



UK COLLEGE
OF BUSINESS AND COMPUTING

Student Support and Experience Framework

Institutional Framework for Student Success, Safeguarding and Experience

Policy no:	SLCC 6.10
Version no. & date:	Version 1.0 – 23 October 2026
Author:	Chief Academic Officer
Policy Owner:	Head of Student Support and Experience
Last review date:	23 October 2026
Next review due:	October 2028
Responsible Committee:	Quality of Education Committee
Approved by & date:	Quality of Education Committee – 23 October 2026
External reference points:	Office for Students (OfS) Regulatory Framework, Conditions of Registration B1, B2, B3, B7 and E6; OfS Condition B: Quality and Standards guidance; Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Principle 10; Equality Act 2010; UK General Data Protection Regulation and Data Protection Act 2018; Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) Higher education: consumer law advice for providers; Prevent Duty Guidance for further and higher education; Keeping Children Safe in Education
Linked policies:	ASQ 1.1 Quality Assurance and Enhancement Policy; ASQ 1.4 Teaching and Learning Strategy; ASQ 1.5 Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure; DIG 2.1 Data Protection and Confidentiality Policy; GA 3.1 Policy Preparation and Version Control Guidance; GA 3.2 Risk Management Framework; GA 3.3 Corporate and Academic Governance Framework; SLCC 6.3 Complaints Policy; SLCC 6.5 Student Withdrawal, Suspension and Transfer Policy; SLCC 6.8 Attendance and Engagement Policy; SLCC 6.13 Student Protection and Material Changes Policy; SLCC 6.14 Student At Risk and Intervention Framework; SWS 7.3 Sexual Harassment and Misconduct Policy; SWS 7.7 Safeguarding and Prevent Policy
Audience:	Students, Staff

Contents

1. Purpose	8
2. Scope	8
3. Definitions	8
Academic support	9
Pastoral support	9
Safeguarding	9
Engagement	9
Risk	9
Tiered intervention	9
Attendance and Engagement Dashboard	9
Personal Academic Tutoring (PAT)	9
Case management	9
Quality of Education Committee (QoE)	9
Academic Risk Register	10
4. Policy Statement	10
4.1 The Student Experience	10
5. Understanding the Student Cohort and Academic Risk Profile	10
5.1 Cohort characteristics	10
5.2 Identified academic risk factors	12
5.2.1 Academic language and communication	12
5.2.2 Assessment literacy and academic conventions	12
5.2.3 Academic confidence and socialisation	12
5.2.4 Competing demands on time and attention	12
5.3 Implications for the College's support approach	12
5.4 Regulatory positioning of the cohort narrative	12
6. Strategic and Regulatory Alignment	13
6.1 Alignment with UKCBC Strategy 2030	13
6.2 Alignment with the Teaching and Learning Strategy (ASQ 1.4)	13
6.3 Alignment with OfS Conditions of Registration	13
6.4 Alignment with the QAA Quality Code: Principle 10	13
6.5 Alignment with awarding body and partnership expectations	14
7. Student Support Strategy and Core Principles	14
7.1 The College's approach	14
7.2 Core principles	14
7.2.1 Proactivity	14
7.2.2 Embeddedness	14

7.2.3 Proportionality	14
7.2.4 Student centricity	14
7.2.5 Data informed delivery	15
7.2.6 Non punitive early stages	15
7.2.7 Accountability and auditability	15
7.3 Minimum support entitlements	15
8. Strategic Levers, Methods and Tactics	15
8.1 The five strategic levers	15
8.1.1 Lever One: Embedded academic literacy and English language support	15
8.1.2 Lever Two: Structured Personal Academic Tutoring	16
8.1.3 Lever Three: Proactive engagement monitoring and outreach	16
8.1.4 Lever Four: Integrated pastoral, wellbeing and safeguarding provision	16
8.1.5 Lever Five: Student voice, representation and co design	16
8.2 How the levers work together	16
9. Student Support and Experience Offer	17
9.1 The six domains of the support offer	17
9.1.1 Academic skills and study success	17
9.1.2 English language support	17
9.1.3 Wellbeing and pastoral support	17
9.1.4 Financial support and hardship	17
9.1.5 Time management and balancing study	17
9.1.6 Safeguarding, harassment and sexual misconduct support	17
9.2 Information, advice and guidance within the offer	18
9.3 What students can expect from the offer	18
9.4 How the offer is communicated	18
10. Omni Channel Access and Service Design	18
10.1 Channels of access	18
10.1.1 In person	18
10.1.2 Digital	19
10.1.3 Telephone	19
10.1.4 Outreach	19
10.1.5 Asynchronous	19
10.2 Consistency across channels	19
10.3 Service level expectations	19
10.4 Accessibility of the service	19
10.5 Integration with case management	19
11. Information, Advice and Guidance	20
11.1 Definitions used in this framework	20

11.1.1 Information	20
11.1.2 Advice.....	20
11.1.3 Guidance	20
11.2 Where IAG is delivered	20
11.3 Quality standards for IAG	20
11.4 Boundary conditions	20
11.5 Assurance and consumer protection	21
12. Safeguarding, Sexual Harassment and Misconduct	21
12.1 Scope of provision	21
12.2 Accountable roles.....	21
12.3 Reporting pathways	21
12.3.1 Named reporting	22
12.3.2 Digital reporting.....	22
12.3.3 Anonymous reporting	22
12.3.4 External reporting	22
12.4 Case management principles.....	22
12.5 Initial assessment and precautionary measures	22
12.6 Investigation, hearing and appeal	22
12.7 Outcomes	23
12.8 Support for reporting parties and respondents	23
12.9 Staff and student relationships.....	23
12.10 Training and awareness.....	23
12.11 Confidentiality and information sharing	23
12.12 Record keeping and governance oversight	24
12.13 Integration with the wider support system.....	24
13. Integration with Teaching, Curriculum and Assessment.....	24
13.1 Teaching practice as student support	24
13.2 Curriculum design for support.....	24
13.3 Assessment as support.....	24
13.4 Expectations of academic staff	25
14. English Language and Academic Skills Support	25
14.1 Embedded English language support.....	25
14.2 Structured academic skills provision	25
14.3 Risk based intensification	25
14.4 Assurance	25
15. Early Identification and Tiered Intervention Model	26
15.1 The four stage model.....	26
15.1.1 Identification.....	26

