



Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers) of Chickenshed Theatre Trust

October 2017

Contents

About this review	1
Key findings.....	2
Judgements	2
Good practice.....	2
Recommendations	2
Affirmation of action being taken.....	2
About the provider	3
Explanation of findings.....	4
1 Judgement: The maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered on behalf of degree-awarding bodies and/or other awarding organisations	4
2 Judgement: The quality of student learning opportunities	14
3 Judgement: The quality of the information about learning opportunities.....	34
4 Judgement: The enhancement of student learning opportunities	37
Glossary	40

About this review

This is a report of a Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers) conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) at Chickenshed Theatre Trust. The review took place from 23 to 25 October 2017 and was conducted by a team of two reviewers, as follows:

- Mrs Fahmida Khan Rushdy
- Mr Howard White.

The main purpose of the review was to investigate the higher education provision and to make judgements as to whether or not academic standards and quality meet UK expectations. These expectations are the statements in the [UK Quality Code for Higher Education](#) (the Quality Code)¹ setting out what all UK higher education providers expect of themselves and of each other, and what the general public can therefore expect of them.

In Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers) the QAA review team:

- makes judgements on
 - the setting and maintenance of academic standards
 - the quality of student learning opportunities
 - the information provided about higher education provision
 - the enhancement of student learning opportunities
- makes recommendations
- identifies features of good practice
- affirms action that the provider is taking or plans to take.

The QAA website gives more information [about QAA](#)² and explains the method for [Higher Education Review \(Alternative Providers\)](#).³ For an explanation of terms see the glossary at the end of this report.

¹ The UK Quality Code for Higher Education is published at: www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code.

² QAA website: www.qaa.ac.uk.

³ Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers): www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews-and-reports/how-we-review-higher-education.

Key findings

Judgements

The QAA review team formed the following judgements about the higher education provision.

- The maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered on behalf of the degree-awarding body **meets** UK expectations.
- The quality of student learning opportunities is **commended**.
- The quality of the information about learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.
- The enhancement of student learning opportunities is **commended**.

Good practice

The QAA review team identified the following features of **good practice**:

- the proactive engagement of students in programme design (Expectation B1)
- the articulation of a pedagogy appropriate to the Trust's strategic aims and the characteristics of the student body (Expectation B3)
- the measures that enable students to overcome barriers to engagement with academic theory and writing (Expectation B3)
- the extensive feedback and dialogue with staff, which supports students' individual personal development (Expectation B3)
- the arrangements that facilitate transition into and progression through higher education, which promote student achievement (Expectation B4)
- the continuing, comprehensive and effective mechanisms for individual student support, which enable students to reach their potential (Expectation B4)
- the opportunities to learn through participation alongside professionals, which reinforces learning and promotes coherent transition into employment (Expectation B5, B3)
- the deliberate steps taken to engage students in enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, which promotes inclusive practice (Enhancement).

Recommendations

The QAA review team makes the following **recommendation**.

By March 2018:

- ensure that the Admissions Policy and programme specifications are published and accessible to applicants and other stakeholders (Expectation C).

Affirmation of action being taken

The QAA review team **affirms** the following actions already being taken to make academic standards secure and/or improve the educational provision offered to students:

- the steps being taken to improve clarity and transparency in governance arrangements (Expectation A2.1)
- the actions being taken in establishing an auditable process for the management of information (Expectation C).

About the provider

Chickenshed Theatre Trust (the Trust) was founded in 1974 and is a registered charity based at a purpose-built theatre at Southgate in North London. The Trust has provided higher education since 2005 and offers foundation degree and BA (Hons) top-up degree programmes in Inclusive Theatre.

The Trust takes its name from its first permanent location, which was donated by a local benefactor, and has a national and international reputation for inclusivity in theatre education. The Trust seeks to change lives by bringing young people from all social and economic backgrounds, cultures and abilities together to study alongside each other. It also uses the stage to celebrate diversity and performance as a vehicle to communicate with audiences and address topical social issues. The Trust has set up 22 theatre organisations throughout the UK, with inclusive activity in Russia and China and new theatre programmes in development in New York and Bristol.

The Trust has 165 students and 90 of these are undertaking higher education programmes. There are 26 academic staff; 21 of these are full-time and five are part-time members of staff. Seventy-five per cent of the Trust's professional artistic/education delivery staff under the age of 30 are graduates of the Trust's programmes and a significant proportion of staff are industry professionals.

The Trust underwent Review for Specific Course Designation in 2015 and afterwards finalised the Strategic and Business Plan, which is currently in the second year of operation. This generated a number of operational plans, which have developed organisational capability and have had a direct, positive impact on the breadth and depth of the higher education offer. Students make a significant contribution to the professional performance work of Chickenshed and at least 50 per cent of students/alumni are engaged in artistic professional projects. This has resulted in improvements in achievement and engagement, which have been fed back into enhancement. The Trust was one of six alternative providers who had suitable metrics for full TEF assessment in 2017, and received a silver award.

There are a number of key challenges faced by the Trust, which are being addressed through identifying strategic aims and objectives and managing change. The first of these relates to removing areas of financial exclusion, which impacts upon the widening participation agenda of the Trust and involves limiting programme fees, awarding a Future Professionals bursary to each student, and Inclusive Support bursary to those students whose Disabled Student Allowance is not accurate or adequate to meet their needs. The second challenge relates to the increasing number of students who require support with mental health, medical support or disadvantage needs and the subsequent increase in funding required, which is achieved through careful financial planning and fundraising activities.

The Trust has a longstanding partnership with one awarding body, Middlesex University, and delivers foundation and BA (Hons) top-up degrees in Inclusive Performance on its behalf.

In the Review for Specific Course Designation in 2015, the review team identified three areas of good practice and eight recommendations, six of which were advisable and two desirable. The findings of these were summarised in an action plan completed by the Trust and this was subject to a QAA annual monitoring visit in March 2016, which recorded a judgement of acceptable progress. The Trust has responded effectively to the recommendations of the review and the areas of good practice have been built upon.

Explanation of findings

This section explains the review findings in greater detail.

1 Judgement: The maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered on behalf of degree-awarding bodies and/or other awarding organisations

Expectation (A1): In order to secure threshold academic standards, degree-awarding bodies:

a) ensure that the requirements of *The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ)* are met by:

- **positioning their qualifications at the appropriate level of the relevant framework for higher education qualifications**
- **ensuring that programme learning outcomes align with the relevant qualification descriptor in the relevant framework for higher education qualifications**
- **naming qualifications in accordance with the titling conventions specified in the frameworks for higher education qualifications**
- **awarding qualifications to mark the achievement of positively defined programme learning outcomes**

b) consider and take account of QAA's guidance on qualification characteristics

c) where they award UK credit, assign credit values and design programmes that align with the specifications of the relevant national credit framework

d) consider and take account of relevant Subject Benchmark Statements.

Quality Code, Chapter A1: UK and European Reference Points for Academic Standards

Findings

1.1 The Education Division of the Chickenshed Theatre Trust delivers foundation and BA (Hons) top-up degree programmes in Inclusive Theatre validated by Middlesex University (the awarding body). They are due for revalidation in 2018.

1.2 Although the programmes are designed by the Trust, the awarding body is responsible for ensuring that they have positively defined learning outcomes which are set at the correct level of *The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ)* and reflect the Foundation Degree Qualification Benchmark and the Subject Benchmark Statement for Dance, Drama and Performance. Procedures to ensure this are set out in the University's Learning and Quality Enhancement Handbook and its legally binding Memorandum of Cooperation with the Trust.

1.3 A Link Tutor, appointed by the University from among its own staff, is required to confirm each year that the programmes are being delivered in accordance with the agreement reached at validation. An external examiner, also appointed by the University,

is required to confirm each year that standards have been set at the appropriate level.

1.4 These arrangements enable the Expectation to be met. To test their operation, the team looked at relevant documents and spoke to the University Link Tutor and senior members of staff at the Trust.

1.5 The QAA responsibilities checklist completed by the Trust confirms that it understands its responsibilities under the partnership agreement. The review team noted that the Trust's Higher Education Quality Assurance and Enhancement Framework document establishes the principle that the FHEQ and the benchmarks should be used in programme development.

1.6 The review team noted that the Trust had participated in the recent consultation on the revision of the Subject Benchmark Statement and has set out to help students to use the benchmarks to advance their personal development. The benchmarks are drawn to the attention of students through the inclusion of the programme specifications in their handbooks.

1.7 The team found no concerns about alignment with external reference points in recent external examiners' reports or in the University's responses to the Trust's annual monitoring reports.

1.8 Noting the Trust's awareness of its responsibilities, its active engagement with the benchmark statements, and the endorsement of the University and its external examiners, the review team concluded that the Expectation is met and the risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A2.1): In order to secure their academic standards, degree-awarding bodies establish transparent and comprehensive academic frameworks and regulations to govern how they award academic credit and qualifications.

Quality Code, Chapter A2: Degree-Awarding Bodies' Reference Points for Academic Standards

Findings

1.9 Credit and qualifications for the Trust's higher education provision are awarded by the University under academic frameworks and regulations approved by its Academic Board.

1.10 Operational oversight of the partnership rests with the University's School of Arts and Education, in collaboration with its Centre for Academic Partnerships. In practice, it is exercised by the Deputy Dean of the School and the University Link Tutor.

