the sector agreed principles in the Advice and Guidance and the Core and Common practices is unclear.

- There were some reservations about including tertiary education formally within the Code and indicated more research was required.

- Any mapping to other frameworks such as the OfS B conditions should not be explicit within the Code itself nor in the Advice and Guidance. However, there was strong support to map the Code to the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG).

- Student Engagement to be more explicitly threaded throughout the Advice and Guidance and to strengthen the wording in the Practices.
Proposed models
Example: Model 1

- A minor rework of the existing version.
- Core and Common practices have been merged.
- The Expectations for Standards and Quality are retained.
- Underpinned by the Advice and Guidance and other elements of the Code
Example: Model 2

- A moderate approach
- Core and Common practices have been merged.
- The Expectations for Standards and Quality are removed.
- Includes sector agreed principles drawn from the current advice and guidance themes
- Underpinned by the Advice and Guidance and other elements of the Code
Example: Model 3

- A more radical approach
- Core and Common practices have been merged and reworked to align to the ESG as ‘Core Outcomes’ and Expectations are removed.
- ESG Standards have been included, where no ESG standard maps across to a particular area, a ‘UK Core Standard’ has been incorporated
- Includes sector agreed principles drawn from the current advice and guidance themes
- Underpinned by the Advice and Guidance and other elements of the Code
Questions
Introduction to tasks

www.menti.com,
Code: 1172 6063

Ruth Burchell, Quality
Enhancement and Standards
Specialist
Section 1: Feedback on the Models
### Feedback on model 1 (minimal change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Answers</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It represents the least amount of change</td>
<td>Feels like it will be easy to implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2: Like linking case studies, subject benchmark statements and qualification framework documents and supporting guidance.</td>
<td>Simplicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick to implement?</td>
<td>Lot of work for not too much change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough change/update in this. Needs a bigger refresh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's understood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn't emphasise enhancement or student engagement enough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback on model 1 (minimal change)

Pros: Short and succinct. Cons: The Standards are overly generic, it’s not mapped to the ESG

I like the Expectations: Clear about why we are doing what we do

Minimal change requires the least adjustment

Better set up. Clear to understand

Too topline

It’s familiar but is it a lost opportunity?

Not enough change to bridge the gap between code and guidance

I like Model 1 – it will be helpful to support those who are just coming into the sector

Minor rework
Feedback on model 1 (minimal change)  

71 Answers

- Simple and familiar to us
- Time to change
- Some key bits will remain missing in model 1
- Could the changes be phased, so model 1 becomes the first step in a more radical move?
- More robust
- Like: we know it works well
- Not enough change
- Dislike: time for change perhaps?
- Not enough challenge
- Minimum changes from the current Quality code
### Feedback on model 1 (minimal change)

#### 71 Answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As a newbie to UK HE, model 1 looks familiar.</th>
<th>Not enough aspiration</th>
<th>Same problem as old code – probably too brief to be useful for mapping, would still require advice and guidance to reference to.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good as a quick intro or summary</td>
<td>Won’t help address changes that have been identified</td>
<td>Too top level, which is not helpful for colleagues new to quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>either institutions map to a very high level or have to do a very detailed mapping. Neither approach is ideal</td>
<td>Some providers (especially small) are behind the curve on clearly mapping regulation/compliance to code - the small changes here mean the first steps are easier to continue</td>
<td>very status quo so easy to implement and not much change needed to policies but not so exciting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback on model 1 (minimal change) 71 Answers

I favour a cleaner, easier to digest set of principles and advice and guidance. It’s too much to take in having expectations, practices and then the more useful hints and pointers.

Tbh, tho, expectations seem as if they should go without saying.

More condensed guidance is clear

Not so principles driven so harder to make useful in practice w/ colleagues who may be unaware of the models

How does it become more relevant in England when OfS conditions are taking over. Needs detail to be over and above OfS conditions

Already understood

easy to engage with

Other proposals make more of the chance for change. Not enough here.

I do always go straight to the guidance for help on what to do
Feedback on model 1 (minimal change) Answers

A lost opportunity to provide more clarity on minimal standards.

We must integrate the advice and guidance with the code, make the links otherwise it won’t become easier to use.

Unclear how this maps to other standards/frameworks especially where working with collaborative providers, esp. in TNE.

