Partner Monitoring and Review Procedure

Contents

This document has been designed to be accessible for readers. However, should you require the document in an alternative format please contact the University Secretariat.

Purpose

1   Monitoring and evaluation of higher education is an essential part of an effective quality assurance framework:

- **Monitoring** involves the routine collection and analysis of data and other sources of information relevant to a programme or subject area. Monitoring is undertaken on an ongoing basis throughout the academic year.

- **Evaluation** is the retrospective assessment of a programme or subject area and is undertaken both annually, as part of **programme monitoring**, and on a five-yearly basis as part of **periodic review**. In both cases evaluative activities are based on analysis of the information collected through monitoring and are intended to improve the quality of the learner experience, including teaching, learning and assessment, and inform planning and other activities.

2   This document sets out the programme monitoring and periodic review processes for Academic Partners and how these feed into the University's wider governance and quality assurance processes.

3   The framework has been informed by the QAA / UKSCQA Expectations for Quality and Standards in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, together with the core and common practices set out in the Advice and Guidance Theme on [Monitoring and Evaluation](#).

4   Collectively, monitoring and evaluation processes at BNU are intended to provide assurance, internally and externally, that University provision continues to meet the Office for Students (OfS) ongoing conditions of registration for [Quality, reliable standards and positive outcomes for all students (Conditions B1-B5)](#).

Applicability and Scope

5   The procedures set out in this document apply to all undergraduate and postgraduate taught provision delivered by the University's Academic Partners.

Responsibilities

6   The maintenance of academic quality and standards is the collective responsibility of **all BNU employees** as well as all staff delivering and monitoring BNU programmes under a validation or franchise relationship.

7   Day to day responsibility for managing the procedures set out in this document lies with the **University Partnerships Team** and reporting to the **University Partnerships Board (UPB)**.

8   Other individual areas of responsibility are outlined within the document, including for **Partnership Tutors, Partner Staff** and colleagues in **Central Services Directorates**.

9   All processes outlined in this document are overseen by **UPB**, operating under delegated authority of Senate, the senior academic board of the University.

Table of Definitions

Access & Participation Plan (APP)	Sets out how higher education providers will improve equality of opportunity for underrepresented groups to access, suceed in and progress from higher education.
Agreement	A legally binding document including any annex and/or appendix and/or schedule, which shall be deemed to form a part of an Agreement.
Graduate Outcomes	The biggest UK annual social survey and captures the perspectives and current status of recent graduates.
National Student Survey (NSS)	An opportunity for students to give their feedback on what its been like to study on their course at University. It is published every year and is a rich and influential source of information about higher education.
Office for Students	The non-departmental public body of the Department for Education, acting as the regulator and competition authority for the higher education sector in England or any successor body which carries out substantially the same function.
Operations Manual	The formal document agreed by the Parties and issued annually by the University specifying the responsibilities of each Party and the procedures to be followed.
Partnership Team	The division of the University's Commercial and Business Development Directorate which oversees all collaborative partnership arrangements.
Partnership Tutor	The tutor appointed by the University to have oversight of the Programmes on the University's behalf in accordance with the requirements of relevant University Policies and Regulations.
Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES)	The only UK sector-wide survey to gain insight from taught postgraduate students about their learning and teaching experience.
Programme Specification	The document describing the programme aims, learning outcomes and the means by which these learning outcomes are achieved and assessed, structure, entry requirements and any other Programme-specific items, as amended by the University from time to time.
Professional Statutory Regulatory Bodies (PSRB)	A diverse group of professional and employer bodies, regulators and those with statutory authority over a profession or group of professionals.
University Partnerships Board	Reports to Academic Planning Committee and holds delegated responsibility for the development and

	maintenance of the University's Partnerships Strategy and operational framework; exercising effective managerial responsibility in respect of partnership arrangements; and monitoring student achievement and the quality of the student experience for those registered under a partnership arrangement.
Validation Arrangement	A programme leading to a recognised award of the University, designed and delivered by a partner but quality assured by the University.

Programme Monitoring

Overview

10 Monitoring and review of programmes is ongoing throughout the year and allows Partners, Schools and the University to ensure that programmes continue to meet the expectations of staff and learners, opportunities to enhance provision are explored, and any issues are identified and resolved.