1.11 A Link Tutor is also designated at the Trust, who is jointly responsible for the programmes; this role is filled by Trust's Director of Education and Training.

1.12 The University's regulations establish procedures for the maintenance of standards. They include assessment and progression decision making; rules governing credit and award classification; the marking scheme and policies on aspects of assessment, including recognition of prior learning; extenuating circumstances; misconduct and appeals. Assessment decisions are made by Exam Boards chaired by the University Link Tutor.

1.13 The Memorandum of Cooperation requires the Trust to implement these regulations and the University checks their observance through annual monitoring and reports submitted by its external examiners.

1.14 These arrangements enable the Expectation to be met. To test their operation, the review team looked at relevant documents and spoke to the University Link Tutor and members of staff at the Trust.

1.15 At the Trust, formal responsibility for a programme rests with a Board of Studies chaired by the Programme Leader and attended by both Link Tutors as well as representatives of staff and students.

1.16 Guidance on implementing the University's assessment procedures is set out in an Assessment Feedback and Academic Integrity Framework document, which is made available to staff and students.

1.17 Delivery is managed by the Education Division Committee, which is chaired by the Director of Education and Training and attended by the Programme Leaders. The Education Division answers, with other divisions, to a joint Management Board. Ultimate authority is exercised by an Executive Board and a Board of Trustees.

1.18 Following a Strategic Review in 2015, the Board of Trustees decided to appoint additional members to improve its capacity for guidance and oversight of the educational provision. At the time of the review visit a search for suitable candidates was underway.

1.19 The team found that Boards of Study and Exam Boards are constituted and conduct their business as specified in the University's regulations. The University's Link Tutor attends regularly, ensuring close cooperation. Teaching and support staff met by the team displayed good knowledge of the University's assessment procedures. No concerns relating to awards

are identified in recent external examiners' reports or in the University's responses to the Trust's annual monitoring reports.

1.20 The Trust acknowledges that its arrangements remain relatively informal, defending this by reference to the scale of provision and its ethos of inclusivity. The review team was told that the Trust values personal communication and is seeking to formalise arrangements only where this is essential, as formality can exclude people. The review team found these arguments persuasive. It noted that although meetings of the Executive Board are not minuted, three of its five members are directly involved in the planning and delivery of higher education, and the review team was told that it considers the role of higher education in the broader strategy of the Trust.

1.21 Downward information flows are mainly informal, but minutes of Education Division meetings are sent to staff electronically and placed on the intranet. Many of the younger members of staff are former students of the Trust and the team noted awareness of succession planning, which should assure continuity.

1.22 The review team noted that in response to recommendations made in the previous QAA review in 2015 the Trust had taken action to enhance oversight of higher education by streamlining its committee structure and improving the records of meetings. The review team was shown minutes of the Education Division, which record deliberation on delivery, student progress and quality management, and minutes of the Management Board including fortnightly reports from the Division on higher education. The review team therefore **affirms** the steps being taken to improve clarity and transparency in governance arrangements.

1.23 The review team concluded that the Trust observes the frameworks and regulations of the awarding body. In the light of continuing action to improve its governance arrangements, and the ultimate responsibility of the University for standards, it concluded that the Expectation is met and the risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A2.2): Degree-awarding bodies maintain a definitive record of each programme and qualification that they approve (and of subsequent changes to it) which constitutes the reference point for delivery and assessment of the programme, its monitoring and review, and for the provision of records of study to students and alumni.

Quality Code, Chapter A2: Degree-Awarding Bodies' Reference Points for Academic Standards

Findings

1.24 Definitive records of the Trust's higher education provision are established in the form of programme specifications at validation and reapproved annually by the University. The University is also responsible for certifying achievement and verifying diploma supplements produced by the Trust.

1.25 These arrangements enable the Expectation to be met. To test their operation, the team looked at relevant documents and spoke to senior members of staff at the Trust.

1.26 The programme specifications, on the University's template, are reproduced in the student programme handbooks. The review team noted that they identify the relevant Subject Benchmark Statements, establish where the programmes sit in relation to the FHEQ, define their learning outcomes, and explain how teaching and assessment enables students to meet them. In addition, they set out admission criteria and establish that the University's assessment regulations apply. The specifications are supplemented by narratives that set out the syllabus, learning outcomes and assessment details for individual modules.

1.27 The team was also shown examples of certificates and diploma supplements and noted that they correctly identified the award and the awarding body.

1.28 The programme specifications do not appear on the Trust's website and a recommendation to ensure that they are published and accessible is made in Expectation C of this report. Nonetheless, as programme specifications exist and ultimate responsibility rests with the awarding body, the team concluded that the Expectation is met and the risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A3.1): Degree-awarding bodies establish and consistently implement processes for the approval of taught programmes and research degrees that ensure that academic standards are set at a level which meets the UK threshold standard for the qualification and are in accordance with their own academic frameworks and regulations.

Quality Code, *Chapter A3: Securing Academic Standards and an Outcomes-Based Approach to Academic Awards*

Findings

1.29 The Trust designs its own programmes, which are validated by the University. The Higher Education Quality Assurance Framework outlines the principles for programme design and development and the Director of Education and Training has oversight of programme planning and design.

1.30 Programme specifications and module learning outcomes are set at the correct level of the FHEQ, reflecting the Foundation Degree Qualification Benchmark and relevant external Subject Benchmark Statements in line with the University's regulations.

1.31 These arrangements enable the Expectation to be met. The review team scrutinised relevant documentation and details were discussed in meetings with staff, external partners, the representative from the awarding body, and students.

1.32 The Trust consults and engages staff, students and external partners for potential input and adaptations to programme design. The Trust has also taken an active role in empowering students to take a proactive voice in inclusion and participation, which has led to the redevelopment of the foundation degree.

1.33 Proposed programme specifications have been designed in line with University regulations to be presented at the upcoming revalidation event. The proposals will be presented to the Trust's Higher Education Management meeting for scrutiny prior to submission to the revalidation event.

1.34 The Trust works closely with the awarding body to ensure that academic standards meet the UK threshold standards, enabling programme design and approval processes to be in accordance with appropriate academic frameworks and regulations. The team concludes that the Expectation is met and the risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A3.2): Degree-awarding bodies ensure that credit and qualifications are awarded only where:

- **the achievement of relevant learning outcomes (module learning outcomes in the case of credit and programme outcomes in the case of qualifications) has been demonstrated through assessment**
- **both UK threshold standards and their own academic standards have been satisfied.**

Quality Code, Chapter A3: Securing Academic Standards and an Outcomes-Based Approach to Academic Awards

Findings

1.35 The Trust has adopted the University's regulations on assessment, which are incorporated in the Assessment Feedback and Academic Integrity Framework. This provides clear, accurate, accessible information and guidelines to all staff and students on assessment design, moderation, feedback, reasonable adjustments and academic integrity.

1.36 The University sets the programme structure, learning outcomes and assessment criteria. The responsibility for assessments lies with the Trust. Assessments are designed and conducted at the Trust. Assessments are produced by programme module teams reporting to the Director of Education and Training. This process is coordinated by the module leader to ensure that assessments are equitable.

1.37 These arrangements enable the Expectation to be met. The review team scrutinised relevant documentation including programme and module specifications, external examiner reports, assignment briefs, and awarding body guidelines. Details were discussed in meetings with staff, the representative from the awarding body and students.

1.38 Assessment decisions are made at formal assessment boards. Finalist assessment boards are chaired by a representative of the University and attended by an external examiner to assure standards.

1.39 External examiner reports have positive comments that confirm qualifications awarded are based on achievement of relevant learning outcomes and that UK threshold standards set by the awarding organisation are being met.

1.40 The team concludes that the achievement of relevant learning outcomes has been demonstrated through assessment. The Expectation is met and the risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A3.3): Degree-awarding bodies ensure that processes for the monitoring and review of programmes are implemented which explicitly address whether the UK threshold academic standards are achieved and whether the academic standards required by the individual degree-awarding body are being maintained.

Quality Code, Chapter A3: Securing Academic Standards and an Outcomes-Based Approach to Academic Awards

Findings

1.41 The Trust undertakes annual programme monitoring and review in accordance with the University's learning and quality enhancement procedures. The Trust submits an Annual Monitoring Report to the University to ensure that academic standards are met. External examiner reports are positive and confirm that academic standards are being met.

1.42 Annual monitoring and review processes are reviewed annually in consultation with the University. The Director of Education and Training has overall responsibility for the process. The Trust's programmes are validated for six years and will be subject to review in accordance to the University's Validation and Review Procedures in 2018.

1.43 These arrangements enable the Expectation to be met. The review team scrutinised relevant documentation including Annual Monitoring Reports, external examiner reports, awarding body guidelines, policies and procedures, and details were discussed in meetings with staff, the representative from the awarding body, and students.

1.44 The Annual Monitoring Report is prepared jointly by the Director of Education and Training and the Higher Education Programme Manager. Information on student achievement, retention, recruitment and progression is collected from Information, Advice and Guidance staff and tutors. Information related to teaching, learning, assessment, engagement and enhancement developments is collated by the Higher Education Programme Manager to be included in the monitoring report. Recommendations from external examiner reports are also included in the report.