Not enough change – needs a bigger fresh … needs to

Think the brevity being good can be addressed by being accessible in any model

With so much change using a format that is familiar is positive, it makes it easier to translate and thinking about our guidance etc. back at base it means that a full re-write may not be required

It’s the easiest shift but is it too close to recent past? Is it time to move on?

It’s family’s r but needs updates

This model is easier to read
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback on model 1 (minimal change)</th>
<th>71 Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like having the principles explicit in the quality code itself</td>
<td>Yes this is sharper and more directed to enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed principles are good to guide our practices</td>
<td>It’s clear and easy to understand. To me, these principles are legitimate ‘expectations’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorry, the practices are expectations.</td>
<td>Not a lot of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Useful to retain quality and standards distinction. Useful to trim some of the levels. Clear link to wider set of docs for reference helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What might be nice is if it allowed members to add in a brief example of how they wld put the principle into action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case studies to support the Quality code is welcomed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback on model 1 (minimal change)

71 Answers

Agree need no’s or references

Good middle ground between 1 and 3. Like the use of numbers for core practices from the perspective of mapping these at an institutional level or using within review methods.

I’m not sure all of these are outcomes - some of them read more as processes?

Do you envisages using model 2 as a basis for developing an approach to review methods?

Very useful for our detailed usage but perhaps denser than the other models for new users. Perhaps this could just be made easier in look/format of it. Should ESG be appendix?

The look of 2 with the content of 3, ESG as a separate map or appendix.

Introduction of the sector led principles gives a greater sense of co-ownership and engagement with the sector.

I think it’s really useful to map to the ESG. If the ESG changed and we went with model 1 or model 2, we would have to do some work to make sure the QC aligned to it.
Feedback on model 2 (moderate change)  51  Answers

Principles are really good especially the explicit focus on assessment which is a key conversation currently

It is good, but I feel it is too much of a compromise

Assessment focus seems key

by case studies, subject benchmark statements, characteristics statements and qualification framework documents and supporting guidance. Good to see how it all fits together

This model is easier to read

Like principles. Easy to follow.

I like the integration of the sector principles, though they stand out somewhat with only being included in CPS4 and CPQ1

Model 2 strikes a good balance between the detail needed while still remaining relatively brief and clear. The reintroduction of sector-led principles is enormously beneficial.

Can see the benefits of incorporating the principles, but feel it could do more (I'm waiting for my favourite!)
Feedback on model 2 (moderate change)  

Answers:

Accessible and easy to reference

Better that model 1. Like the principles of practice.

Agreed with the principles

Easy to follow/navigate - need to be able to use it

Principles have utility for use and bringing teaching colleagues along with us - there is clear relevance to their core work

Like the principles being integrating into the Quality Code itself

Sector led principles are good to see

Not sure core practices and principles distinction is useful

Looking across the models like the integration of guidance etc., in this one.
Feedback on model 2 (moderate change)

Brings most together but more required - needs to strike a balance for core practice

A small point but can we number the sector principles? Need to show how each principle ties back to the core practices

Sector led principles really helpful and encourage enhancement more

Have we lost any mention of research degrees or research elements in taught degrees in updated version

Principles are useful

Do you need to follow the principles though? Could be confusing

Better aligned to OfS B Conds?

Like: the potential for sector led principles to be live and organic

Simple yet informative
Feedback on model 2 (moderate change)

This is a good balance between 1 & 3. Principles are valuable

model 2 is well laid out and easy to follow

With greater focus on practices can we talk more directly about how those play out in teaching? Feel these are still a bit institution-level focussed

Clear and useful

Principles offer an element which is less fixed and can respond to changes in the sector

Still not sure that the distinction between principles/practices is useful

I really like how the Advice and guidance section is sitting alongside the principles/practice

Have the expectations actually been removed? CPS1 on model 2 is the same as EPS1 on Model 1 so is it just the duplication that is removed? Note other comments about vague distinctions agrees

The layout seems to have the potential to serve as a useful tool for enhancement - as opposed to the regulatory framework which is getting longer and harder and less accessible.
Feedback on model 2 (moderate change)  

Need to be clear about what is prescriptive and what is guidance. Principles could be ‘principles for good practice’

Principles with further detail are useful and give more value to the code. Minor element on wording for assessment, some providers are moving away from learning outcomes towards learning themes

If the principles from the existing code are updated and put into context of the current provision and regulatory environments is very good. Although I like the focus on outcomes of model 3

Having the principles integrated into the Code will make it easier to navigate.