11 Programme monitoring takes place through:

- consideration of student performance data at module and programme level;

- analysis of internal and external survey results;

- consideration of formal and informal student feedback;

- discussions at teaching review meetings;

- publication of NSS, PTES and Graduate Outcomes data, and

- receipt of and responses to external examining reports.

12 Collectively, these inform the formal reporting process following the end of each academic year and incorporate activity at both programme and partner level. The completion of reports is intended to provide a robust process to give the University the necessary assurance that academic quality and standards are being maintained.

13 Preparation of reports is overseen by the Partner within the timescales provided by the University.

14 Central service directorates, particularly the Partnerships Team and the Directorate for Strategic Planning & Change, will help facilitate the process through provision of information and further guidance as required.

Timeframe of activities

Timeframe	Activity
June	The **Partnerships Team** will share with Partners; templates, guidance notes, data, key dates and deadlines that underpin the process.

Timeframe	Activity
July - August	A **Programme Monitoring Report** will be prepared for each programme / group of programmes by each Partner and Partnership Tutor. A **Partner Quality Report** will be prepared by each Partner.
September	**Partnership Tutor(s)** will prepare a Partnership Tutor Report and carry out a Risk Assessment.
October	Programme Monitoring Reports and Partner Quality Reports are reviewed by a sub-committee of **University Partnerships Board**.
November	University Partnership Board will confirm the maintenance of quality and standards at the Partner. This will be reported to **Senate via Education Committee.**

Use of data and other sources of information

15 Data provided by the University **must** be used when completing each report.

16 Data will be displayed over a four-year period and will align with OfS expectations where available (particularly B3 Student outcomes / performance) as well as any pertinent internally agreed KPIs. To identify areas of differential performance data will also be broken down by characteristic (age, gender, ethnicity, disadvantage).

17 Dashboards will include the following datasets:

- **Student outcomes data**, including continuation / retention, completion and degree outcomes.

- **NSS, PTES and other internal and external survey results**, including mid-semester (MSS) and/or module surveys undertaken

- **Graduate outcomes data**, including highly skilled employment rates 15 months after graduating and graduate views on career progress

18 Reference should also be made to:

- **Module performance data**, including the Module Board Report

- **External Examiner reports**, including relevant comments from external examiners recorded in Board of Examiner meetings

- **PSRB reports** completed during the reporting period as applicable

- **Programme Committee Meeting (PCM)** records, as well as any other formal or informal feedback received during the year

Programme Monitoring Reports

19 A senior member of staff at the partner must identify the individual(s) responsible for completing each required report. These will usually be the Partner Programme Lead.

20 The Partner Programme Lead must produce the report in collaboration with the University Partnership Tutor.

21 All reports must use the templates provided which align directly to the OfS B Conditions of Registration. Core metrics for each section will be drawn from a range of datasets evidencing assurance in each section.

Section	Core metrics that will apply
Academic experience (B1): • **Currency** • **Coherency** • **Educational Challenge** • **Effectiveness of delivery** • **Skills development**	• NSS / MSS – Learning opportunities questions • NSS / MSS – Organisation and management questions • Value added / Learning gain KPI
Resources, support and student engagement (B2): • **Sufficiency of resources (staffing, physical space, learning, digital teaching, and specialist resources)** • **Sufficiency of academic support (academic content, teaching, misconduct issues, and careers)** • **Effectiveness of student engagement approaches**	• NSS / MSS – Learning resources questions • NSS / MSS – Teaching on my course questions • NSS / MSS – Assessment and feedback questions • NSS / MSS – Academic support questions • NSS / MSS – Mental wellbeing questions • NSS / MSS – Freedom of expression questions • NSS – Student voice questions • Student satisfaction KPI (to be developed)
Student outcomes / performance (B3): • **Continuation and completion rates** • **Degree outcomes, including attainment gaps** • **Graduate employment** *Note: To include comparison of performance from learners starting on the Foundation Year vs learners entering at Level 4*	• Continuation KPI (Tableau) • Completion KPI (Tableau) • Differential degree outcomes KPI (Tableau) • Good Honours KPI (Tableau) • Value added / learning gain KPI (to be developed) • Graduate Outcomes / Highly skilled employment KPI (Tableau) • Graduate views on career progress KPI (Tableau)
Assessment and awards (B4): • **Assessment process, design, misconduct etc** • **Credibility of assessment (classification distribution over time)** • **Assessment regulations**	• Academic misconduct numbers • Good Honours KPI • Other esteem indicators (e.g. national awards, learner conference submissions)