1.45 The review team noted that Annual Monitoring Reports are not discussed as a single document in any formal meeting. Staff acknowledged that relevant issues such as programme design are discussed in meetings with appropriate staff. As noted in Expectation A2.1, the Trust acknowledges that its arrangements remain relatively informal and is seeking to formalise arrangements.

1.46 The Trust ensures that processes for monitoring and review of programmes are implemented and that academic standards required by the awarding body are being maintained.

1.47 The team concludes that the Expectation is met and the risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A3.4): In order to be transparent and publicly accountable, degree-awarding bodies use external and independent expertise at key stages of setting and maintaining academic standards to advise on whether:

- **UK threshold academic standards are set, delivered and achieved**
- **the academic standards of the degree-awarding body are appropriately set and maintained.**

Quality Code, Chapter A3: Securing Academic Standards and an Outcomes-Based Approach to Academic Awards

Findings

1.48 The Higher Education Quality Assurance and Enhancement Framework establishes principles for programme design which include consultation with external stakeholders and employers. The Trust engages extensively with programme teams at the University, external examiners, prospective students and potential employers. This ensures that input into programme design and development is clear, targeted and focused on the Quality Code and other external benchmarks. The appointment of an Artistic Director who has academic and current professional experience is a further initiative to engage external expertise.

1.49 These arrangements enable the Expectation to be met. The review team considered a range of documents, and understanding of the role of externality was explored in meetings with staff, students, external partners and the representative from the awarding body.

1.50 The Trust uses both internal and external review opportunities to analyse and, where necessary, update assessment policy and practice to keep abreast of changes in aspects of higher education development. The Trust has developed a portfolio of partnerships with schools, public sector organisations, theatre and arts organisations and corporate businesses. The Trust engages professional playwrights and actors to work collaboratively with students.

1.51 The Trust has developed an external 'Professional Partners' scheme which enables alumni to act as paid practitioners to advise and develop the skills, knowledge and experience of existing students. The Trust's external partners are an important source of externality for programme design and development. Staff have attended conference events related to employability, business links to education and safeguarding, which feed into the ongoing programme revalidation process.

1.52 The Trust also has many sponsors, including professionals and artists. The Trust strives to create opportunities to calibrate the achievements of its students and gain access to a wide range of external expertise. Staff and students have delivered inclusive practice training and development events to universities, businesses and external institutions.

1.53 Staff are committed to using external measures and contexts of practice development, including the Higher Education Academy Associate Fellowship process and the UK Professional Skills Framework (UKPSF).

1.54 The Trust has an ongoing commitment to engage external and independent expertise for setting and maintaining standards. The team concludes that the Expectation is met and the risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

The maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered on behalf of degree-awarding bodies and/or other awarding organisations: Summary of findings

1.55 In determining its judgement on the setting and maintenance of academic standards of awards at the Trust, the review team considered the findings against the criteria as outlined in Annex 2 of the published handbook. All Expectations in this area are met and the level of risk is considered low. There is an affirmation in this section which relates to the steps being taken to improve the clarity and transparency of governance arrangements.

1.56 The approach to maintaining academic standards at the Trust is defined by the degree-awarding body. The Trust uses the established University academic frameworks, regulations and procedures. Programmes are designed by the Trust, and the awarding body is responsible for ensuring that they have learning outcomes that are set at the correct level of the FHEQ and reflect the Foundation Degree Qualification Benchmark and the Subject Benchmark Statement for Dance, Drama and Performance.

1.57 Staff are familiar with the responsibilities that are assigned to the Trust with regard to academic standards, and there is significant external engagement through external partners and employers. There is oversight of standards through the awarding body and through the use of external examiners.

1.58 The review team concludes that the maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered on behalf of the degree-awarding body at the provider **meets** UK expectations.

2 Judgement: The quality of student learning opportunities

Expectation (B1): Higher education providers, in discharging their responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, operate effective processes for the design, development and approval of programmes.

Quality Code, Chapter B1: Programme Design, Development and Approval

Findings

2.1 The Trust designs its own programmes, which are validated by Middlesex University. The Trust offers foundation and BA (Hons) top-up degree programmes in Inclusive Theatre and all programmes have been validated until 2018.

2.2 The Higher Education Quality Assurance Framework outlines principles for programme design and development. The Trust has taken an active role in empowering students to take a proactive voice in inclusion and participation, which has led to the redevelopment of the foundation degree and engagement in programme design. The Trust consults and engages staff, students and external partners for potential input and modifications to programme design. The Director of Education and Training has oversight of programme planning and design.

2.3 Programme specifications and module learning outcomes are set at the correct level of the FHEQ, reflecting the Foundation Degree Qualification Benchmark and relevant external Subject Benchmark Statements in line with the University's regulations.

2.4 These arrangements enable the Expectation to be met. The review team considered the effectiveness of design and approval of programmes and modules through the scrutiny of relevant documents, and details were discussed in meetings with staff, external partners, the representative from the awarding body and students.

2.5 The Trust has internal programme design processes to enable students to adapt and organise flexibly in the way that higher education experiences are structured and organised. Discussions with staff and students concerning programme design are represented in the Student Experience Group. Students are consulted on their interpretation and understanding of the Foundation Degree Qualification Benchmark by reflecting upon their own practices and learning experiences.

2.6 Programme review processes and consultation meetings ensure that programmes are redesigned to address student needs and enhance learning. The Trust is committed to making the process of programme design a more granular process through staff and student engagement.

2.7 The Trust has redesigned the foundation degree programme to include a dedicated module focusing on practical development. The Trust has also developed a module to encompass knowledge and skills in two parallel inclusive theatre development areas - Children's Theatre and Outreach and Home Education Network Projects. The review of the foundation degree involved extensive consultation with staff, students and external expertise and has resulted in rationalising the course structure from 12 to six modules.

2.8 In addition, the Trust is piloting an employability module to be fully developed and added to the BA degree programme, which is an initiative arising from student representation and consultation with staff and external partners. The Trust is engaging

student representation to develop an outreach experience to transition from a student engagement experience to a fully accredited module. The team found the proactive engagement of students in programme design to be a feature of **good practice**.

2.9 Proposed programme specifications have been designed in line with University regulations to be presented at the upcoming revalidation event, and the proposals will be presented to the Higher Education Management meeting for scrutiny prior to submission to the University's revalidation event.

2.10 The Trust works closely with the awarding body to ensure that academic standards meet the UK threshold standards, enabling the programme design and approval process to be in accordance with appropriate academic frameworks and regulations. The review team therefore concludes that the Expectation is met and the risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B2): Recruitment, selection and admission policies and procedures adhere to the principles of fair admission. They are transparent, reliable, valid, inclusive and underpinned by appropriate organisational structures and processes. They support higher education providers in the selection of students who are able to complete their programme.

Quality Code, Chapter B2: Recruitment, Selection and Admission to Higher Education

Findings

2.11 Under the terms of the Memorandum of Cooperation, the Trust has responsibility for the admission of students on the basis of procedures and criteria agreed with the University. These are set out in an Admissions Policy which establishes guiding principles for fair admission on the basis of achievement or potential achievement against entry criteria.

2.12 Applicants complete a form and are encouraged to attend an open event. Interviews are normally conducted by at least two members of staff, who are given guidance on what to discuss and who are required to complete a record.

2.13 Decisions must be recorded in writing on the application form. Unsuccessful applicants have the right to ask for feedback and to request a review of the decision if they have new information to provide. Recognition of prior learning must be approved by the University as the awarding body.

2.14 Information for applicants is provided through the Trust's website, prospectus booklets and flyers. These identify the awarding body and provide information on the level and structure of the programmes, as well as support for students and career progression opportunities. They establish the current tuition fees and additional costs and also make clear that applicants must undergo a check by the Disclosure and Barring Service because they will work with children and/or vulnerable adults. The website establishes that the Trust is unable to sponsor applicants who would require a Tier 4 UK visa. It also contains details of support available, which currently includes a hardship fund and the offer of a bursary to all applicants.

2.15 These arrangements enable the Expectation to be met. To test their operation, the review team looked at relevant documents and spoke to members of staff and students at the Trust.

2.16 Inclusivity is central to the Trust's mission, and the team found its admissions publicity and processes to be strongly focused on widening the participation of students with protected characteristics and from areas of disadvantage. Half of those admitted in recent years have been eligible to receive a Disabled Student's Allowance.

2.17 The application form foregrounds disclosure of disabilities and admissions staff are briefed to discuss individual needs during the admissions process. The Trust has an Accreditation of Prior Learning and Experience Policy and welcomes applications from those who do not have formal level 3 qualifications but can demonstrate aptitude and relevant experience, although no applications for recognition of prior learning have been made in recent years.

2.18 In practice, the Trust's recruitment is largely internal; most of its level 3 Extended Diploma students progress to the foundation degree and most of the foundation degree students to the BA (Hons) top-up year. In order to facilitate transition into and between its programmes, the Trust promotes cross-cohort activity inside and outside the learning space.

To develop this, particularly for students recruited externally, it has piloted summer 'pre-induction days' for applicants who have accepted offers. This is identified as good practice in Expectation B4 of this report.

2.19 The team found the rates of progression and completion at the Trust to be impressive. Students are uniformly positive about their experience of admission and about the pre-induction days in particular. They told the review team that they had instantly felt welcome and engaged, as well as fully informed about the programme they wished to join.