15.1.2 Intervention.....	26
15.1.3 Escalation.....	26
15.1.4 Assurance.....	26
15.2 Risk categorisation and thresholds.....	26
15.3 The tiered intervention model.....	27
15.3.1 Tier One: Universal entitlement.....	27
15.3.2 Tier Two: Early stage intervention	27
15.3.3 Tier Three: Targeted intervention	27
15.3.4 Tier Four: Intensive intervention and formal outcome.....	27
15.4 Consistency across programmes	28
16. Roles, Responsibilities and Resourcing.....	28
16.1 Strategic accountability	28
16.2 Operational leadership roles	28
16.2.1 Head of Student Support and Experience	28
16.2.2 Student Support and Experience Manager	28
16.2.3 Head of School.....	28
16.2.4 Academic Registrar	29
16.2.5 Head of Registry	29
16.3 Frontline delivery roles.....	29
16.3.1 Personal Academic Tutor.....	29
16.3.2 Assistant Lecturer	29
16.3.3 Student Support and Experience Officer.....	29
16.3.4 Academic staff	29
16.4 The Attendance Working Group	30
16.5 Training and competence.....	30
16.6 Capacity review and adjustment	30
17. Data, Monitoring and Risk.....	30
17.1 The Attendance and Engagement Dashboard.....	30
17.2 Data governance.....	31
17.3 Framework indicators and reporting cadence	31
17.4 Integration with institutional risk.....	31
18. Engagement and Student Voice	31
18.1 Institutional representation structures	31
18.2 Feedback mechanisms	31
18.3 Closing the loop.....	32
19. Governance, Oversight and Accountability.....	32
19.1 Governance ownership	32
19.2 Governance architecture for this framework	32

19.3 Reporting cadence.....	32
19.4 Escalation	32
19.5 How governance drives improvement.....	33
20. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion	33
20.1 Principles	33
20.2 Inclusive design	33
20.3 Differential outcome analysis.....	33
20.4 Training and culture	33
21. Outcomes, Impact and Theory of Change.....	34
21.1 Theory of change	34
21.2 Intended outcomes and numerical targets.....	34
21.3 Evidence base for improvement	35
22. External Quality Alignment	35
22.1 OfS Conditions of Registration	35
22.2 QAA Quality Code: Principle 10	35
22.3 Partnership and awarding body expectations	36
23. Monitoring, Evaluation and Continuous Improvement	36
23.1 Evaluation approach	36
23.2 Evidence base	36
23.3 Continuous improvement	36
23.4 Framework review cycle.....	36
24. Regulatory Positioning and Assurance Statement.....	36
24.1 Sufficiency statement	37
24.2 Credibility statement	37
24.3 Outcomes statement.....	37
24.4 Safeguarding and student protection statement	37
25. Linked Policies	37
26. External References	38
27. Version Control Table	38
Version History	38

1. Purpose

This framework establishes the institutional approach by which UK College of Business and Computing (UKCBC) supports every student to succeed academically, to remain engaged, to progress through their programme and to complete their award with confidence. It articulates the philosophy, strategic levers, operating model, resourcing assumptions, governance and assurance that together constitute the College's response to its duty of care under the Office for Students (OfS) Conditions of Registration and the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

The framework exists primarily to evidence compliance with OfS Condition B2, which requires the College to take all reasonable steps to ensure that each cohort of students receives academic experience and support sufficient for successful continuation, completion and positive progression. It simultaneously underpins credibility under Condition B7 by demonstrating that the College has the governance, capacity and resources to deliver its plans in practice, and it provides the operational architecture through which Condition B3 outcomes are achieved. It aligns with the QAA Quality Code Principle 10 expectation that providers facilitate a coherent framework of support enabling students to achieve their potential.

The framework is designed to be read as an integrated institutional statement, not a standard operating procedure. It explains how the College thinks about support, how it designs services around identified student need, how delivery is resourced, how effectiveness is monitored, and how governance holds the system to account. Operational procedures that sit beneath the framework are referenced and linked but are not reproduced in full.

The framework describes support from two perspectives that are given equal weight. The first is the institutional perspective: how the College designs, resources, governs and assures its support system. The second is the student perspective: what a student can expect to experience as they engage with their programme. The consolidated Student Support and Experience Offer, set out in Section 9, is written explicitly from the student perspective; the Omni Channel Access and Service Design (Section 10), Information, Advice and Guidance (Section 11) and Safeguarding, Sexual Harassment and Misconduct (Section 12) sections describe how that offer is accessed, delivered and safeguarded in practice.

2. Scope

This framework applies to all students registered on higher education provision delivered by UKCBC, whether directly or through franchise, validation or other partnership arrangement. It covers undergraduate, postgraduate taught, foundation year and pre registration provision, and applies equally to students studying in teach out arrangements or subject to interrupted study.

It applies to all staff with responsibility for the design, delivery, oversight or assurance of student facing services, including academic staff, student support staff, registry, quality assurance, and executive leadership. It extends to awarding body partners where support delivery forms part of a shared quality assurance agreement, and to external providers commissioned to deliver specialist support such as counselling or disability services.

The framework sits within the College's Corporate and Academic Governance Framework (GA 3.3) and is consistent with the Policy Preparation and Version Control Guidance (GA 3.1). Where this framework refers to other policies, it establishes direction and expectation; the operational detail resides within the referenced policy or standard operating procedure.

3. Definitions

The following terms are used throughout this framework.

Academic support

Any activity delivered by the College, by its staff or by its partners, that is designed to develop a student's academic capability, confidence or assessment readiness. Academic support includes in class scaffolding, personal academic tutoring, diagnostic and formative activity, embedded academic literacy, referencing and study skills provision, and timely feedback on assessed work.