Section	Core metrics that will apply
• **English language proficiency**	
Standards (B5): • **Alignment to national frameworks etc** • **PSRB standards of proficiency** • **External examiner comments / concerns**	• External examiner report ratings • PSRB review ratings

22 Reports should be evaluative in nature; they should reflect on the current position and identify emerging issues, areas for improvement and good practice identified. Reports should <u>not</u> include data themselves but should instead analyse the datasets against benchmark and baseline indicators identifying where gaps exist and how these may be closed or performance improved.

Rating of reports and Quality Improvement / Enhancement Plans

23 Completed programme monitoring reports will be rated by the Partner Programme Lead and Partnership Tutor. Each report will receive an overall rating, as well as underpinning ratings in each of the five areas of:

(1) academic experience; (2) resources, support and student engagement; (3) student outcomes; (4) assessment and awards; and (5) standards.

24 There will be four rating categories signifying increasing degrees of excellence above the baseline.

Rating	Meaning	Type of plan required
Gold	The programme is typically outstanding.	N/A. No plan required
Silver	The programme is typically very high quality and there may be some outstanding features.	Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)
Bronze	The programme is typically high quality (the default position) and there may be some very high-quality features.	Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)
Requires improvement	The programme is not typically high quality and requires improvement.	Quality Improvement Plan (QIP)

25 Ratings awarded for each programme will be ratified by UPB and reported to the Education Committee. Depending on the overall rating applied, a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), Quality Improvement Plan (QIP), or no plan will also be required.

26   Where a programme requires improvement, a QIP must be completed and the programme will be subject to enhanced monitoring by UPB.

27   EPs must be updated regularly by the Partner and should incorporate actions from other processes throughout the year. Enhancement Plans should focus on addressing areas that are limiting a higher rating being awarded (i.e. Bronze to Silver or Silver to Gold). Progress against actions will be reported in the subsequent academic year via the subsequent Programme Monitoring Report.

Partnership Tutor Reports

28   Once programme reports have been completed, Partnership Tutor will be required to complete a Partnership Tutor Report and risk assessment. Each report will consider each of the five areas of: (1) academic experience; (2) resources, support and student engagement; (3) student outcomes; (4) assessment and awards; and (5) standards.

Partner Quality Reports

29   The Partner Quality Report will be completed by a senior partner representative, such as the Principal or Quality Lead following the completion of the Programme Monitoring Reports.

30   The Partner Quality Report should also include a summary of any common themes emerging from reports in each of the five areas mentioned above as well as areas where support may be required from other areas of the University.

31   A sub-committee of UPB will consider both the programme and partner quality reports at its meetings in October. These will directly inform the overall judgement on whether quality and standards have been maintained.

32   A category of Failing Quality and Standards can be assigned to a Partner where deemed necessary by UPB. This is where the programme is not of high quality and with little or no evidence of improvement after a period of two years. This will result in a recommendation to Senate with endorsement from UPB and UET, that consideration be given to termination.

Record Keeping and Retention

33   Once complete, all reports will be kept by the Partnerships Team as part of the audit record.

34   Reports may be used towards other processes, including Periodic Partner Review and other external review activities, and will be securely disposed of in line with records retention requirements.

Partner Periodic Review

Overview

35   The partner periodic review (PPR) process is the formal process by which the University is assured of the continuing quality of provision at a Partner institution. It is the process by which subject areas are strategically reviewed to ensure that teaching, learning and assessment approaches and resources continue to be current, and programmes continue to meet the requirements of learners, employers, Professional, Statutory, Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs), while also meeting the strategic aims of the University.

36   PPRs are an opportunity to review provision within the subject area and the availability of resources required to deliver programmes to the required standard critically. Review events will normally be held over the period of one day, although this may vary depending on the size and scope of the partner and subject area.