2.20 The Admissions Policy does not appear on the Trust's website and a recommendation to ensure that it is published and accessible is made in Expectation C of this report. Despite this, the team concluded that the Trust demonstrates a sustained commitment to fairness and inclusivity in admissions and admits students who can succeed. The Expectation is met and the risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B3): Higher education providers, working with their staff, students and other stakeholders, articulate and systematically review and enhance the provision of learning opportunities and teaching practices, so that every student is enabled to develop as an independent learner, study their chosen subject(s) in depth and enhance their capacity for analytical, critical and creative thinking.

Quality Code, *Chapter B3: Learning and Teaching*

Findings

2.21 The draft Higher Education Development Plan and the Higher Education Inclusive Learning, Teaching and Support Framework document articulate a strategic vision of teaching at the Trust and of the competencies that it aims to develop in its students. Learning is presented as a partnership requiring student engagement and involving the empowerment of students to gain autonomy as learners and become professionals. Teaching is organised by the Director of Education and Training, supported by a Higher Education Programme Manager and programme leaders.

2.22 The University, as the awarding body, monitors the appointment and development of staff to ensure that they are competent to teach. Most are professional practitioners in the performing arts and a high proportion are graduates of the Trust. Staff undergo annual appraisal and are observed teaching twice a year.

2.23 The Trust's Higher Education Staff Teaching, Team Teaching Framework document establishes a policy for staff development. Staff are encouraged to become associate fellows of the Higher Education Academy (HEA) and to use the UKPSF to manage their personal development. They are also encouraged to access external training, including in other divisions of the Trust, and are released from teaching to do so. Current and potential managers are released for leadership training.

2.24 The Trust asserts that it offers students a unique opportunity to learn and perform in a working theatre. Most learning is work-based, with students specialising in one or two disciplines of performance or production but working together in core modules as members of the cast of a real or simulated production. Core academic skills and personal development planning are delivered through the curriculum. Each student cohort also has one or more Year Tutors who are responsible for monitoring and guiding individual progress.

2.25 These arrangements enable the Expectation to be met. To test their operation, the review team looked at relevant documents and spoke to members of staff and students at the Trust.

2.26 The Trust's programmes in inclusive performance are unique in both their aims and their inclusivity. Several students told the team that they would not have been able to access higher education in the performing arts anywhere else, because of perceived disabilities or personal problems.

2.27 The programmes are grounded in a distinctive pedagogy described as 'practice as research', which is derived from Gardner's theory of 'multiple intelligences' and Kolb's theory of 'learning cycles'. Students are taught through practical exercises to understand how they and others learn, to articulate and reflect on their experiences, and to relate practice to theory. 'Milestones' are established in each module to enable students to meet learning outcomes in stages.

2.28 Staff demonstrated how they helped students with academic writing: starting with the concept of recording in a variety of formats, then working to articulate questions and gradually building up to essay plans and essays. The measures that enable students to overcome barriers to engagement with academic theory and writing are a feature of **good practice** at the Trust.

2.29 The Trust adopts an approach to delivery based on group exercises taught by teams of staff. The presence of three or four members of staff in every session enables students to be closely monitored and supported; ensures that individual achievement in group activity is captured; enables staff to model professional behaviour including teamwork; and allows more experienced staff to pass on knowledge and skills to colleagues. This approach is set out in an Inclusive Team Teaching Policy document. To this is added the practice of occasionally mixing students from different cohorts, and also alumni, to facilitate transition and model personal development.

2.30 The Trust's approach is explained to students in their programme handbooks and a booklet on Inclusive Monitoring and Assessment. Students are encouraged to reflect on these, and the review team was impressed by records of exercises entitled 'Create your own Learning Cycle' and 'What is Chickenshed's Method?' which show students gaining insight into learning and career options. The articulation of a pedagogy appropriate to the Trust's strategic aims and the characteristics of the student body is a feature of **good practice**.

2.31 The Trust also adopts a team approach towards monitoring and encouraging student progress. In addition to the Year Tutors who have primary responsibility, there are designated subject and project tutors, supported by teams of support/mentor staff. Student progress is reviewed at frequent meetings of the Higher Education Management team and of the Education Division. The review team noted the close engagement of senior higher education staff in this.

2.32 Students receive individual feedback on their modules and overall progress. As well as paper records, an electronic trail of interaction with each individual is maintained. It is intended to transfer this to the virtual learning environment (VLE) to make it easier for both staff and the students to access.

2.33 Students are enabled to plan their development through core modules in each programme. In the BA (Hons) top-up degree a 'patch' process prompts them to reflect on their personal style of delivery or performance and identify goals and methods for improvement. Students told the team that they found feedback on their learning helpful and also cited instances of receiving unscheduled, unsolicited feedback. Examples of feedback seen by the team were personal, supportive and very clear on strengths and weaknesses. The extensive feedback and dialogue with staff, which supports students' individual personal development, is a feature of **good practice** at the Trust.

2.34 A particular feature of higher education at the Trust is the wide range of professional extracurricular activities open to students, at the Trust itself and at organisations with which it has established links through its 'Outreach' work to celebrate diversity and promote change. Seventy per cent of students currently engage in these and the Trust plans to make it compulsory in both programmes. To this end, a more formal 'Professional Partners' scheme is being developed.

2.35 The review team learned that the Trust's artistic programme was explicitly designed to provide outreach opportunities and to feed more generally into the higher education curriculum. The professional Christmas show is developed with student input and staff told the team that there was frequent direct contact with students regarding this. The opportunities to learn through participation alongside professionals, which reinforces learning

and promotes coherent transition into employment, are identified in Expectation B5 of this report as a feature of **good practice** at the Trust.

2.36 The review team noted that relatively few staff have formal teaching qualifications but established that all are experienced professionals. Strengthening the staff base had been identified as a priority in the 2015 Strategic Review, and the team met several teachers who are working towards HEA fellowship and/or accreditation by the Dyslexia Guild. Teachers met by the team have a clear understanding of the general characteristics and requirements of higher education in the performing arts as well as the Chickenshed method. The review team saw detailed records of staff appraisal and individual teaching observations, noting that the Trust also conducted collective observation of teaching teams. Staff find these processes supportive but place more value on their continuous informal interaction as teams of teachers and as teams of professionals engaged in the other activities of the Trust. The review team was shown a list of nine training sessions put on for teaching staff in the previous year. All staff met by the team had participated in some form of professional development.

2.37 The review team noted high praise for teaching in the Trust's external examiner reports. Students met by the team were also extremely positive, echoing views recorded in the minutes of student meetings and the National Student Survey. Students told the team that staff had explained higher education to them in a way they found easy to understand and students who had participated in 'Outreach' activities felt strongly that they had learned a great deal.

2.38 Noting evidence of good practice in teaching and high levels of student satisfaction, the team concluded that the Expectation is met and the risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B4): Higher education providers have in place, monitor and evaluate arrangements and resources which enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential.

Quality Code, Chapter B4: Enabling Student Development and Achievement

Findings

2.39 In keeping with its mission to promote and model inclusion, the Trust promises support and mentoring to all its students irrespective of perceived 'disability' or 'special educational need'. This is articulated on the Trust's website and in its Higher Education Inclusive Learning, Teaching and Support Framework document.

2.40 Support in the learning space is delivered by performance professionals. This is backed up by administrative staff in the Information, Advice and Guidance Team and by a medical support worker and a counsellor. Individual requirements are assessed on admission.

2.41 The Trust aims to operate as a social enterprise and develop a surplus from its activities, and as a registered charity it has been able to raise funds to provide financial and other assistance to its students. It has recently created an in-house counselling and medical support service providing drop-in or continuing support one day a week.

2.42 Careers advice is provided in-house by the Trust's staff, most of whom are performance professionals. Students are made aware of the support available through the website, their programme handbooks and a Student Experience, Support Services and Communication booklet.

2.43 The Trust promises its students a unique opportunity to learn and perform in a working theatre where they can engage with professional performing and backstage staff. The main theatre space is fully equipped and is used for professional productions. It is complemented by a range of indoor and outdoor drama and studio spaces, a music and video editing suite, and a small library/learning resources area.

2.44 These arrangements enable the Expectation to be met. To test their operation, the team looked at relevant documents and spoke to members of staff and students at the Trust.

2.45 The Trust aims to support all of its students and as a matter of principle does not distinguish those with 'special educational needs'. Support staff meet fortnightly to review the progress and needs of every individual. The Trust has a distinctive approach to support in the learning space, which is delivered by 'support/mentor teams' guided by the Higher Education Inclusive Learning, Teaching and Support Framework document and a set of Inclusive Support/Mentor staff guidelines.

2.46 The review team noted that support staff attend Education Division meetings, and saw evidence of effective liaison with the Year Tutors who monitor academic progress. The review team established that support staff engage in training appropriate to their roles and evaluate their performance by reference to usage, outcomes and student feedback.

2.47 Students told the review team that staff create a caring environment and that they always felt supported. Several described the Trust as 'feeling like a family'. They valued the counselling service and gave examples of staff going out of their way to help individuals with personal difficulties. These views are also reflected in internal and external student surveys. The team found the continuing, comprehensive and effective mechanisms for individual

student support, which enable students to reach their potential, to be a feature of **good practice** at the Trust.