I like the outcomes as they are action focussed and allow a variety of practice in achieving these.

Combination between model 2 and 3 would be useful

It is easy to follow but losing ESG alignment is a missed opportunity to demonstrate we do align to ESG

Can the wording of principle be broad enough to allow institutional autonomy, whilst not being so vague it loses value

Yes it’s radical but maybe it’s time to do this ... I like it as institution led
Feedback on model 2 (moderate change)  

I like it. Helpful to incorporate ESG and for that not to be at the expense of UK expectations.

I actually appreciate the detail/congruence of the ESG with UK standards, and ironically, post-Brexit, that we see a use for European standards.

NO! I don’t need the ESG as another framework to grapple with. Mapping to the ESG elsewhere is all that is required.

Some of the outcomes are ambitious but can be good to raise aspirations.

Needs lots of examples to support any implication.

If the ESG Voluntary Recognition Review becomes popular model 3 will still allow us all to work to the same quality code.
Feedback on model 3 (radical change) 49 Answers

Not sure if it’s inspired or madness. Kind of like it

I like the fact this represents clearer blue water between past and now

Thorough and easy to follow and map

I love the integration of quality and standards

Need to understand ESG changes and soon

Model 3 is really helpful, but I wonder about its usability for a wider audience. Should the ESG mapping be underpinning information rather than top level?

What happens when the ESG changes? Are we at their mercy? Will we be required to change every time they change?

I like the alignment to the ESG, but would that be better in an additional mapping document to allow for future changes and accessibility?

Like the use of the word “outcomes”. Measure?
Feedback on model 3 (radical change) 49 Answers

Very busy, but does cover all current eventualities.

Useful to us in Wales to have the mapping to ESG and find it clearer than other models. Is ESG likely to change that much really?

I like the consideration of the ESG to keep everyone internationally focussed and comparable but yes would it be better as a map? Integration makes it longer, but clearer and more visible.

Prefer this one: feels like the best value model!

ESG changes may be quite radical. They are looking at values for example that are wider than now.

The outcomes focus is positive but it’s a rather overwhelming document. Mapping to ESG should be a separate reference document.

Could we possibly add ‘those who deliver learning’ as opposed to ‘teaching’?

I like having alignment to ESG, even if it changes. It is useful to show that we do align but the layout of the model is harder to understand.

Like it. Would prefer big change rather than tinkering. Lot of info tho.
### Feedback on model 3 (radical change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>49 Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easiest way to align to ESG. Like the UK Standards. Not sure about labelling those as outcomes though? Somewhat feels like a passing nod to the OfS regulation which I don’t think is fully necessary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I’d rather this model pulled us through and across to the UK wide notion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I like Model 3. Nice to make ESG more prominent (whilst not at the expense of UK requirements)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combination of model 2 and 3 would be helpful</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feel it’s a hostage to fortune to have the ESG fully integrated in the model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment with ESG helps to set the code in the wider context for colleagues. Agree, separate supporting reference document might be easier for updating and timing thereof.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link to the ESG useful for when working with overseas partners to help with demonstrating alignment as an English provider not really expected to look to anything but 8 Conditions.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I like this model, as it provides an international context. Plus providers outside England have to align with the ESG and it helps to have the QC and ESG in one document</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The terminology is more useful for discussion with senior managers - outcomes are more understandable.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback on model 3 (radical change)

49 Answers

I like the fact ESG is mapped here. It does feel quite heavy though, how it is displayed/provided will need to be given some thought.

I like how it’s mapped to ESG and I do prefer the use of ‘outcomes’

If we went for this model, would it take an awful lot of time to implement given it’s relatively radical – could the changes be staged so model 1 or 2 comes first

If we align to ESG more closely it may make this approach more difficult for the OFS to attack?

More alignment would help

Like but needs to not get too big/complex. Must be usable

No! I don’t need another framework. ESG should be mapped to separately

I like the fact it is raising ESG awareness by incorporating it into the document

Alignment to ESG may help us to reassure international partners.
Outcomes is helpful—allowing a variety of practices to achieve these outcomes?

Why are people asking for radical or major change to the quality code?

Strategically, foregrounding ESG could be helpful for UK providers looking to demonstrate to potential partners that the progs they develop share design parameters with European and related providers

Should the code be aligning with the ESG when the Quality Code is internationally recognised in its own right?