Pastoral support

Structured activity delivered by the Student Support and Experience function that addresses a student's personal, welfare, financial, inclusion or social circumstances where these affect, or may affect, their academic engagement, attendance, continuation or outcomes.

Safeguarding

The institutional response to concerns relating to the welfare, protection or safety of a student, including statutory safeguarding duties, Prevent responsibilities and the College's institutional response to sexual harassment and misconduct as set out in SWS 7.3.

Engagement

A composite construct encompassing timetabled attendance, meaningful participation, assessment submission, contact responsiveness and interaction with the virtual learning environment. The framework distinguishes between attendance as presence and true attendance as sustained, meaningful participation.

Risk

In the context of this framework, the likelihood that a student will fail to continue, complete or progress within expected parameters, or the likelihood that a pattern of disengagement or distress will crystallise into a safeguarding, welfare or academic integrity concern.

Tiered intervention

The College's graduated response to identified risk, beginning with universal entitlement, moving through early stage, targeted and intensive intervention, and concluding, where necessary, with formal outcome processes managed through registry.

Attendance and Engagement Dashboard

The institutional operational dashboard that consolidates attendance, engagement and assessment submission data to provide real time visibility of student risk at individual, cohort and programme level.

Personal Academic Tutoring (PAT)

The structured tutorial model through which every student is allocated a named academic contact responsible for developmental conversations, academic progress review and first line academic guidance.

Case management

The threshold driven, data informed, auditable process through which Student Support and Experience Officers manage allocated caseloads of students identified as being at emerging, high or critical risk.

Quality of Education Committee (QoE)

The deliberative committee of the Academic Board responsible for scrutiny of quality, standards, programme performance, Condition B compliance, student feedback, engagement and academic support. QoE is the principal governance owner of this framework.

Academic Risk Register

The institutional register recording academic risks, including risks to continuation, progression, assessment integrity and student protection, maintained by the Academic Registrar and scrutinised by QoE.

4. Policy Statement

UKCBC is committed to supporting every student to succeed. The College recognises that its student body includes a significant proportion of mature learners, students for whom English is not a first language, and students balancing study with work, caring responsibilities or complex personal circumstances. The College treats the academic risks that these characteristics create as predictable and addressable, not as individual deficits. It therefore designs its support framework to be proactive, embedded, structured and proportionate to need, rather than optional, self referred and uniform.

The College commits, through this framework, to take all reasonable steps to ensure that each cohort of students receives the support necessary to achieve successful continuation, completion and positive progression. It commits to resourcing that support credibly, governing it rigorously and improving it continuously in response to evidence.

From the student's perspective, the College commits that every student will know what support is available to them, will be able to access it through a channel that fits their circumstances, will be supported proactively rather than being expected to find support on their own, and will be listened to when support is not working as intended. The detail of that commitment is articulated in the Student Support and Experience Offer (Section 9) and in the access model set out in Section 10.

4.1 The Student Experience

UKCBC aims to give every student an experience in which they feel they belong, are known by name, and are challenged and supported to achieve their potential. We want students to experience a welcoming and inclusive community; teaching that is applied, stretching and connected to the world of work; clear and timely information; and staff who are approachable, respond promptly and treat them with respect.

This matters because students who feel connected to their programme, their peers and their tutors are more likely to engage, continue, complete and progress. A positive experience is therefore not separate from student success; it is one of its foundations.

Every member of staff contributes to that experience. Academic staff create it through their teaching, feedback and personal academic tutoring; the Student Support and Experience Team through its welcome, guidance, enrichment and student voice activity; and professional services staff through accurate, courteous and timely service. Staff are expected to model the College's values in every interaction, to act on student feedback and to close the feedback loop, so that students can see how their views shape the College.

5. Understanding the Student Cohort and Academic Risk Profile

The foundation of this framework is the College's understanding of who its students are and why they require a support model designed around their specific academic context. Support is not generic; it is shaped by cohort need. The OfS expectation under Condition B2 that support provision is weighted according to cohort academic need cannot be demonstrated in the absence of a clear cohort narrative. This section sets out that narrative.

5.1 Cohort characteristics

UKCBC recruits predominantly into applied business, computing and allied disciplines. The student body differs in meaningful ways from the traditional eighteen to twenty one year old higher education entrant. The following cohort profile draws on institutional records maintained by the Academic Registrar and is reviewed by the Quality of Education Committee. Two reference cohorts are used throughout this framework: the current enrolled population of 1,237 students and the four year rolling average of 4,553 students, which provides a stable longitudinal baseline against which year on year movement can be interpreted.

The age profile is consistent across both reference cohorts, with an average age of 37 years. This is a mature population by sector standards and the support model is therefore designed around the academic, personal and employment pressures that mature learners typically carry. The sex distribution is broadly balanced. In the current cohort, students are recorded as 52.71 per cent female and 47.29 per cent male. Across the four year rolling average the figures are 50.54 per cent female and 49.46 per cent male. Declared disability stands at 5.74 per cent of the current cohort and 3.36 per cent across the four year average, indicating a modest but rising trend in disclosure that the College supports through its inclusive learning and reasonable adjustment arrangements.

The cohort is drawn overwhelmingly from UK and EU domicile populations. In the current cohort, UK domicile students represent approximately 18 per cent of enrolment (218 students) and EU domicile students represent at least 72 per cent (a minimum of 889 students identified within the ten most represented nationalities). Across the four year rolling cohort, UK domicile students represent approximately 14 per cent (644 students) and EU domicile students represent at least 77 per cent (a minimum of 3,508 students identified within the ten most represented nationalities). These domicile proportions are derived from the nationality distribution held in the Population Dashboard and are presented as a proxy for domicile pending formal reconciliation against the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) domicile classification. The clear implication is that a significant proportion of students are studying in English as an additional language and that the cultural and educational reference points of UK higher education cannot be assumed as shared starting conditions.