2.48 The Trust puts great effort into supporting transition into and through higher education, using cross-cohort activities in the learning space to facilitate role modelling and peer support. In 2017-18 it is piloting a peer mentor scheme, which staff believe is working well. Both initiatives extend to level 3 students, to ease their path into higher education.

2.49 The Trust has also introduced summer 'pre-induction days' for applicants who have accepted offers and engages current students and alumni in their delivery. Students consider them highly successful. The Trust has a high level of engagement with its alumni, which it is seeking to develop further in order to support transition into employment.

2.50 The Trust offers students a wide range of opportunities to join its professionals in 'Outreach' work, including workshops and performances, which also gives them access to an extensive network of informal partner organisations in business, education, the performing arts and public services. This helps them to develop transferable skills and to understand the range of careers open to them. The review team met a number of alumni who had gained employment this way and also spoke to representatives of informal partners who are keen to support the Trust's work. The team also learned of other successful journeys into employment by students who might have struggled at another institution.

2.51 Students with complex needs are supported to take part in 'Inreach' activities which take place for external audiences on site. Relevant staff meet to plan students' participation in these activities. Alumni and representatives of informal partner organisations told the review team that Chickenshed graduates are versatile, confident and well prepared for employment, although the Trust acknowledges that it could do more to promote entrepreneurship. As part of its mission, the Trust also sets out to change the mindsets of employers. The review team found the arrangements that facilitate transition into and progression through higher education, which promote student achievement, to be a feature of **good practice** at the Trust.

2.52 Core academic skills and personal development planning are delivered through the curriculum and are described in Expectation B3 of this report.

2.53 Noting the Trust's impressive rates of progression and completion, student appreciation of high levels of support, and evidence of good practice, the team concluded that the Expectation is met and the risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B5): Higher education providers take deliberate steps to engage all students, individually and collectively, as partners in the assurance and enhancement of their educational experience.

Quality Code, Chapter B5: Student Engagement

Findings

2.54 The Trust is committed to inclusion and widening participation of prospective students in higher education to empower students to take a proactive role. The policy on Student Engagement in Quality Assurance outlines the Trust's commitment to engaging students in quality assurance and course enrichment activities.

2.55 Students are encouraged to contribute to all higher education processes and activities through the Student Experience Committee. Student representatives also attend Education Division, Higher Education Management meetings and Boards of Study meetings.

2.56 Students are invited to provide feedback at module level through module evaluation questionnaires. Students also take part in the National Student Survey. Students are represented at Boards of Study meetings, where actions of student feedback are discussed and circulated.

2.57 These arrangements enable the Expectation to be met. The review team scrutinised meeting minutes, procedures, surveys, questionnaires, booklets and handbooks. Details were discussed in meetings with staff and students.

2.58 The Trust has produced booklets for students which explain representation and engagement in general terms. The Trust actively encourages students to feel empowered and has developed workshops to help students understand how change can be achieved. Students are also encouraged to be ambassadors for the Trust at fundraising events to gain essential engagement experience in professional fundraising activity.

2.59 Student representatives are provided with initial training during induction and ongoing training is embedded within the curriculum. This regular informal training has been effective in preparing students to represent themselves and others.

2.60 Students have an opportunity to join outreach teams, travelling in different communities delivering workshops to promote inclusivity, diversity and change. Students have opportunities to engage both within the Trust and at other organisations with which it has established links through its 'Outreach' work. The Trust reports that over 70 per cent of students have participated in the scheme and plans to make it compulsory for both foundation degree and BA (Hons) top-up degree programmes. The Trust supports students with complex needs to take part in 'Inreach' activities which take place within other internal departments at the Trust.

2.61 Individual students have the opportunity to become 'understudies' to Chickenshed professional actors in large-scale Christmas show productions, providing both one-on-one and group training sessions. Students also benefit from work-shadowing opportunities, which help them to develop their skills and engage further with their programme and participate in activities such as participation in Children's Theatre and Youth Theatre sessions. The Trust is looking at developing a formal placement scheme, whereby students can further develop their skills as inclusive practitioners and carry out 'practice as research' in a different professional working environment.

2.62 The Trust has developed an external 'Professional Partners' scheme which enables alumni to act as paid practitioners to advise and develop the skills, knowledge and

experience of existing students. The Trust invites alumni to deliver sessions to existing students. This scheme has been beneficial for both the alumni and existing students. Pre-Induction sessions have been delivered by the Student Experience Committee and alumni to students on the foundation degree courses. Alumni and representatives of partner organisations are confident that the students are well prepared for employment when graduating from the Trust.

2.63 The Trust has an overall vision to systematically widen the professional performance and outreach experience for students. The artistic plan enables students to access broader opportunities and makes them more versatile, confident and well prepared for employment. The review team found that the opportunities to learn through participation alongside professionals, which reinforces learning and promotes coherent transition into employment, is a feature of **good practice**. This area of good practice is linked to points in Expectation B3 of this report.

2.64 The Trust has taken deliberate steps to engage all students, individually and collectively, as partners in the assurance and enhancement of their educational experience. The team therefore concludes that the Expectation is met and risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B6): Higher education providers operate equitable, valid and reliable processes of assessment, including for the recognition of prior learning, which enable every student to demonstrate the extent to which they have achieved the intended learning outcomes for the credit or qualification being sought.

Quality Code, Chapter B6: Assessment of Students and the Recognition of Prior Learning

Findings

2.65 The Trust adheres to the University's regulations on assessment, which are incorporated in the Assessment Feedback and Academic Integrity Framework. This provides clear, accurate, accessible information and guidelines to all staff and students on assessment design, moderation, feedback, reasonable adjustments and academic integrity.

2.66 The University sets the programme structure, learning outcomes and assessment criteria. Assessments are designed and conducted at the Trust. Assessment activities include: written outcomes, presentations, workshops, role play, debates, reflective practice, simulations and discussions. Assessments are produced by the programme teams reporting to the Executive Director of Education and Training. This process is co-ordinated by the module leader to ensure that assessments are valid and equitable.

2.67 These arrangements enable the Expectation to be met. The review team scrutinised programme and module specifications, external examiner reports, assignment briefs, assessment documents, minutes of assessment board, awarding body guidelines, policies, and procedures. Details were discussed in meetings with staff, the representative from the awarding body and students.

2.68 The Inclusive Team Monitoring and Assessment Guidelines enable students to build up achievements gradually by setting milestones at several points and include professional extracurricular opportunities. The Trust encourages assessment literacy through peer and self-assessment. The Trust uses 'practice as research' as a distinctive pedagogy and students are taught through practical exercises and reflection of their experiences to be able to apply practice to theory. Students are given clear learning structures and frameworks to evaluate and utilise their professional approach through reflective practice and 'practice as research' methods in projects.

2.69 The Trust assesses and grades students using a 20-point scale. Each group of points on the scale represents a different classification for foundation and BA Honours degree classification. The Trust assesses 'process' and 'performance' separately for project and module outcomes. Students are given a different process and performance grade based on the 20-point scale. Students are assessed individually based on performance and contribution within a group setting. Both staff and students appreciate the benefits of this approach as it promotes both inclusive teaching and ensures that students have an understanding of collective responsibility for each other's learning.

2.70 All assessments are marked by a first marker and second marker. At least 20 per cent of each assessment task is second marked. The Trust aims to review its Assessment Policy and to strengthen its assessment and moderation teams to ensure that a wider group of people other than the core team are involved in assessment. The Director of Education and Training verifies and moderates marks against assessment criteria.

2.71 The Trust has measures in place to support all students, including those with 'special educational needs' as outlined in the Higher Education Inclusive Learning, Teaching

and Support Framework document. Support staff and mentor teams conduct regular reviews to discuss and monitor the progress and needs of all students.

2.72 The Trust has a Recognition of Prior Learning and Experience Policy for students who do not have formal qualifications but who are able to demonstrate aptitude and relevant experience. Any requests for prior learning assessment will be managed in line with University regulations. There have not been any assessments for recognition of prior learning in recent years.

2.73 The programme handbook contains module narratives which specify the learning outcomes, assessment scheme, weighting and timing of assessments and a link to the University's regulations on academic misconduct. The Assessment Feedback and Academic Integrity Framework document sets out principles for academic misconduct. The annual monitoring reports indicate that there have been no cases of academic misconduct.

2.74 Finalist assessment boards are chaired by a representative of the University and attended by an external examiner to assure standards. This Board discusses individual student progression with decisions formally recorded and actions followed up.

2.75 The Trust operates valid and reliable assessment processes to ensure that students have appropriate opportunities to demonstrate the extent to which they have achieved the intended learning outcomes for the award of credit or qualification. The team therefore concludes that the Expectation is met and the risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B7): Higher education providers make scrupulous use of external examiners.

Quality Code, Chapter B7: External Examining

Findings

2.76 The University defines the role of its external examiners and is responsible for appointing them. The Trust works with the University to ensure that both external examiner appointments and the processes that they operate are in line with requirements that are endorsed in the Assessment Feedback and Academic Integrity Framework document.

2.77 These arrangements enable the Expectation to be met. The review team scrutinised external examiner reports, responses to reports, meeting minutes, awarding body guidelines, policies, and procedures. Details were discussed in meetings with staff, the representative from the awarding body and students.