No

Could this help is also indicate alignment beyond Europe given that there are other more global qa approaches which have ESG as a touchstone?

Combination of 2 and 3. Like the succinctness of 2 but like the wider mapping with ESG in 3

Agree that a combination of 2 and 3 could be helpful

I like something you can actually say is the standard to adhere to with no messing. Sometimes it helps.
Feedback on model 3 (radical change)  

49 Answers

Once model 2 has all of the sector agreed principles in it will look like a substantial document. I’d like to see that as a starting point before thinking about adding anything further.

Inclusion of ESG could have strategic value for the sector. It could help evidence compatibility and make partnerships easier to establish, and thereby promote student mobility. So, prefer 3 or 2+

2 with more of an enhancement focus – or an explicit link to GEF

Like the mapping to ESG in 3 and wonder how far that gets us down the road to UK-ness in itself? Also like that change in terminology in 3. A combination 2–3 would also be much better than currently.
Do you have ideas for a hybrid, or a different model of your own?

What ever ends up must cover all the UK regions

Agree with the potential of having a more 2 inspired focus to the Code but perhaps an appendices which maps that code to the ESG clearly

I like the idea of 2 and 3 together – provides more guidance whilst still allowing flexibility

It could be easier to map as advice and guidance/ an appendix the ESG alignment to the Code which means it’s easier to update

2 and 3. Perhaps if 3 had a different layout? It seems too busy.

Without over engineering could we merge 2 and 3 and ensure we have sufficient emphasis onintelligent use of data in decisions on quality?

Module 2 and 3 combination would be helpful

Mix of 2 and 3 (as suggested).

Not every provider wants to map to the ESG. The quality code is used internationally and in some countries the ESG does not figure into their quality and standards
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ```version of model 2 and 3 - more 3 in layout/format bringing together the standards and quality rather than separate, but includes principles. Mapping to ESG and others (OfS etc) done in document.
 It would be useful to do the mapping exercises as part of the design of the code, even if they are not to be included in the final document for other considerations - eg. too busy.

Once model 2 has all the underpinning sector agreed principles it will look very substantial. I'd like to see what this looks like before considering further additions.``` |
| ```I definitely appreciate the sector-agreed principles; they're helpful, and I also appreciate alignment with a wider set of standards, such as ESG. Will there be sector-agreed principles for EA outcome?``` |
| ```I like something you can adhere to, to pin things too. Clear standards for us all with no confusion about the really key things.``` |
| ```Model 3: but not having separate documents/chapters for Advice and Guidance as in the current code. Everything in one document will be helpful.``` |
| ```Model 2 with some more focus on enhancement? Or explicit link to QEF``` |
| ```Combination of 2 and 3 but clearer to view and map.``` |
| ```It's difficult to provide high level model that encompasses different models (it might be worth thinking about tertiary education too) and its worth coming back to the main purpose of the code for all``` |
Do you have ideas for a hybrid, or a different model of your own?

Agree that outcomes is very metrics driven
Given the context of your institution and your role what model would you choose?
Section 2: Content for The Code
If we embedded "sector-led principles" into the core of The Code - what are your thoughts/concerns?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like sector-led, need refreshed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would want it to be really dynamic and continuously updated as we navigate changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The do we have to do them? What bits are essential is key and useful for external review to make reccs and point towards something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles may offer the opportunity to respond more flexibly to developments in the policy environment without a full review of the code e.g. could there be a principle on AI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’d welcome the through-line between bits of the Code, but agree they would need review as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like sector-led, it’s inclusive and highlights where the principles derive from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to be refreshed as the sector has moved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive thoughts about embedding sector principles. It adds value to the code and gives a reference point for those who want to cut quality corners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If we embedded "sector-led principles" into the core of The Code – what are your thoughts/concerns?