37   All PPRs will culminate in a report of the Review event for consideration by University Partnerships Board (UPB) and Education Committee.

38   The purpose of a PPR is to:

- Ensure that students registered on each higher education course receive a high-quality academic experience.

- Ensure each cohort of students registered on each higher education course receives resources and support which are sufficient, including the continued appropriateness and adequacy of the partner's physical resources and facilities.

- Ensure that students are assessed effectively and that assessments are valid and reliable

- Explore the academic partner's achievement of appropriate academic standards in its contribution to the delivery of the programme(s) and its understanding of higher education quality and standards in relation to teaching, learning and assessment

- Review the student experience at the partner including the use of student feedback, learning resources, student support and the accuracy and completeness of published information

- Assess the success of the operation of the partnership by considering contribution of all teams involved in the operation and support of the partnership

- Review the staffing in place at the partner institution, levels, staff CPD and research activities, and ensure all staff are entered on the partner staff register and are suitable to undertake their duties, and consider the range and nature of staff development activity in place at the partner

Scheduling of Reviews

39   PPRs will take place according to a rolling five to six-year schedule maintained by the Partnerships Team.

40   The schedule of reviews is approved by UPB and will be reviewed annually to take account of any changes to partnership activity. The schedule will also be reviewed to consider Agreement renewal

dates and partner risk levels. The schedule remains under review annually as changing partner dynamics may affect the year in which they are reviewed

41   For newly established partnerships with a medium to high risk a full review will take place normally after a maximum of 3 years; for established partnerships or those with low risk reviews will normally take place every 5-6 years. Higher risk partnerships may be subject to more frequent reviews.

42   However, in exceptional circumstances, the University Partnerships Board may request a review of partnership arrangements at an earlier date (exceptional review) should evidence come to light that quality and/or standards may be at risk in a partnership arrangement.

43   The renewal of the agreement is based on the outcome of the periodic review and is carried out in conjunction with ongoing due diligence including a reassessment of the associated risk and any mitigation that is required.

44   Where a partner institution is in termination and is due to undergo a periodic review in the final year of delivery of the programme, the review will normally be brought forward by one year. This will allow the review panel to make recommendations in relation to the teach-out and the management of student experience throughout the period of transition.

45   Where the Partner has one or more programmes delivered on a validation basis, the review will include an academic review of the content of these programmes in addition to a review of their provision. The content of all programmes delivered under a Franchise arrangement will be excluded from consideration as these programmes are subject to scrutiny under the University's standard academic review procedures.

46   The preparation for the reviews will be managed by the Partnerships Team, who will liaise with the Partner and BNU School(s) to set the event date, timelines, documentation and panel requirements.

47   Reviews will typically take place during normal term-time. To avoid overlap with other monitoring activities, PPRs will normally be scheduled between December and March annually. Care will also be taken to try to avoid any major events or religious festivals.

Review Panel Membership

48   The size of the review panel will depend on the volume of partnership activity and breadth of the programme portfolio. The panel is appointed by the Partnership Team representative, who will also act as Secretary at the review event.

49   All review panels will be chaired by a senior member of staff at the University, normally a member of the University Management Group (UMG).

50   Membership of the review panel will also include

- an internal academic member of staff;

- one or more external subject specialist from another higher education institution and,

- a student member

51   External members will be sourced and nominated by the Partnership Tutor and approved by a Senior member of the School i.e. Head or Deputy Head of School. External members will receive a fee from the School payable at a standard University rate which will be reviewed regularly.

External members will also be able to claim reimbursement for any travel, subsistence and/or accommodation costs incurred in undertaking their role.

52 Student members will be nominated by the Partner. The student representatives should be a mix of final year students and, where possible, students who reflect the diversity of the student body. The minimum number of students is six and should range from all the different programmes under review. Where possible, the elected course representative should also be included.

53 To avoid the potential for bias, all panel members must be independent of the partner being reviewed and will be asked to declare any potential conflicts of interest as part of the nomination process.

54 PPRs will be supported by an Officer from the Partnerships Team who will act as the principal communication point with the partner and the Review Panel, ensuring that key deadlines are met, documentation is completed and provided to panel members on time. The Officer will also act as Secretary to the Review event itself and will draft a report of the PPR and its key findings.