2.78 The Trust demonstrates a high level of engagement with external examiners, who visit twice a year. The external examiner has attended live performances, met with students and participated in an Education Division meeting. The external examiner has commented positively on student work, collaborative practice, milestone performance to gradually develop work, and highly supportive staff. Students have met the external examiner and are aware that external examiner reports are available on the VLE.

2.79 External examiner reports are discussed at Assessment Board with actions informing the Annual Monitoring Report. The Trust's Annual Monitoring Report includes commentary on the external examiner's report and actions taken in response to issues raised. Recommendations and actions are discussed at Higher Education Management meetings and actions followed up at Assessment Board. The Trust responds formally to external examiner reports, setting out the actions taken, and the response is made available to the University.

2.80 The Trust makes scrupulous use of external examiner reports to ensure that standards are met. The review team therefore concludes that the Expectation is met and the risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B8): Higher education providers, in discharging their responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, operate effective, regular and systematic processes for monitoring and for review of programmes.

Quality Code, Chapter B8: Programme Monitoring and Review

Findings

2.81 The Trust undertakes annual programme monitoring and review in accordance with the University's Learning and Quality Enhancement procedures. Annual monitoring and review processes are reviewed annually in consultation with the University. The Trust's programmes are validated for six years and are subject to review in accordance with the University's Validation and Review Procedures.

2.82 The Trust compiles and submits an Annual Monitoring Report, prepared by the Director of Education and Training and the Higher Education Programme Manager, to the University, to ensure that academic standards are met. The Director of Education and Training has overall responsibility for the process. External examiner reports are positive and confirm that academic standards are being met.

2.83 These arrangements enable the Expectation to be met. The review team scrutinised Annual Monitoring Reports, external examiner reports, awarding body guidelines, policies, and procedures. Details were discussed in meetings with staff, the representative from the awarding body and students.

2.84 The Annual Monitoring Report includes information on student achievement, retention, recruitment and progression, which is collected from Information, Advice and Guidance staff and tutors. Information related to teaching, learning, student engagement and enhancement developments is collated by the Higher Education Programme Manager.

2.85 Staff hold meetings to review teaching practice, which enables a holistic approach to monitoring and review. Student Experience and Education Division meetings enable students to reflect upon learning experiences and provide input into the annual review process. Recommendations from external examiner reports are also included within the report.

2.86 The Annual Monitoring Report submitted to the University is a very detailed and lengthy document. Staff acknowledged that the current reporting process could be more streamlined and that the monitoring report could be more concise to improve the audit of actions taken.

2.87 The review team noted that Annual Monitoring Reports are not discussed as a single document in any formal meeting. Staff acknowledged that relevant issues such as programme design, student retention and professional development are extracted from the report and are addressed in different forums such as Education Division meetings. As noted in Expectation A2.1, the Trust acknowledges that its arrangements remain relatively informal, and is seeking to formalise these.

2.88 The Trust operates systematic processes for monitoring and review of programmes to ensure that academic standards are maintained and that the quality of learning opportunities is enhanced. The team therefore concludes that the Expectation is met and the risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B9): Higher education providers have procedures for handling academic appeals and student complaints about the quality of learning opportunities; these procedures are fair, accessible and timely, and enable enhancement.

Quality Code, Chapter B9: Academic Appeals and Student Complaints

Findings

2.89 The Trust has a formal procedure for handling complaints in line with University regulations. The procedure is summarised in the programme handbooks and available on the VLE. The programme handbook has a link to the University's academic appeals procedures.

2.90 There are formal procedures outlined in the Admissions Policy to request a review of an admission decision. Students are encouraged to contact the Information, Advice and Guidance team for support and guidance. The University has overall responsibility for dealing with academic appeals.

2.91 These arrangements enable the Expectation to be met. The review scrutinised validation documents, awarding body guidelines, policies, and procedures. Details were discussed in meetings with staff, the representative from the awarding body, and students.

2.92 The Trust places great emphasis on finding informal resolutions to complaints and being proactive in understanding students' issues. All staff, including the Director of Education and Training and the Higher Education Manager, have an open door policy regarding listening to student complaints and providing support and guidance. Students reported that they value the access to senior staff that these arrangements provided. The Education Support Mentor Team, Counsellor, Medical Support Officer and Information, Advice and Guidance team work with tutors to meet student needs and mitigate any issues and concerns which may arise.

2.93 Students are aware of formal procedures and are confident that they would be able to access the necessary support and guidance to submit a formal complaint or academic appeal.

2.94 There have been no requests for reviews of admissions or formal academic appeals in recent years. The Trust has had two formal complaints and these have been dealt with appropriately.

2.95 The Trust understands the extent of its responsibilities as assigned by the awarding body and operates fair and accessible procedures to handle appeals and complaints. The review team therefore concludes that the Expectation is met and the risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B10): Degree-awarding bodies take ultimate responsibility for academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities, irrespective of where these are delivered or who provides them. Arrangements for delivering learning opportunities with organisations other than the degree-awarding body are implemented securely and managed effectively.

Quality Code, Chapter B10: Managing Higher Education Provision with Others

Findings

2.96 Students are strongly encouraged to engage in extracurricular professional activities, within and beyond the Trust. In addition to performances, these include measures to promote public awareness of inclusivity and training packages for external organisations, in which students either shadow professionals or participate directly. These activities are known and referred to as 'Outreach' within the Trust.

2.97 Students who participate in 'Outreach' are managed by the Trust's staff, who conduct risk assessments and who may use these activities for assessment against module learning outcomes. The Trust's Higher Education Inclusive Learning, Teaching and Support Framework document provides guidance for risk assessment and safeguarding. Responsibility for the safeguarding of vulnerable adults rests with the Director of Education and Training, and staff participate in regular safeguarding training. A booklet on safeguarding is provided for students and parents.

2.98 The Trust has plans to make such activities compulsory and is planning new modules in the foundation and BA (Hons) top-up degree programmes to this end, subject to the approval of its awarding body.

2.99 The Trust has already prepared a Policy on Professional Development Learning Experience and Placement which establishes procedures and responsibilities for the approval, management and monitoring of placement learning and for the support of students on placement. However, at the time of the visit, students were able to achieve programme and module learning outcomes without taking part in them, so for this reason this Expectation is not applicable.

Expectation: Not applicable

Level of risk: Not applicable

Expectation (B11): Research degrees are awarded in a research environment that provides secure academic standards for doing research and learning about research approaches, methods, procedures and protocols. This environment offers students quality of opportunities and the support they need to achieve successful academic, personal and professional outcomes from their research degrees.

Quality Code, *Chapter B11: Research Degrees*

Findings

The Trust does not offer research degrees; therefore, this Expectation is not applicable.

Expectation: Not applicable

Level of risk: Not applicable

The quality of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

2.100 In determining its judgement on the quality of student learning opportunities at the Trust, the review team considered the findings against the criteria outlined in Annex 2 of the published handbook. All Expectations in this area are met and the level of risk is considered low in all Expectations. The review team identified a total of seven areas of good practice in Expectations B1, B3, B4 and B5. There are no recommendations or affirmations in this area.

2.101 The Trust has internal programme design processes to enable students to adapt and organise flexibly in the way that higher education experiences are structured and organised. Students are consulted on their interpretation and understanding of the Foundation Degree Qualification Benchmark by reflecting upon their own practices and learning experiences, and this ensures that programmes are redesigned to address student needs and enhance learning. The Trust has redesigned the foundation degree programme to include a dedicated module focusing on practical development, and this involved extensive consultation with staff, students and external expertise and has resulted in rationalising the course structure. In addition, the Trust is piloting an employability module to be fully developed and added to the BA degree programme, which is an initiative arising from student representation and consultation with staff and external partners. The Trust is also engaging student representation to develop an outreach experience to transition from a student engagement experience to a fully accredited module. The review team therefore recognises as good practice the proactive engagement of students in programme design.

2.102 Programmes are grounded in a distinctive pedagogy described as 'practice as research', which is derived from established learning theories. Students are taught through practical exercises to understand how they and others learn, to articulate and reflect on their experiences, and to relate practice to theory. 'Milestones' are established in each module to enable students to meet learning outcomes in stages. Staff demonstrated how they helped students with academic writing: starting with the concept of recording in a variety of formats, then working to articulate questions and gradually building up to essay plans and essays. The review team notes as good practice the measures that enable students to overcome barriers to engagement with academic theory and writing.

2.103 The Trust adopts an approach to delivery based on group exercises taught by teams of staff. The presence of three or four members of staff in every session enables students to be closely monitored and supported; ensures that individual achievement in group activity is captured; enables staff to model professional behaviour including teamwork; and allows more experienced staff to pass on knowledge and skills to colleagues. To this is added the practice of occasionally mixing students from different cohorts, and also alumni, to facilitate transition and model personal development. The Trust's approach is explained to students in their programme handbooks and a booklet on Inclusive Monitoring and Assessment. Students are encouraged to reflect on these, and the review team was impressed by exercises which show students gaining insight into learning and career options. The review team considers as good practice the articulation of a pedagogy appropriate to the Trust's strategic aims and the characteristics of the student body.

2.104 The Trust also adopts a team approach towards monitoring and encouraging student progress. In addition to Year Tutors, who have primary responsibility, there are designated subject and project tutors, supported by teams of support/mentor staff. Student progress is reviewed at frequent meetings of the Higher Education Management team and of the Education Division. Students receive individual feedback on their modules and overall progress. Students are enabled to plan their development through core modules in each programme. In the BA (Hons) top-up degree a process prompts them to reflect on

their personal style in delivery or performance and identify goals and methods for improvement. Students told the team that they found feedback on their learning helpful. The review team recognises as good practice the extensive feedback and dialogue with staff, which supports students' individual personal development.