The cohort's access and participation profile is a defining feature of the College's mission. Using the Tracking Underrepresentation by Area (TUNDRA) measure, the current cohort comprises 32.58 per cent Quintile 5, 22.31 per cent Quintile 4, 11.16 per cent Quintile 3, 11.08 per cent Quintile 2 and 9.22 per cent Quintile 1, with 13.18 per cent unclassified. The four year rolling cohort shows a comparable pattern, at 38.96 per cent Quintile 5, 22.34 per cent Quintile 4, 12.89 per cent Quintile 3, 10.52 per cent Quintile 2, 9.40 per cent Quintile 1 and 5.34 per cent unclassified. Quintile 5 and Quintile 4 learners combined represent between 54 and 61 per cent of enrolment, confirming that UKCBC serves a student body drawn substantively from areas of low historical higher education participation. This is a core widening participation population and the framework treats that fact as central to its design rather than incidental to it.

Engagement data reinforces the rationale for a proactive, embedded support model. Overall attendance, measured across timetabled sessions, stands at 89.90 per cent in the current cohort and 89.04 per cent across the four year rolling average. True attendance, which measures sustained presence across the full learning week rather than single session attendance, stands at 61.13 per cent in the current cohort and 63.70 per cent across the rolling average. Within the four year cohort, approximately 19.17 per cent of students (873 learners) are identified as at risk through institutional engagement monitoring. The gap between overall and true attendance is the principal operational signal the College uses to target early intervention, and is described further in Section 8.

Taken together, these characteristics describe a student body that is mature, internationally diverse, linguistically varied, drawn substantively from widening participation backgrounds, and subject to the practical pressures of combining higher education with employment and caring responsibilities. A significant proportion of students are studying in English as an additional language. Many students enter with prior qualifications that, while meeting entry requirements, may not have fully prepared them for the

expectations of UK higher education assessment and independent learning. These characteristics are not treated as deficits; they are recognised as creating predictable academic risks that the College actively addresses through the design of its teaching, support and engagement model.

5.2 Identified academic risk factors

Drawing on analysis of progression patterns, engagement data and assessment performance, the College identifies four recurrent academic risk factors within its student body. Each factor informs the design of the support model set out in subsequent sections.

5.2.1 Academic language and communication

Students studying in English as an additional language may demonstrate strong conceptual understanding but experience difficulty in academic writing, critical argumentation and the interpretation of assessment briefs. Without structured and embedded support, this gap can depress assessment performance, confidence and progression.

5.2.2 Assessment literacy and academic conventions

Many students are unfamiliar with UK higher education assessment norms, including referencing conventions, expectations relating to the use of sources, expectations of originality, and the relationship between learning outcomes, marking criteria and feedback. Where this familiarity is absent, the risk of underperformance and inadvertent academic misconduct rises materially.

5.2.3 Academic confidence and socialisation

Mature learners may lack confidence in participating in seminars, seeking clarification or challenging academic ideas. This reticence can mask underlying academic difficulty, delay help seeking and defer intervention until difficulty has already affected engagement or submission.

5.2.4 Competing demands on time and attention

Students balancing academic study with employment, caring responsibilities or complex personal circumstances may struggle to sustain consistent attendance, to engage with independent study and to submit on time. The gap between overall attendance (currently 89.90 per cent) and true attendance (currently 61.13 per cent) is the clearest operational expression of this risk, and the at risk population identified across the four year rolling cohort (approximately 19.17 per cent or 873 students) confirms that it affects a material minority of the student body at any given time. This risk is structural rather than attitudinal and requires a proactive, planned response rather than reactive monitoring.

5.3 Implications for the College's support approach

In light of these risks, the College has concluded that a standard higher education support model based on optional workshops and student self referral would be insufficient. The College therefore adopts a proactive, embedded and structured approach to academic and pastoral support, underpinned by five commitments that recur throughout this framework. First, academic support is an integral part of teaching and curriculum delivery, not an add on service. Second, early identification of academic risk is essential and is undertaken within the first weeks of study. Third, support is normalised and routinely experienced by every student, with additional intensity where risk is identified. Fourth, academic staff have a central role in delivering and reinforcing support, and are equipped and supported to do so. Fifth, decisions about support intensity are data informed, threshold driven and auditable.

5.4 Regulatory positioning of the cohort narrative

This cohort informed approach enables the College to demonstrate that it takes all reasonable steps to ensure that each cohort receives academic support sufficient to enable success, in accordance with

OfS Condition B2. It provides the contextual basis for demonstrating the credibility of the College's plans under Condition B7, and the likelihood that these plans will improve continuation, completion and progression outcomes under Condition B3. It also aligns with QAA Principle 10, which anticipates that the support framework scaffolds the academic, personal and professional learning journey of every student.

6. Strategic and Regulatory Alignment

This section sets out how the framework connects to the College's strategic priorities, to its statutory and regulatory obligations, and to sector expectations. Alignment is articulated not as a list of references but as a statement of purpose against each anchor.

6.1 Alignment with UKCBC Strategy 2030

UKCBC Strategy 2030 states that the enduring purpose of the College is to enable opportunity, cultivate confidence and develop capability through applied learning grounded in authentic experiences for its learners. Strategy 2030 is organised around four pillars covering approach to education, people, learning community and operational excellence. This framework gives operational meaning to Pillar 1 commitments that learner support is personalised, joined up and accessible across the learner journey, that educators and support teams are developed to build capability in applied pedagogy and inclusive approaches, and that teaching practice is reflective and adaptive, informed by diagnostic insight.

The framework also gives effect to Pillar 2 commitments that every colleague has a clear understanding of their role and contribution to learner experience, that performance is managed through regular, evidence based conversations, and that professional development is planned, role appropriate and aligned to applied learning. The operating model in Section 16 translates those people commitments into specific expectations for the staff delivering support.

6.2 Alignment with the Teaching and Learning Strategy (ASQ 1.4)

This framework operates in direct partnership with the College's Teaching and Learning Strategy, Cultivating Capability (ASQ 1.4). Where that strategy sets out how teaching is designed, delivered and enhanced, this framework sets out how students are supported to succeed within that teaching. The two documents are intentionally interdependent. Teaching is the primary vehicle of student support within UKCBC; this framework articulates the structures, identification mechanisms, interventions and governance that surround and strengthen teaching.