55 Quorum will not be established without the presence of the Chair, the nominated internal academic and the Secretary. If unforeseen circumstances prevent an external academic from attending, the event can proceed but every effort should be taken to ensure that an in-absentia report is received from the external.

Roles and Responsibilities

56 Responsibilities are allocated as follows:

Chair	- to approve the event agenda - to approve the external academic reviewer(s) as a member of the panel - to facilitate and ensure the review event is conducted according to the approved process - to ensure all panel members are allowed an equal opportunity to participate in the discussions - to ensure that the partner is assessed comprehensively and objectively - to agree the outcome of the event
Secretary	- to inform the partner of the review - to set the review event date and agenda - to organise arrangements for panel members and break-out meetings - to compile and collate documentation - to manage the arrangements of the event e.g. room bookings, hospitality and communications with all parties - to extend invitation to externals - to process external fees and expenses - to prepare the final report and action plan - to advise on matters of process and regulations
Panel	- to read the review event documentation and prepare for the meeting by identifying areas of discussion which will form basis of the questioning of various staff and student groups. - to make a sound judgement on the evidence provided

	▪ to make recommendation to enhance activities or identify good practices for dissemination
Partner	▪ to prepare a self-evaluation document (SED) ▪ to provide all required documentation to the Secretary as requested and in a timely manner ▪ to manage arrangement of the event e.g. room bookings and hospitality

Documentation

57   The main document for the periodic review is the Self-Evaluation Document, which will form the focus of the review event. The document will set the scene for the panel and provide context for the review. This is likely to be the first document read by the panel and must be written collaboratively between the partner and partnership tutor(s) prior to the Review event itself.

58   The SED should be critically evaluative and strategic in nature and should consider objectively the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) of / to the partner. The SED should also explicitly highlight areas of good practice.

59   Supporting documentation will normally comprise of the following:

- A list of programmes delivered in the subject area;
- Partner Quality Reports and relevant Programme Monitoring Reports (or their equivalent);
- External Examiner reports and the School's response in each case;
- Student survey data, including NSS, PTES, PRES and any internal module or mid-semester survey results;
- The latest versions of Programme Handbooks and Programme Specifications;
- Relevant committee minutes, including programme committee records;
- The most recent PSRB report (as applicable);
- Operations Manual;
- Organisational and Governance Structures;
- Examples of Marketing Materials;
- Previous PPR Report & Action Plan (if applicable);
- Partnership Tutor Visit Reports;
- Staff Profiles

60   Where any such data is required to produce the SED, the University will be responsible for obtaining and sharing the datasets with its partners. Documentation will normally be provided for the two years prior to the review. Data will be displayed over a four-year period.

61   In preparation for the review, the partner is required to submit all relevant documentation to the Secretary. For overseas partners, all documentation should be submitted in English, with notarised translations of original foreign-language documentation where appropriate.

62   Once the documentation has been received, the Secretary will compile an electronic periodic review pack and distribute to all panel members in advance of the event. Documentation will be made available to panel members electronically, normally via Microsoft Teams.

Review Event

63 The review event takes place over a half or full day, depending on the size and nature of the partnership and normally takes place at the partner's prime location. The partner is responsible for liaising with the Secretary to make the arrangements for the day.

64 For overseas partners the review event is conducted in three stages as follows:

   a) A desk-based review of the documentation, followed by a written submission by all panel members

   b) A site visit to the overseas partner to meet with senior staff, academic teaching team and students

   c) A panel meeting to conclude the findings of the site visit and outcomes of the review

65 Given the logistical challenges of a full panel visiting an overseas partner, at a minimum the Chair and Secretary will undertake the visit.

66 The review event must follow a standard agenda template and include a tour of the partner's facilities. Further breakout meetings will occur as follows:

Senior Management Meeting

67 The review event usually starts with a meeting with the partner management, to discuss any matters relating to governance, management and leadership of the partner and discuss strategic plans and future direction.

Academic Teaching Team Meeting

68 The agenda will include a block of time in which the panel will discuss scholarly and research activity, staff development, and learning and teaching activity with the partner academic team. This meeting will also focus on student support mechanisms and the overall student experience and employability aspects.

