



Self-Assessment Review Policy

POLICY DETAILS	
Policy Category:	Academic
Version Number:	V5
Approving Authority:	Academic Board
Approval Date	1 Sept 2025
Date Reviewed:	29 July 2025
Date of next review:	1 August 2026
Author:	Quality Manager
Owner (if different from above):	Principal
Compliance Measures:	1. Rewrote <i>Introduction</i> and updated it to a Purpose section. 2. Added a Scope section. 3. Added a Definitions section 4. Corrected numbering errors 5. Updated the SAR template to include <i>Educational Gains</i> guidance 6. Updated the SAR template to include <i>Programme Data Profile</i> guidance 7. Added clause 2.7
Related Policies / Procedures	Academic Board Terms of Reference Programme Committee Assessment Policy Internal Verification Policy Equal Opportunities and Diversity Statement BTEC HN - Guide to Quality Management Review BTEC HN - Guide to External Examination BTEC HN - Guide to Quality Assurance Higher Nationals in Business specification
Effective Date:	01/09/2025

1 Purpose

- 1.1 To deliver its strategic policy aims of excellence in Curriculum Innovation, Learning, Teaching and Assessment and the Student Experience, Results Consortium Ltd. (thereafter 'the College') implements structured processes for the annual review of programme standards and quality, involving programme staff, collaborative partners and student representatives.

These are referred to as Self-Assessment Reviews (SARs). The purpose is to ensure each programme is relevant to the needs of students, employers and the community and that students' educational gain is measurable. It is carried out objectively and collaboratively, aiming for continuous improvement of the student experience and student outcomes.

- 1.2 SARs form part of the College's compliance with the Office for Students' (OfS) Conditions of Registration and contribute to meeting the criteria for the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF).

2. Scope

This policy covers all higher education programmes offered by the College. It sets out how self-assessment reviews (SARs) are to be carried out each year at both programme and organisational level. The policy applies to Programme Leaders, teaching staff, the Quality Team, senior managers and student representatives involved in the delivery or review of programmes.

3. Definitions

Academic Board: The committee responsible for academic governance, including oversight of the SAR process.

Educational Gain: The measurable improvement in knowledge, skills, behaviours and outcomes made by students over the course of their programme. There are 17 in total.

Quality Improvement Plan (QIP): A document that records the actions identified through the SAR process to address areas for improvement and maintain good practice.

Self-Assessment Review (SAR): An annual review of a programme's quality and standards, completed by the Programme Leader using feedback, data and evidence from the academic year.

4. Procedures and Responsibilities

- 4.1 The Academic Board is responsible for implementation of procedures.

- 4.2 Programme Leaders are responsible for the management of regular Programme Committee and team meetings, including scheduling, agenda setting, minute keeping, action plans and implementation. They are also responsible for completing the SAR form at programme level (see appendix) by the date specified in the Quality calendar.
- 4.3 Programme Leaders are responsible for the collection of data and module feedback from reliable sources. These include:
- Student feedback
 - The previous year's Quality Improvement Plan (QIP)
 - Awarding Organisation (AO) Annual Programme Monitoring Report, or Partner Quarterly Reviews
 - Issues raised at, and feedback from, Programme Committee meetings
 - Feedback from the Lead Internal Verifier on good and innovative practice, programme highlights and scholarly activity
 - External Examiner Reports
 - Feedback from academic staff on good and innovative practice and programme highlights
 - Feedback from the Academic, Assessment and Progress Boards
 - Academic Misconduct records
 - Student engagement records
 - Data such as unit academic achievement by characteristics such as age, sex, nationality, assessment and internal verification records, recruitment, retention, continuation, completion, progression, destinations, attendance, punctuality.
 - Staff development activities and records
 - Observation of Teaching, Learning and Assessment (OTLA) records
 - Managers, at their discretion, may include other data that inform the programme quality improvement process.
- 4.4 The Principal is responsible for the completion of an Annual Review Report and for submission to the Awarding Organisation of an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) form by the February following an academic year end in August, or as required by partners.
- 4.5 Programme Leads are responsible for the implementation of the planned actions identified through the SAR process, as identified on the Quality Improvement Plan (QIP). The Quality Manager is responsible for monitoring and supporting completion of the actions identified in the programme level QIPs and reporting to the Principal and CEO.
- 4.6 The Quality Manager is responsible for collating SARs and QIPs at programme level to inform and produce the SAR and QIP across the

organisation. The SAR process is standardised across programmes to promote consistency in reporting, evaluation and action planning.