6.3 Alignment with OfS Conditions of Registration

The framework anchors primarily to OfS Condition B2, which requires that the College delivers a high quality academic experience for every student and takes all reasonable steps to ensure that each cohort receives resources and support sufficient to succeed. Condition B2 is treated as the primary condition this framework exists to satisfy. Condition B3 is treated as the consequence the framework is designed to produce, measured through the lagging indicators of continuation, completion and progression. Condition B1 is engaged through the framework's articulation of how teaching and curriculum design function as student support. Condition B7 is engaged through the framework's explicit articulation of capacity, resourcing and governance, such that the OfS can reasonably test the credibility of delivery in practice. Condition E6 is engaged through the framework's integration with safeguarding, harassment and sexual misconduct responsibilities held within the Student Support and Experience function.

6.4 Alignment with the QAA Quality Code: Principle 10

QAA Principle 10 provides that providers facilitate a framework of support for students that enables them to have a high quality learning experience and to achieve their potential as they progress in their studies. This framework operationalises that principle by scaffolding the academic, personal and professional learning journey, by supporting students at key transition points, by ensuring that staff are appropriately qualified and supported, and by ensuring that students are aware of and supported to access academic, professional and pastoral services throughout their learning journey.

6.5 Alignment with awarding body and partnership expectations

Where provision is delivered under franchise, validation or other partnership arrangement, this framework operates in a manner consistent with the expectations of the awarding partner. Partner specific requirements are incorporated through the Partnership Quality Assurance arrangements maintained by the Academic Registrar and the relevant Head of School. Section 13 of this framework details the integration between academic and support delivery across partnership models.

7. Student Support Strategy and Core Principles

This section states the College's approach to supporting students. It is deliberately written as a strategic statement rather than a procedural checklist, because the approach determines the design of everything that follows.

7.1 The College's approach

UKCBC supports students to succeed through a coordinated system of embedded academic support, structured personal academic tutoring, proactive engagement monitoring, tiered intervention and integrated pastoral provision. Support is delivered through the curriculum first, reinforced by dedicated academic and support staff, and governed by clear thresholds and escalation routes. The system is designed to be proactive rather than reactive, to be structured rather than discretionary, and to be proportionate rather than uniform.

7.2 Core principles

Seven principles guide every decision about the design and delivery of student support at UKCBC.

7.2.1 Proactivity

The College does not wait for students to identify difficulty and ask for help. Engagement, attendance and assessment data are monitored continuously and used to initiate contact where concerns emerge. Support reaches the student before the student has to reach for support.

7.2.2 Embeddedness

Academic support is integral to teaching and curriculum, not an optional adjunct. Academic literacy, assessment literacy, referencing and critical thinking are scaffolded within modules, within tutorial activity and within feedback, so that every student routinely experiences support as part of the academic experience.

7.2.3 Proportionality

All students receive a defined baseline entitlement. Students identified as at emerging, high or critical risk receive additional, structured support calibrated to the level and nature of that risk. Proportionality is operationalised through the tiered intervention model set out in Section 15.

7.2.4 Student centricity

Support is designed around student reality, not around institutional convenience. Service design, channels of access, intervention tone and timing all reflect an understanding of the competing demands that students manage and the language and confidence with which they engage.

7.2.5 Data informed delivery

Decisions about support intensity, thresholds and escalation are driven by validated institutional data. The Attendance and Engagement Dashboard provides real time visibility; the Attendance Working Group operates as the triage mechanism; case management records decisions and outcomes for audit and review.

7.2.6 Non punitive early stages

At emerging risk stages, contact is supportive, exploratory and non punitive in tone. The intent is to understand circumstances, remove barriers and re engage. Formal or procedural consequences only apply once supportive intervention has been exhausted or where statutory duties require earlier action.

7.2.7 Accountability and auditability

Every support activity is recorded, every threshold is documented, every escalation is logged. This enables the framework to withstand regulatory scrutiny and to generate the evidence required for continuous improvement.

7.3 Minimum support entitlements

Every student registered at UKCBC is entitled, as a minimum, to the following support irrespective of identified risk. This is the baseline the College commits to under Condition B2. First, a structured induction and transition programme, including diagnostic activity designed to identify academic risk within the first weeks of study. Second, a named Personal Academic Tutor with scheduled tutorial contact across the academic year. Third, access to embedded academic literacy, English language and assessment support within taught modules. Fourth, timely, developmental feedback on assessed work that is usable in subsequent assessments. Fifth, access to the Student Support and Experience function, including pastoral, financial, disability, wellbeing and safeguarding support, through multiple channels including in person, digital and self service. Sixth, access to independent student voice and representation routes through the Programme Committee and Student Council.

Students identified as at emerging, high or critical risk receive the additional support set out in Section 15, calibrated to the level of risk. No student receives less than the baseline; some students, by design, receive more.

8. Strategic Levers, Methods and Tactics

This section articulates the strategic levers through which the College operationalises its support strategy, the methods by which those levers work, and the tactics staff apply day to day. It answers the regulator's question: what does the College actually do, in practice, to discharge its Condition B2 obligations?

8.1 The five strategic levers

The College operates five strategic levers. Each is described below with its intended effect, its method of operation and the day to day tactics staff use to deliver it.

8.1.1 Lever One: Embedded academic literacy and English language support

Intended effect: to raise academic language proficiency, assessment interpretation capability and confidence for students studying in English as an additional language, within the curriculum rather than

alongside it. Method: embedding English language and academic literacy activity within modules, supported by structured academic skills sessions delivered by Assistant Lecturers and coordinated by the Head of School. Tactics: diagnostic writing tasks in the first weeks of study; scaffolded assessment briefings that unpack wording, marking criteria and exemplars; formative feedback on draft work; targeted academic skills workshops; and follow up tutorial action for students whose diagnostic performance indicates structured support need.