2.105 The Trust aims to support all of its students and as a matter of principle does not distinguish those with 'special educational needs'. Support staff meet fortnightly to review the progress and needs of every individual; they also attend Education Division meetings and liaise effectively with the Year Tutors, who monitor the academic progress of each student. Students felt that staff create a caring environment and that they always feel supported. Students valued the counselling service and cited examples of staff going out of their way to help individuals with personal difficulties. These views are also reflected in internal and external student surveys. The review team considers as good practice the continuing, comprehensive and effective mechanisms for individual student support which enable students to reach their potential.

2.106 The Trust puts extensive effort into supporting transition into and through higher education, using cross-cohort activities in the learning space to facilitate role modelling and peer support. The Trust is piloting a peer mentor scheme, which staff believe is working well. Both initiatives extend to level 3 students, to ease their path into higher education. The Trust has also introduced summer 'pre-induction days' for applicants who have accepted offers and engages current students and alumni in their delivery. Students consider them highly successful. In addition, the Trust has a high level of engagement with its alumni, which it is seeking to develop further in order to support transition into employment. The review team found the arrangements that facilitate transition into and progression through higher education, which promote student achievement, to be a feature of good practice at the Trust.

2.107 Students have the opportunity to join outreach teams, delivering workshops to promote inclusivity, diversity and change. The Trust supports students with complex needs to take part in 'Inreach' activities, which take place within other internal departments at the Trust. Students have the opportunity to become 'understudies' to Chickenshed professional actors in large-scale productions, providing both one-on-one and group training sessions. Students also benefit from work-shadowing opportunities which help them to develop their skills. The Trust has developed an external 'Professional Partners' scheme, which enables alumni to act as paid practitioners to advise and develop the skills, knowledge and experience of existing students. The Trust invites alumni to deliver sessions to existing students. This scheme has been beneficial for both the alumni and existing students. The artistic plan enables students to access broader opportunities and makes them more versatile, confident and well prepared for employment. The review team found that the opportunities to learn through participation alongside professionals, which reinforces learning and promotes coherent transition into employment, is a feature of good practice.

2.108 These are all examples of good practice and there are no recommendations for improvement. The Trust has plans to enhance this area further. Student engagement in the management of this area is widespread and supported and managing the needs of students is a clear focus of the Trust's strategies and policies. The review team concludes that the quality of student learning opportunities at the Trust is **commended**.

3 Judgement: The quality of the information about learning opportunities

Expectation (C): UK higher education providers produce information for their intended audiences about the higher education they offer that is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy.

Quality Code, Part C: Information about Higher Education Provision

Findings

3.1 The mission, values, history, activities and governance arrangements of the Chickenshed Theatre Trust are explained on its website. The Education Division has its own section, 'Study at Chickenshed', which is oriented towards applicants. Each programme has its own page which includes links to the programme prospectus booklet, application form and a set of 'frequently asked questions'. The awarding body's logo and a link to its website appear on these pages. The prospectus booklets clearly identify the nature of the programme and the awarding body responsible. Under the partnership agreement, all publicity material relating to the programmes must be approved by Middlesex University in advance. The University also produces certificates for graduates and verifies the diploma supplements produced by the Trust.

3.2 Written information for current students is mainly provided through the Trust's VLE, although documents are also available in hard copy. There is a student handbook for each programme which includes the programme specification and module narratives as well as basic information and general guidance about studying at Chickenshed. The Trust has produced a series of booklets for students with advice about issues including: assessment; engagement; personal development; safeguarding; the Prevent duty; the Quality Code; and student support services. They are made available on the VLE along with module handbooks and documents on the Trust's policies, procedures and resources.

3.3 Written information for staff is provided through an intranet. A series of 'Framework' documents set out principles and processes for assessment, quality assurance, teaching, and student support. These are supplemented by guidelines on specific topics such as the use of Kolb's learning cycle in teaching, the conduct of team assessment, and supporting students in the learning space. Minutes of Education Division meetings are sent to staff electronically and then posted on the intranet. To support its processes of annual monitoring the Trust produces statistics on recruitment, the student body profile, progression and completion, academic misconduct and graduate destinations.

3.4 These arrangements enable the Expectation to be met. To test their operation, the team looked at relevant documents and spoke to members of staff and students at the Trust.

3.5 The review team found public information produced by the Trust to be attractively presented and accurate but noted that programme specifications are not published on the website. Programme content and admissions requirements are explained clearly but there is limited information about the process of admission. The Admissions Policy does not appear on the website, which means that applicants are not informed about their rights to complain or to request feedback or a review. The review team therefore **recommends** that the Trust ensures that the Admissions Policy and programme specifications are published and accessible to applicants and other stakeholders.

3.6 Both students and staff told the review team that they felt well informed. The team found handbooks to be clear and well written and advice booklets, which had been drawn up with student input, easy to understand. The 'Framework' documents are also helpful, although the Trust acknowledges that they are still under development.

3.7 Both staff and students impressed upon the review team that they tend not to rely on formal written communication as this presents potential barriers to inclusion for some in their community. They find face-to-face and email contact, made possible by the small scale of the provision and the high staff-student ratio, to be more effective. Students told the team that email is particularly valued by those who find oral communication difficult. Students explained that the Director of Education and Training had gone through their programme handbooks with them in meetings at the start of the year. They were aware of the leaflet on the Quality Code but had learned more through discussing it with the Higher Education Programme Manager. They told the review team that teaching and support staff were easy to contact and invariably helpful. Staff told the team that they had been successful in overcoming reluctance to use the VLE for communication, instead of social media and email, and students confirmed this. An additional training session had been provided for students who had struggled with the VLE. Students told the team that they had learned to appreciate its value as a space for discussion and mutual support. The review team was given access to the VLE and was able to note current engagement in online discussions.

3.8 The review team noted that in response to a recommendation made in the previous QAA review in 2015 the Trust had taken action to create an auditable process for the management of public information. A policy statement has been drawn up along with a pro forma for sign off. A member of the Information, Advice and Guidance team has responsibility for the website and VLE and monitors it regularly. Many of the Trust's documents are now labelled with dates of origin or update. However, some remain undated and a checklist for audit of internal documents has not yet been created. The review team therefore **affirms** the actions being taken in establishing an auditable process for the management of information.

3.9 The review team concluded that the Expectation is met but noted problems in a small part of the provision in the form of omissions on the website and the need for continuing action to improve the management of information. The team therefore assessed the risk as moderate.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Moderate

The quality of the information about learning opportunities: Summary of findings

3.10 In reaching its judgement, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook.

3.11 The Expectation in this area is met and the review team identified one recommendation and one affirmation in this area. The risk is assessed as moderate, as the problems identified are confined to a small part of the provision.

3.12 The Trust produces information through a range of mechanisms that is well presented and accurate. The Trust has a website, VLE for students and intranet for staff. Materials, booklets and handbooks are available in hard copy. Both staff and students make extensive use of electronic communication.

3.13 The Trust does not publish programme specifications or the Admissions Policy on its website. As prospective students do not have access to the Admissions Policy, they are not informed about their rights to complain or to request feedback or a review. The review team therefore recommends that the Trust ensures that the Admissions Policy and programme specifications are published and accessible to applicants and other stakeholders.

3.14 In response to a recommendation made in the previous QAA review the Trust had taken action to create an auditable process for the management of public information. A policy statement has been drawn up along with a pro forma for the sign off of public information. A member of staff has responsibility for the website and VLE and monitors these regularly. Many of the Trust's documents are labelled with dates of origin or update; however, some remain undated and a checklist for audit of internal documents has not yet been created. The review team affirms the actions being taken in establishing an auditable process for the management of information.

3.15 The review team concludes that the quality of the information about learning opportunities at the provider **meets** UK expectations.

4 Judgement: The enhancement of student learning opportunities

Expectation (Enhancement): Deliberate steps are being taken at provider level to improve the quality of students' learning opportunities.

Findings

4.1 The Trust has a strong enhancement ethos aligning to their mission of promoting inclusive practice. The Trust is committed to improving and developing learning opportunities for all students through student engagement, student representation, staff and student development and a commitment to quality assurance and inclusive practice.

4.2 The Higher Education and Training Development Plan and Higher Education Learning, Teaching and Support Framework sets out strategic objectives and key priorities. The overall responsibility for enhancement of higher education lies with the Director of Education and Training in liaison with the University's Link Tutors.

4.3 The Trust has appointed a Higher Education Programme Manager to promote enhancement of the student experience and future development. The higher education student experience is discussed and reported at the Management and Executive Boards and Trustee Boards. The appointment of an Artistic Director who has academic and current professional experience is a further initiative to engage external expertise in enhancing the student experience.

4.4 These arrangements enable the Expectation to be met. The review team scrutinised programme and module specifications, external examiner reports, annual monitoring reports, strategic plans, meeting minutes, policies, and procedures. Details were discussed in meetings with staff, the representative from the awarding body and students.