Student Meeting

69 A meeting will be held with a group of students to discuss academic practices, support mechanisms, concerns and/or general experiences. The student meeting will supplement the written information provided in the review documentation, e.g. summaries of NSS results and actions taken in programme committees, in order to provide the panel with a comprehensive view of the mechanisms used to gain student feedback, the adequacy of these mechanisms, and whether feedback provides evidence of the satisfactory nature of the student experience.

University Meeting

70 The panel will meet with the partnership tutor(s) and PSE staff from the University, to discuss operational and quality matters and support mechanisms affecting the partnership.

Areas for Discussion

71 Where possible, similar themes should be explored at each periodic review event. Below is a list of areas which could be addressed:

Student Experience	- Student feedback and representation - Supporting students whilst they undertake the programme, both academic and pastoral - Access to online and physical resources

	▪ Escalating or raising a complaint
Quality and Standards	▪ Suitability and credentials of the partner staff to teach the curriculum ▪ Staff engagement with the wider sector in relation to research and professional development activities ▪ Staff development
Teaching, Learning & Assessments	▪ Effectiveness of teaching and learning approaches ▪ Marking, Moderation and Feedback
Employability	▪ Preparing students for the world of work ▪ Links with potential employers ▪ Supporting students through the course to enhance their overall employability
Partnerships	▪ Communication channels ▪ Support provided by the University ▪ Partnership Tutor role ▪ Resources and physical facilities

Outcome of Reviews

72 At the end of the review event, the Panel will meet to discuss the outcomes of the process. A unanimous decision of the panel is required for the conclusion of the review event.

73 These will include:

- confirmation on the **academic quality and standards** of the partner under review;
- Conclusion on the **partnership**;
- **commendations** for good practice and strengths of the area identified during the review;
- **recommendations** for enhancement of the subject area;
- **conditions** regarding areas where improvement is required and the timescale within which these must be met.

74 The Secretary will prepare a detailed report on the subject area drawing on both the documentation provided in advance, and records of discussions held during the review event itself. The report will include a rationale for how quality and standards can be confirmed and for any commendations, recommendations, and conditions identified.

75 The Partner with the School will be asked to discuss and initiate actions in response to any conditions and recommendations identified which will be incorporated into the final report which will be received by UPB and with an executive summary to Education Committee.

Record Keeping and Retention

76 PPR reports will normally be retained by the Partnerships Team for the current academic year plus five years in accordance with the Retention Scheme.

77 PPR reports will inform the production of the subsequent SED when the partner is scheduled for review where an update on progress against actions will be provided.

Guidance

78 Supplementary guidance on each process, including supporting documentation, is available via the Partnerships Team.

Appendix: Equality Impact Assessment

1. What is changing and why?
This is a new procedure which brings together and updates the previous Annual Monitoring and Partner Periodic Review processes ensuring that the University remains aligned to OfS requirements and sector practice – especially the QAA UK Quality Code. These processes include direct analysis of data drawn from the University Student Records System or collected through surveys.

2. What do you know?
Partners tend to recruit learners from areas of disadvantage who typically require greater levels of support. Without support such learners are at greater risk of underperformance or disengaging with their studies. The University is addressing gaps identified between demographic groups through its Access and Participation Plan (APP) and the processes in this document will support the APP by analysing gaps at programme and subject level and identifying actions to address these. In general, such activities should positively benefit all learners by improving quality and standards and the quality of the learner experience.

3. Assessing the impact

	Could benefit	May adversely impact	What does this mean? *Impacts identified from what you know (actual and potential)*	What can you do? *Actions (or why no action is possible) to advance equality of opportunity, eliminate discrimination, and foster good relations*
a) How could this affect different ethnicities? *Including Gypsy, Roma, Traveller, Showmen and Boaters, migrants, refugees and asylum seekers.*	☒	☐	Ethnicity data is collected for all learners in accordance with JISC / HESA data requirements enabling detailed analysis. The process could benefit learners by identifying and helping to address gaps identified.	Ensure that review activities are appropriately critical, and datasets clearly identify areas of weakness so that actions can be put in place.
b) How could this affect cisgender and transgender men and women (including maternity/pregnancy	☐	☐	Gender data is collected and stored on the University's student records system in accordance with JISC / HESA data. Data is limited, however, preventing analysis of this	Options are currently limited. As JISC / HESA data expands to include greater gender options, this will enable closer tracking thereby benefiting such learners.