8.1.2 Lever Two: Structured Personal Academic Tutoring

Intended effect: to ensure every student has a named academic relationship within which academic progress, engagement patterns and personal circumstances can be discussed, and through which early concerns can be surfaced. Method: every student is allocated a Personal Academic Tutor for the duration of their programme, supported by the Personal Academic Tutoring Handbook. Tactics: scheduled tutorial contact at defined points in the academic year, documented tutorial records, progress review tied to assessment milestones, and structured handover between tutors where allocation changes.

8.1.3 Lever Three: Proactive engagement monitoring and outreach

Intended effect: to identify students showing early indicators of disengagement before engagement loss crystallises into non continuation. Method: continuous monitoring through the Attendance and Engagement Dashboard, with defined thresholds triggering structured outreach by Assistant Lecturers and Student Support and Experience Officers. Tactics: outbound multi channel communication (call, email, short message service (SMS) where appropriate), supportive conversation focused on understanding and removing barriers, agreed re engagement actions, and case recording within the institutional case management system.

8.1.4 Lever Four: Integrated pastoral, wellbeing and safeguarding provision

Intended effect: to ensure that non academic barriers to engagement are identified, assessed and addressed without students having to navigate a fragmented service landscape. Method: the Student Support and Experience function operates as a single point of access, with the Student Support and Experience Manager holding Designated Safeguarding Lead responsibilities and operational oversight of the College's response to sexual harassment and misconduct in accordance with SWS 7.3. Tactics: first line pastoral support by Student Support and Experience Officers; escalation to specialist internal and external wellbeing provision where required; crisis response protocols; reasonable adjustments for disabled students; financial hardship provision; and coordinated signposting.

8.1.5 Lever Five: Student voice, representation and co design

Intended effect: to ensure that the design and review of support services is informed by the experience of the students they serve. Method: structured student representation at programme, institutional and Board level. Tactics: Programme Committee forums with student representatives, Student Council engagement with the Executive Leadership Team and Board of Governors, student feedback cycles at module, programme and institutional level, and structured review of support services through student engagement activity.

8.2 How the levers work together

The five levers are deliberately interdependent. Embedded academic literacy (Lever One) creates the conditions for meaningful tutorial conversation (Lever Two), which in turn generates intelligence that complements the Attendance and Engagement Dashboard (Lever Three). Pastoral provision (Lever Four) addresses the non academic barriers that would otherwise frustrate academic intervention. Student voice (Lever Five) informs the continuous refinement of all four other levers. Taken together, they constitute the operational architecture through which the College meets its Condition B2 obligations.

9. Student Support and Experience Offer

This section sets out, from the student's perspective, what support every UKCBC student can expect to receive. Earlier sections describe how the College designs and governs its support system; this section describes what students actually experience. The offer is deliberately expressed in plain terms so that students, staff, partners and external reviewers can read it without needing to interpret operational detail.

9.1 The six domains of the support offer

The UKCBC student support and experience offer is organised around six domains. Each domain is available to every student, delivered through multiple channels, and is designed to work alongside, rather than separately from, the academic programme.

9.1.1 Academic skills and study success

Every student has access to academic skills support delivered through the curriculum, through timetabled academic skills sessions, through Personal Academic Tutor review and through targeted workshops. This includes academic writing, referencing, critical reading, assessment preparation, independent study technique, digital skills and research methods. Support is designed to build capability over time rather than to resolve one off requests.

9.1.2 English language support

Every student studying in English as an additional language has access to embedded English language support within taught modules, to structured academic literacy provision, and, where indicated by diagnostic activity, to intensified English language support delivered through the tiered intervention model in Section 15.

9.1.3 Wellbeing and pastoral support

Every student has access to pastoral and wellbeing support through the Student Support and Experience function. First line support is delivered by Student Support and Experience Officers; specialist internal provision and, where appropriate, onward referral to external services, is arranged through the Student Support and Experience Manager. Support covers mental health, personal circumstance, crisis response, reasonable adjustments for disabled students, and coordinated signposting to external agencies where needs fall outside the College's scope.

9.1.4 Financial support and hardship

Every student has access to information, advice and structured support in relation to their financial circumstances. Provision includes guidance on tuition fee payment arrangements, hardship provision, cost of living pressures, council tax questions, financial planning conversations, and signposting to external specialist advice.

9.1.5 Time management and balancing study

Recognising that the UKCBC cohort includes a significant proportion of mature learners balancing study with employment and caring responsibilities, every student has access to structured support in managing time, workload, attendance patterns and assessment scheduling. This is delivered through Personal Academic Tutor conversation, through targeted workshops, and through Student Support and Experience Officer case work where competing demands become a material risk to continuation.

9.1.6 Safeguarding, harassment and sexual misconduct support

Every student has access to a clearly signposted route for raising concerns about their own welfare or safety, or that of another student, and for reporting experiences of harassment or sexual misconduct. The operational detail of this domain is set out in Section 12. In summary: reports can be made through named, anonymous and digital routes; reporting parties are offered support regardless of whether a formal process is pursued; and all reports are handled in accordance with the College's Sexual Harassment and Misconduct Policy (SWS 7.3).

9.2 Information, advice and guidance within the offer

Sitting across the six domains is the College's Information, Advice and Guidance provision, described in detail in Section 11. Students can expect consistent, impartial information about their programme, their progression, their rights and responsibilities, and the support available to them. The distinction between information, advice and guidance is maintained deliberately so that students know when they are receiving procedural information, when they are receiving advice on options, and when they are being supported to make a personal or academic decision.

9.3 What students can expect from the offer

In using the support offer, every UKCBC student can expect that support is available through more than one channel; that contact with support is acknowledged promptly and progressed in a proportionate timeframe; that confidentiality is protected within the limits of safeguarding and statutory obligation; that support is delivered by staff with the appropriate training and professional boundaries; and that feedback on support provision is invited and used to improve the service. The operational standards that sit behind these expectations are described in Section 10.