- If they are taken from the principles in the current A & G, are you confident these are sector-led in a 2023 context?
- Might we be asked what gives us The mandate to do this?
- I really like the sector-led principles – probably the most useful part of the Code. It needs to be clear that they are guidance and not prescriptive though.
- Clarity of terminology would be helpful = principles vs requirements?
- Al person – I meant Academic Integrity but incorporating the other Al!
- To be focussed more on the why we do than the what we do
- Students – and plenty of them – to be included in developing sector principles
- Only concern in England around how they would be highlighted as separate to ‘Sector Recognised Standards’
- To underpin ethos
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principles are helpful as they ‘flesh out’ the core practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would be really important to understand must haves/nice to haves – best practice vs baseline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector led, might help to promote buy in from colleagues. Particularly if they reflect (as they should) current context and priorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector-led is a good term, it would need to be clear what our commitment as institutions (as QAA members) is to uphold them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In England we don’t need to follow the quality code, just the OfS, but principles add value as to how we should do things</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the code being informed by sector led principles is fine, but folks do want a baseline of requirements and standards to adhere to, are these principles guidance or requirements?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplars and case studies would be fabulous, especially if organisations are willing to share how they embed change and bring the whole organisation along.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector led principles are useful reference to current practices but should be refreshed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see sector-led principles as being an accurate reflection of the sector-led ethos of the code as demonstrated by UKSCQA and QAA’s joint responsibility for the Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If we embedded "sector-led principles" into the core of The Code - what are your thoughts/concerns?

The challenge of a principle of being 'sector-led' is the vast array of different providers and ensuring all voices are heard.

Like the idea of using 'sector led principles' as a basis for collating case studies of best practice in each of those principles which could be shared online or through QAA events?

What I loved about the 'old Code' was the separate and clear commitment to Enhancement. Don't have a solution yet about how to best extricate it!

Is there any appetite from members to commit to implementing the Code in a way appropriate to them?

Agree Alisa, really need clarity for reviews

Maybe more guidance on robustness of RPL processes, which will be more important for LLE

In Scotland we have been developing principles on the student learning experience. These are based on what students have told us should be included. Would be good to consider how to align this

I'd be concerned we might attract more attention from Jacob Rees Mogg

what is aspirational in one institution may not be achievable in other institutions
If we embedded "sector-led principles" into the core of The Code – what are your thoughts/concerns?

If it becomes too aspirational, then it is easy to ignore as not appropriate in the OfS conditions race to a baseline.

Aspirational as in helping teaching colleagues to see reg/compliance as a tool to do what they love - not firefighting but innovating, enhancing, trying new things, collectively exploring.

Different providers will have different aspirations depending on size, ethos, context - so aspirations need to be realistic for 'average' Institution.

Definitely different types of partnerships including TNE
What is missing from the core practices or indeed the outcomes statements of model 3?

- We might need to be explicit references to metrics/data as evidence.
- Case studies would be supportive & useful.
- I really liked the separate Enhancement chapter of the 'old code' - haven't yet worked out how this would best be extricated in an updated one though!
- Model 3: ESG on teaching staff professional development much stronger than UK standard example. Maybe we should be stronger in some areas?
- Don’t know how this is best reflected in core practice but is there a need for something around managing quality in micro-credentials and modular qualifications?
- I would welcome an addition to the outcome about learning and development (5) to include integrity (in the broad sense), responsibility.....
- Better linkages between code, char statement, benchmarks etc helpful.
We've heard you want The Code to be "aspirational" and have an enhancement ethos. How aspirational should we be with the practices/outcomes?

- We could ask our students to review us against more aspirational lens?

- It used to be aspirational for new providers and helped them set policy and practice.

- What is the metric for aspirational and whether a HEI meets the aspiration? Who decides? Does it depend on the type of HEI (i.e., small, large, etc.)?

- Could be more aspirational with core stuff and allow 'working towards'.

- Shoot for the moon! Practices should reflect a vision for an institutional model of continuous enhancement.

- Important to remember the very different resource base of the HEIs - there's a world of difference between being aspirational at a Russell group Uni as opposed to a HE provision in a FE college.

- Differentiating between 'remedial' enhancement and 'reaching' enhancement (i.e., fixing a problem or excelling in an area of strength).

- We may need to be wary of quality burden as well as the art of the financially possible?

- I wonder if use of 'outcomes' makes this more challenging, as it maybe suggests you either have achieved them or you haven't. Whereas it should be about continuous enhancement and striving for more.
We've heard you want The Code to be "aspirational" and have an enhancement ethos. How aspirational should we be with the practices/outcomes?