impact), as well as non-binary people?			demographic. Although this cannot be tracked, there is no reason why the process should adversely affect such learners.	
c) How could this affect disabled people or carers? *Including neurodiversity, invisible disabilities and mental health conditions.*	☒	☐	Disability data is collected for all learners in accordance with JISC / HESA data requirements enabling detailed analysis. The process could benefit these learners by identifying and helping to address gaps identified.	Ensure that review activities are appropriately critical, and datasets clearly identify areas of weakness so that actions can be put in place.
d) How could this affect people from different faith groups?	☒	☐	Data on learners' religious beliefs is collected for all learners in accordance with JISC / HESA data requirements enabling detailed analysis. The process could benefit these learners by identifying and helping to address gaps identified.	Ensure that review activities are appropriately critical, and datasets clearly identify areas of weakness so that actions can be put in place. Additionally, consideration will be given to scheduling review activities to ensure that no learner is excluded by seeking to minimise review activities coinciding with major religious festivals.
e) How could this affect people with different sexual orientations?	☐	☐	Data on a learner's sexual orientation is collected for all learners in accordance with JISC / HESA data requirements enabling detailed analysis. At programme and subject level analysis is not advised as this could lead to individual learners becoming identifiable. This level of analysis is best undertaken at University level.	See across as to why this is not advisable.
f) How could this affect different age groups or generations?	☒	☐	Information on age is collected and analysed by age (young / mature learners – under or over 21 years of age on entry) in accordance with JISC / HESA data requirements. The process	Ensure that review activities are appropriately critical, and datasets clearly identify areas of weakness so that actions can be put in place.

			could benefit these learners by identifying and helping to address gaps identified.	
g) How could this affect those who are married or in a civil partnership?	☐	☐	Information is not analysed for marital status but there is no reason to indicate that the process might have any adverse impact.	No action recommended.
h) How could this affect people from different backgrounds such as: socio-economic disadvantage, homeless, alcohol and/or substance misuse, people experiencing domestic and/or sexual violence, ex-armed forces, looked after children and care leavers.	☒	☐	There is significant potential to benefit learners from areas of deprivation as there is an existing gap between IMD and an emerging gap between POLAR4 quintiles.	Ensure that review activities are appropriately critical, and datasets clearly identify areas of weakness so that actions can be put in place.
i) How could this affect people with multiple intersectional experiences?	☒	☐	Collectively, there is potential to benefit such learners, especially BAME males, and data is evolving to enable this.	Ensure that review activities are appropriately critical, and datasets clearly identify areas of weakness so that actions can be put in place.

4. Overall outcome

No major change needed ☒	Adjust approach ☐	Adverse impact but continue ☐	Stop and remove ☐

5. Details of further actions needed

No specific actions needed, beyond ensuring that data analysis continues to evolve, and the process meets any new APP requirements.

6. Arrangements for delivery and future monitoring

The process will be reviewed every five years in line with University requirements and when sector practice requires a change.

7. Completed by:	Shabana Hussain	Principal Partnerships Officer	**Date**	**25/04/2023**

8. **Signed off by:**	Ian Harper	Commercial & Business Development Director	**Date**	**25/04/2023**

High Wycombe Campus
Queen Alexandra Road
High Wycombe
Buckinghamshire
HP11 2JZ

Aylesbury Campus
59 Walton Street
Aylesbury
Buckinghamshire
HP21 7QG

Uxbridge Campus
106 Oxford Road
Uxbridge
Middlesex
UB8 1NA

**BNU based at
Pinewood Studios**

Pinewood Studios
Pinewood Road
Iver Heath
Buckinghamshire
SL0 0NH

Missenden Abbey
London Road
Great Missenden
Buckinghamshire
HP16 0BD

Telephone: 01494 522 141

BucksNewUni

BucksNewUni

BucksNewUni

BucksNewUniversity