9.4 How the offer is communicated

The support offer is communicated to students at induction, within the student handbook, through the virtual learning environment, through Personal Academic Tutor conversation, and through visible signposting in College premises and digital communications. A single summary of the offer, written in student facing language, is published on the College website and is reviewed annually to ensure currency. The communication channels and their integration with the underlying service are described in Section 10.

10. Omni Channel Access and Service Design

This section describes how students access the support offer set out in Section 9. The College operates a multi channel service model designed around the reality of its cohort: mature learners, students balancing study with employment and caring responsibilities, students studying in English as an additional language, and students with varying confidence in approaching formal institutional services. Access is therefore deliberately plural, and the channels are integrated through a shared case record so that a student's experience is consistent regardless of how they enter the service.

10.1 Channels of access

Students can access support through the following channels.

10.1.1 In person

Drop in and appointment based access at the College's delivery sites, covering academic skills support, Personal Academic Tutor meetings, Student Support and Experience Officer appointments, and safeguarding and wellbeing conversations. Drop in hours are published at the start of each semester and are advertised through the virtual learning environment and programme communications.

10.1.2 Digital

Self service access through the virtual learning environment and the student portal, including access to induction and study skills content, self assessment diagnostics, the published support offer, referral forms, and the secure reporting tools used for safeguarding, harassment and sexual misconduct concerns described in Section 12. Digital channels are available at all times.

10.1.3 Telephone

Telephone access through the Student Support and Experience function during College opening hours, with call back arrangements for students unable to attend in person or digitally. Telephone provision recognises that some students, particularly those balancing employment, prefer voice contact at times that fit around work patterns.

10.1.4 Outreach

Outbound contact initiated by the College through the proactive engagement lever described in Section 8.1.3, including calls, messages and scheduled conversations triggered by attendance and engagement data. Outreach sits alongside student initiated contact and does not replace it.

10.1.5 Asynchronous

Written, form based and recorded contact that does not require both parties to be available at the same time, supporting students who cannot make live appointments. All asynchronous contact is logged in the case management system and is responded to within the service level expectations set out in Section 10.3.

10.2 Consistency across channels

The channels are designed to provide a consistent student experience. A student who raises an issue through one channel is not required to repeat the background when the issue is continued through another channel, because all channels record to the shared case management system. Where a student's circumstances require a handover between staff or channels, the handover is documented and communicated to the student.

10.3 Service level expectations

The College maintains the following service level expectations. As a minimum, every contact receives acknowledgement within the timeframe published in the student handbook, every issue is triaged against the risk categorisation in Section 15.2, and every substantive response is progressed in line with the tier thresholds set out in Section 15.3.

10.4 Accessibility of the service

The service is designed to be accessible to students with a range of needs. Digital channels are developed in line with the College's accessibility statement and reasonable adjustments are made for disabled students through the Wellbeing and Safeguarding function. Communications are written in plain English and, where proportionate, are offered in alternative formats. Accessibility of the service is reviewed through the governance cycle in Section 19 and through the student voice mechanisms in Section 18.

10.5 Integration with case management

All channels feed into a single case management record for each student. This enables continuity of support, coherent escalation through the tiered intervention model, auditable decision making and the production of assurance evidence required under OfS Conditions B2 and B3. Access to case records is

controlled under the Data Protection arrangements described in Section 17.2 and governed by the Designated Data Protection Officer.

11. Information, Advice and Guidance

This section describes how the College structures the information, advice and guidance it provides to students. A clear distinction between information, advice and guidance is maintained deliberately, so that students can understand the nature of what they are receiving and so that staff operate within clear professional boundaries. The framework treats Information, Advice and Guidance (IAG) as a core component of the support offer rather than a secondary activity.

11.1 Definitions used in this framework

11.1.1 Information

Factual, accurate and current material about the College, its programmes, regulations, processes, policies, rights and entitlements. Information is provided without recommendation and without interpretation of the student's specific circumstances.

11.1.2 Advice

A structured conversation in which a staff member helps a student understand how information applies to the student's specific situation, identifies options and discusses the implications of each option. Advice supports the student to reach their own decision; it does not direct the decision.

11.1.3 Guidance

A more developmental conversation in which a staff member supports a student to reflect on their academic, personal and professional goals, to consider how a current decision fits those goals, and to plan subsequent action. Guidance is typically provided within the Personal Academic Tutor relationship and, where appropriate, through Student Support and Experience Officer case work.

11.2 Where IAG is delivered

IAG is delivered through several interlocking points. Personal Academic Tutors provide academic guidance within the tutorial relationship. Student Support and Experience Officers provide advice and first line guidance on pastoral, wellbeing, financial and welfare matters. The Academic Registrar and Head of Registry provide information and advice on regulations, progression, extensions, appeals and academic misconduct. The Careers and Employability function, where operational, provides guidance on progression and employability. External regulated advisers are used, and signposted to, where a matter requires specialist expertise outside the College's scope.

11.3 Quality standards for IAG

All IAG provided under this framework is expected to meet the following standards. It is accurate and current, based on the College's published regulations and policies. It is impartial, offered without bias towards a particular outcome for the College. It is confidential, within the limits of safeguarding and statutory obligation. It is recorded where the conversation crosses the threshold from general information into advice or guidance that affects a student's academic or personal pathway. It is delivered by staff with appropriate training and, where required, by staff holding the relevant professional qualification.

11.4 Boundary conditions

Staff providing IAG operate within defined boundaries. Information can be provided by any appropriately trained member of staff. Advice on academic regulations is provided by staff within the Academic Registrar's remit or by Personal Academic Tutors acting within published guidance. Advice on welfare and pastoral matters is provided by Student Support and Experience Officers with appropriate training. Guidance on matters that require regulated advice (for example, formal immigration advice, legal advice, regulated debt advice, clinical mental health intervention) is not given within the College and students are referred to appropriately regulated external providers. These boundaries are set out in staff induction and in the Personal Academic Tutor Handbook.

11.5 Assurance and consumer protection

The quality of IAG is monitored through case record sampling, through student feedback mechanisms described in Section 18, through Programme Committee review, and through periodic internal audit. This assurance regime supports the College's obligations under consumer protection law in relation to the accuracy of information and the fair treatment of students, and is reported through the governance structures set out in Section 19.