Appendix A: Higher Education Self-Assessment Review: Programme SAR

Programme Title and Level		Programme Leader	
Awarding Organisation		Cohort(s) and year of completion	

1	Context
Briefly describe the programme, where and when it was delivered and by whom, and the cohort student profile.	

2	Curriculum Overview
Briefly describe the curriculum, how it was sequenced to be coherent and challenging, how it meets local needs, and who was involved in creating it. What is the intent?	

3	Programme Data Profile				
3a	Number of starts	10	3g	Continuation (The percentage of students who remain in active study (including those repeating or re-sitting) 12 months after their official commencement/registration excluding those who withdrew early, transferred to another provider, or entered dormant or sabbatical status)	%
3b	Early withdrawals (within 6 weeks)	2	3h	Completion (finished and achieved the planned credits for <i>that year</i> within .. months of start date)	%
3c	Students for completion rate (3a minus 3b)	8	3i	Progression (The percentage of higher	Professional employment %

3d	Withdrawals (after 6 weeks on programme)	1		education graduates who, 15 months after qualifying, report a positive outcome in the Graduate Outcomes survey. This includes progression to professional or managerial employment, further study (at any level), travelling, caring responsibilities or retirement. Only survey respondents are counted.	Further study at a higher level	%
3e	Total number of students retained (3c minus 3d)				Travelling; Retirement; Caring for sick or disabled relative	%
3f	Retention (3e as a % of 3c)	%			No progression	%

Judgements are required for sections 4-7 using the TEF ratings below.

Gold	This feature is embedded across the programme and of outstanding quality.
Silver	This feature is embedded across the programme and of high quality.
Bronze	There is evidence of this feature at the standard expected.
Requires improvement	There is no, or minimal, evidence of this, and/or the quality is below expectation and therefore it is an area of concern.

- Evaluate the programme for each statement below.
- Change the colour of the box for each statement code to reflect your judgement.
- Include comments about how this was achieved, giving specific examples.
- Provide sources of evidence for each statement that can prove your judgement.

4	Academic Experience and Assessment	Comments and Evidence
SE1a	Teaching effectively supported students' learning, progression and achievement.	
B4.4	Teaching supported proficiency in the English language.	

SE1b	Feedback and assessment practices effectively supported learning, progression and achievement.	
B4.2	Assessment was valid and reliable; awards were credible.	
SE2a	Course content and delivery engaged students.	
SE2b	Students were stretched and challenged to develop their knowledge and skills.	
SE3a	Research and innovation related to the subject discipline and professional practice contributed to the student experience.	
SE3b	Employer engagement contributed to the student experience.	

5	Resources, Support, Student Engagement	Comments and Evidence
SE4	CPD for programme staff supported academic practice.	
SE5a	The learning environment was supportive.	
SE5b	There was a range of academic support personalised to individuals' needs.	
SE6	Physical and virtual learning resources supported teaching and learning.	
SE7	Staff used student voice to improve students' experiences and outcomes.	

6	Positive Outcomes	Comments and Evidence
SO1	Support and guidance helped students succeed in and beyond their studies.	
SO2	Positive outcomes met or exceeded 80% for continuation and 75% for completion.	
SO3	Progression rates met or exceeded 60% within 15 months of completion.	

7	Educational Gains	Comments and Evidence
SO4 and SO5	Programme intent statement in section 2 of this SAR is clear. It includes what students will achieve and why this is relevant to them. Evaluate the extent to which your intent for this programme has been met. What evidence do you have to justify your evaluative statements?	

SO5 and SO6	Results' intended educational gains are for students to be: Communicative Confident Creative Curious Collaborative Resourceful Responsible Respectful Resilient Reflective Self-aware Entrepreneurial Adaptable Solutions-focussed Accountable Leaders and influencers Technological To what extent are students on the programme making these educational gains? How do you know?	How are educational gains measured? There are many ways. However, the evidence for whether students have achieved the intended educational gains is obtained through the following mechanisms, as outlined in Results Consortium's Educational Gain Statement: Initial Skills Assessment - Conducted at the beginning of a student's course. - Uses self-reporting to establish a baseline for each of the 17 identified skills and attributes. Exit Self-Report Survey - Completed at the end of the course. - Allows comparison with baseline data to evaluate the distance travelled in each skill area. These two tools form a before-and-after measurement framework, enabling the College to assess individual development and collective educational impact. Additional triangulation may include portfolios, engagement data and feedback.
----------------------------	---	---

8 Summary of Key Strengths

Summarise the key strengths of the programme that have emerged during self-assessment review. Reflect on why they are strengths and how you could apply your successful approaches to areas for development.

How can you share best practice with others?

-
-

9 Summary of Key Areas for Improvement

Highlight the key improvements identified during programme self-assessment.

These will inform your programme's Quality Improvement Plan. Who/what can help you with them?

-