- Can the use of principles allow individual providers to decide what its outcomes should be?
- Perhaps this is a way in which the code is presented. If we have baseline standards / requirements and then aspirations a bit like the separation of the old expectations and indications.
- Like the idea of 'working towards' as we've not all got the same objectives and resources required if setting a new baseline across all areas.
- There prob needs to be core stuff that’s clearly non-negotiable and then more aspirational aims.
- Establishing intention to enhance and continuing to enhance. This might be about process/governance more so than outcome (which would presumably be shifting?)
- Enhancement as continuous improvement (allows for more relativity!)
- Emphasise that detailed KPIs are a way to set aspirational goals - must be done by institutions.
- If the language to too aspirational, the it is easy to ignore in the English race to the OfS base line minimum.
- It might be nice to allow us to review where things haven't worked out so well and what our lessons learned might be as a result?
We've heard you want The Code to be "aspirational" and have an enhancement ethos. How aspirational should we be with the practices/outcomes?

32 Answers

There may not be an end point, it's rather a journey which engages academics and students in developing the next deliberate steps to deliver better outcomes (student outcomes and experience).

Sometimes meeting core stuff well and reviewing it regularly is enhancement.

It will be useful to provide some context on where aspirations would be more valuable.

The aspirational aspects should be to drive excellence and not as a tool to ‘punish’ small institutions or new provider.

Is it a difference between measuring 'where are we at' (Standard) then stating 'where do we want to go' (aspiration), what are we doing about it (enhancement) which can be evidenced at review.

We seem to come back to enhancement as a wrap-around principle.

Aspiration should be part of a culture, rather than be specific examples.

Might have to be more aspirational in order to get buy in in English HEIs that may be less invested in the code if it's close to what OfS is asking but just a bit different in some areas?

Practices shouldn't be a tick list and once you've done them you've 'completed' quality. They can be starters for conversation with students and staff.
We've heard you want The Code to be "aspirational" and have an enhancement ethos. How aspirational should we be with the practices/outcomes?

Encouraging and sharing examples of creative and innovative solutions, stories about the journey,... anything that reminds us that when humans are involved it won't necessarily be straightforward!

But trying and failing can be good

There is risk with enhancement, trying stuff out and failing

We can learn so much from failing!!
Advice and Guidance Parking Lot
Advice and Guidance Parking Lot
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- Working with more than one partner (i.e., another provider and an employer)
- Degree apprenticeships
- What about non-academic services or things that fall outside of the teaching and learning/curriculum space?
- Maybe it's time to think about the A&G about practical implementation - thinking through processes, legal implications, rather than what used to be the substance of 'Chapters' in previous codes
- Definitely something more focused on TNE - as there are different issues than U.K. partnerships.
- Artificial Intelligence (large language models) / Academic Integrity
- Work based learning and apprenticeships
- Following OfS’s release this morning definitely a focus on international partnerships, international students and transnational education would be very useful
- A reference to that excellent recent guidance. On international students ;-)
Advice and Guidance Parking Lot
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Consideration of all higher provision including recognised and non-recognised provision.

Validating bodies vary in the level of responsibility they take as an awarding body. Can we include guidance and advice to strengthen this area?

Maintaining quality through disruption (explaining on COVID guidance to cover industrial action and other ‘emergency’ situations)

WBL

Agree on support viewed as outside of teaching/learning (e.g. wellbeing)

Placements

Dual degree awards

Link all the stuff

Approaches to/needs of Partner Intellectual Property Partnership Programmes versus Home Intellectual Property Partnerships
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice and Guidance Parking Lot</th>
<th>32 Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second linking all the stuff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancements to improve student engagement in their academic experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reflective questions is critical within the advice and guidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNE, in particular partnerships with other degree-awarding bodies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the split on evaluation versus External Quality Review in Model 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing the whole picture together is vital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InternshipsBlended/online learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration would be very welcome. Can it be presented as web-based resource that links everything rather than the standalone PDFs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do we separate particular student groups out, or should we ensure the A&amp;G is designed to work for all students?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advice and Guidance Parking Lot
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- Bring back the rummy!
- Is it too mischievous to suggest an A&G document on how to conduct investigations?
- More interactive rather than downloadable (Snap as I type!)
- Duty of care
- I’d like to see the advice and guidance set out in a way that specific colleagues can access information in a way that they get what is really relevant and actionable for their role.....[complex!?!]
What next?

Dr Ailsa Crum, Director, Membership, Quality Enhancement and Standards
Next steps

- Sharing substantial update with the UK Standing Committee for Quality Assurance in June
- A worked up model of a proposed way forward for the Autumn committee
- Share a proposed timetable for reviewing and updating the advice and guidance across a 2-3 year period

Contact r.burchell@qaa.ac.uk if you are interested in contributing or learning more about the project