4.5 The Trust is piloting an employability module to be fully developed and added to the BA (Hons) top-up degree programme, which is an initiative arising from student representation and consultation with staff, external partners and employers. The Trust is engaging students to develop an 'Outreach' experience to transition from a student engagement experience to a fully accredited module.

4.6 The Trust has redesigned the foundation degree programme to include a dedicated module focusing on practical development. The Trust has also developed a module to encompass knowledge and skills in two parallel inclusive theatre development areas - Children's Theatre and Outreach and Home Education Network Projects. Furthermore, students on the BA (Hons) top-up degree and foundation degree year 2 receive training in project and individual impact assessment to broaden and deepen both the programmes and their professional development. The Trust has developed an innovative 'practice as research' technique to open up support for research processes, widen participation and promote greater equality and inclusive learning opportunities.

4.7 Students have an opportunity to engage in a wide range of professional extracurricular activities, at the Trust itself and at organisations with which it has established links through its 'Outreach' work to promote diversity and change. The Trust reports that over 70 per cent of students have participated in the scheme. The Trust is also involved in negotiations with partner organisations and potential employers to create opportunities for placement experience. The Trust supports students with complex needs to take part in 'Inreach' activities, which take place within other internal departments at the Trust.

4.8 The Trust has consolidated the professional performance and 'Outreach' experience for students to enhance learning opportunities. Students have the opportunity to become 'understudies' to Chickenshed professional actors in large-scale Christmas productions, providing both one-on-one and group training sessions. Students also benefit from work-shadowing opportunities, which help them to develop their skills and engage further with their programme. Students have engaged in activities such as Children's Theatre and Youth Theatre sessions, in planning meetings and conversations about work development. The Trust aims to widen professional experience by exposing students to a range of professional activities including the understudy process, backstage and front of house activities, Children's Theatre and Early Years support.

4.9 Students are given opportunities to create their own, bespoke engagement events and activities, to comment on, develop and raise awareness of their work and contribute to the wider Chickenshed Artistic Plan. Furthermore, there are opportunities to run workshops and engage with target groups on specific themes.

4.10 The Trust has developed an external 'Professional Partners' scheme which enables alumni to act as paid practitioners to advise and develop the skills, knowledge and experience of existing students. The Trust invites alumni to deliver sessions to existing students. This scheme has been beneficial for both the alumni and existing students. Pre-Induction sessions have been delivered by the Student Experience Committee and alumni to students on the foundation degree courses. Alumni and representatives of partner organisations are confident that the students are well prepared for employment when they graduate from the Trust.

4.11 The review team found that the deliberate steps taken to engage students in enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, which promotes inclusive practice, is a feature of **good practice**.

4.12 Higher education management and staff are engaged in the process of acquiring HEA Fellowships as part of learning enhancement and professional development.

4.13 The review team concludes that Trust has taken significant deliberate and effective steps to enhance the quality of student learning opportunities. The Trust has a clear and strong enhancement ethos aligning to the mission of promoting inclusive practice. The team therefore concludes that the Expectation is met and the risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

The enhancement of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

4.14 In reaching its judgement, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook.

4.15 The Expectation in this area is met and the associated level of risk is low. The review team identified an area of good practice in this Expectation and there are no recommendations or affirmations.

4.16 The Trust has a strong enhancement ethos which is clearly aligned to its mission and values and is embedded at all levels within the organisation. A number of key enhancement initiatives, such as the piloting of the employability module on the BA (Hons) top-up degree, the redesign of the foundation degree programme to include a module focusing on practical development, which draws together skills and knowledge from external projects, and the innovative 'practice as research' technique, which opens up support for research processes, widens participation and promotes greater equality and inclusive learning opportunities, have all involved active and extensive engagement with students. The Trust has ensured that students have an opportunity to engage in a wide range of professional extracurricular activities and has consolidated professional performance and 'Outreach' activities to enhance students' learning opportunities. The review team recognises as good practice the deliberate steps taken to engage students in enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, which promotes inclusive practice.

4.17 The review team notes that the Trust plans to enhance this area further, that student engagement in the management of this area is widespread and supported, and that managing the needs of students is a clear focus of the Trust's strategies and policies. The review team therefore concludes that the enhancement of student learning opportunities at the provider is **commended**.

Glossary

This glossary is a quick-reference guide to terms in this report that may be unfamiliar to some readers. Definitions of key operational terms are also given on pages 21-24 of the [Higher Education Review \(Alternative Providers\) handbook](#).

If you require formal definitions of other terms please refer to the section on assuring standards and quality: www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality.

User-friendly explanations of a wide range of terms can be found in the longer Glossary on the QAA website: www.qaa.ac.uk/Pages/GlossaryEN.aspx.

Academic standards

The standards set by **degree-awarding bodies** for their courses (programmes and modules) and expected for their awards. See also **threshold academic standard**.

Award

A qualification, or academic credit, conferred in formal recognition that a student has achieved the intended **learning outcomes** and passed the assessments required to meet the academic standards set for a **programme** or unit of study.

Awarding organisation

An organisation authorised to award a particular qualification; an organisation recognised by Ofqual to award Ofqual-regulated qualifications.

Blended learning

Learning delivered by a number of different methods, usually including face-to-face and e-learning (see **technology enhanced or enabled learning**).

Credit(s)

A means of quantifying and recognising learning, used by most institutions that provide higher education **programmes of study**, expressed as numbers of credits at a specific level.

Degree-awarding body

A UK higher education provider (typically a university) with the power to award degrees, conferred by Royal Charter, or under Section 76 of the Further and Higher Education Act 1992, or under Section 48 of the Further and Higher Education (Scotland) Act 1992, or by Papal Bull, or, since 1999, granted by the Privy Council on advice from QAA (in response to applications for taught degree awarding powers, research degree awarding powers or university title).

Distance learning

A course of study that does not involve face-to-face contact between students and tutors but instead uses technology such as the internet, intranets, broadcast media, CD-ROM and video, or traditional methods of correspondence - learning 'at a distance'. See also **blended learning**.

Dual award or double award

The granting of separate awards (and certificates) for the same **programme** by two **degree-awarding bodies** who have jointly delivered the programme of study leading to them. See also **multiple award**.

e-learning

See technology enhanced or enabled learning.

Enhancement

The process by which higher education providers systematically improve the quality of provision and the ways in which students' learning is supported. It is used as a technical term in our review processes.

Expectations

Statements in the **Quality Code** that set out what all UK higher education providers expect of themselves and each other, and what the general public can therefore expect of them.

Flexible and distributed learning

A programme or module that does not require the student to attend classes or events at particular times and locations. See also **distance learning**.

Framework

A published formal structure. See also **framework for higher education qualifications**.

Framework for higher education qualifications

A published formal structure that identifies a hierarchy of national qualification levels and describes the general achievement expected of holders of the main qualification types at each level, thus assisting higher education providers in maintaining academic standards. QAA publishes the following frameworks: *The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* (FHEQ) and *The Framework for Qualifications of Higher Education Institutions in Scotland* (FQHEIS).

Good practice

A process or way of working that, in the view of a QAA review team, makes a particularly positive contribution to a higher education provider's management of academic standards and the quality of its educational provision. It is used as a technical term in QAA's audit and review processes.

Learning opportunities

The provision made for students' learning, including planned study, teaching, assessment, academic and personal support, and resources (such as libraries and information systems, laboratories or studios).

Learning outcomes

What a learner is expected to know, understand and/or be able to demonstrate after completing a process of learning.

Multiple awards

An arrangement where three or more **degree-awarding bodies** together provide a single jointly delivered **programme** (or programmes) leading to a separate **award** (and separate certification) of each awarding body. The arrangement is the same as for **dual/double awards**, but with three or more awarding bodies being involved.

Operational definition

A formal definition of a term, establishing exactly what QAA means when using it in reviews and reports.

Programme (of study)

An approved course of study that provides a coherent learning experience and normally leads to a qualification.

Programme specifications

Published statements about the intended **learning outcomes** of programmes of study, containing information about teaching and learning methods, support and assessment methods, and how individual units relate to levels of achievement.

Quality Code

Short term for the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, which is the UK-wide set of **reference points** for higher education providers (agreed through consultation with the higher education community, and published by QAA), which states the **Expectations** that all providers are required to meet.

Reference points

Statements and other publications that establish criteria against which performance can be measured.

Self-evaluation document

A report submitted by a higher education provider, assessing its own performance, to be used as evidence in a QAA review.

Subject Benchmark Statement

A published statement that sets out what knowledge, understanding, abilities and skills are expected of those graduating in each of the main subject areas (mostly applying to bachelor's degrees), and explains what gives that particular discipline its coherence and identity.

Technology enhanced or enabled learning (or e-learning)

Learning that is delivered or supported through the use of technology.

Threshold academic standard

The minimum acceptable level of achievement that a student has to demonstrate to be eligible for an academic **award**. Threshold academic standards are set out in the national **frameworks** and **Subject Benchmark Statements**.

Virtual learning environment (VLE)

An intranet or password-only interactive website (also referred to as a platform or user interface) giving access to **learning opportunities** electronically. These might include such resources as course handbooks, information and reading lists; blogs, message boards and forums; recorded lectures; and/or facilities for online seminars (webinars).

Widening participation

Increasing the involvement in higher education of people from a wider range of backgrounds.

QAA2057 - R9751 - Jan 18

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2018
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB
Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786

Tel: 01452 557050
Website: www.qaa.ac.uk