12. Safeguarding, Sexual Harassment and Misconduct

This section sets out how the College operationalises its safeguarding responsibilities together with its commitments in relation to sexual harassment and misconduct. The framework does not reproduce the College's Safeguarding Policy or its Sexual Harassment and Misconduct Policy (SWS 7.3) in full; it describes the operating model that gives effect to them and positions them within the wider support system. The regulatory alignment of this section with the Office for Students Conditions of Registration is recorded in Section 18.

The College maintains a zero tolerance position in respect of harassment, discrimination, bullying and sexual misconduct. All students, staff and visitors have the right to study, work and participate in College activity free from intimidation, unwanted behaviour or harm. This framework gives operational effect to that position.

12.1 Scope of provision

The College's safeguarding and misconduct provision covers four overlapping areas: the welfare and protection of students who are at risk of harm from others or from themselves; statutory duties in relation to children and adults at risk who come into contact with the College; Prevent duties in relation to radicalisation; and the prevention of, support in relation to, and response to sexual harassment and misconduct, within the student body, within the staff body, and between the two.

12.2 Accountable roles

The Student Support and Experience Manager is the Designated Safeguarding Lead and holds operational oversight of sexual harassment and misconduct provision. The Head of Student Support and Experience holds strategic accountability for the safeguarding, sexual harassment and misconduct operating model. The Academic Registrar, as Designated Data Protection Officer, advises on the information governance elements of reporting, investigation and record keeping. The Executive Leadership Team and Board of Governors receive assurance through the governance structures described in Section 19.

12.3 Reporting pathways

The College provides multiple reporting pathways so that students and staff can raise concerns through the route that best fits their circumstances. A concern can be raised formally, informally or anonymously.

12.3.1 Named reporting

A student or staff member can report a concern by name to the Student Support and Experience Manager, to any Student Support and Experience Officer, to a Personal Academic Tutor, to a Head of School, or to a member of the Executive Leadership Team. Named reports are triaged and allocated by the Student Support and Experience Manager.

12.3.2 Digital reporting

Students and staff can report a concern through the College's digital reporting tool, available on the student portal and the staff intranet at all times. The tool captures the information required for triage and alerts the Student Support and Experience Manager and a named deputy.

12.3.3 Anonymous reporting

Students and staff can raise a concern anonymously through the digital reporting tool. Anonymous reports are recorded, reviewed and used to inform prevention activity and trend analysis. The College is transparent with reporting parties that anonymous reports limit the scope of any investigation that can follow and may prevent the College from taking direct action against a named respondent.

12.3.4 External reporting

Students and staff are signposted to external reporting routes where relevant, including the police, specialist support services and, for student complaints, the Office of the Independent Adjudicator. Signposting does not require the student or staff member to have first reported internally.

12.4 Case management principles

All reports are managed under defined principles. Every reporting party is offered support regardless of whether a formal process is pursued. Every respondent is treated fairly, is informed of the nature of the allegation where it is safe and lawful to do so, and has access to support. Every case is progressed with appropriate pace, recognising the impact of delay on all parties. Records are maintained to a standard that supports disclosure to the reporting party, supports any subsequent process, and satisfies data protection obligations. Conflicts of interest are identified and managed through referral to an alternative case manager. The reporting party and the respondent are supported by separate members of staff at all stages.

12.5 Initial assessment and precautionary measures

On receipt of a report, the Student Support and Experience Manager, or a trained nominated deputy, conducts an initial risk and safeguarding assessment to determine the level of concern and the immediate support required. Where there is evidence of serious or imminent risk, the College may impose temporary precautionary measures, including temporary suspension, restricted access to sites or systems, timetable adjustment, or amended supervisory arrangements. Precautionary measures are not a determination of guilt; they are protective and are reviewed as the case progresses. Immediate support is offered to all parties at this stage, including referral to the Wellbeing Team where required.

12.6 Investigation, hearing and appeal

Where a formal report is received, the College initiates an internal investigation in line with the Sexual Harassment and Misconduct Policy (SWS 7.3) and the relevant disciplinary procedure. Investigations are impartial, evidence based and conducted by staff trained for this purpose, operating to defined

timescales. Where an external investigation, for example a police investigation, has begun, the internal process may be paused to avoid interference and is resumed or concluded once the external process permits.

Where the findings warrant it, a formal hearing is held. For student respondents, the hearing is conducted by an impartial panel, with both parties given the opportunity to present information. For staff respondents, the case is reviewed under staff disciplinary procedures by a manager or, where appropriate, by an external investigator. All parties are notified of the outcome, any sanctions applied and their right of appeal under the relevant procedure.

12.7 Outcomes

Possible outcomes include, but are not limited to: no further action; a written apology; a behavioural caution or formal written warning; suspension or expulsion of a student; dismissal of a staff member; referral to an external agency; or a combination of these. Outcomes are recorded, communicated to the parties entitled to receive them, and logged for trend analysis and governance reporting.

12.8 Support for reporting parties and respondents

Support is offered to both reporting parties and respondents throughout. Reporting parties have access to wellbeing and pastoral support through the Student Support and Experience function, to reasonable adjustments to their academic arrangements where the circumstances require, and to signposting to external specialist services. Respondents have access to wellbeing support, to clear information about the process, and to procedural fairness at every stage. Support to one party is not dependent on an outcome being reached against the other.

12.9 Staff and student relationships

The College expects relationships between staff and students to remain professional and clearly bounded at all times. Intimate personal relationships between staff members and students are strongly discouraged, in recognition of the significant power imbalance such relationships carry and the risk of real or perceived undue influence, exploitation or conflict of interest. Staff and students are required to disclose any personal or intimate personal relationship in accordance with the disclosure procedures set out in the Staff and Student Relationships Policy and the Sexual Harassment and Misconduct Policy (SWS 7.3). Where a staff member's conduct does not meet the expected professional standards in relation to boundaries, behaviour or undisclosed relationships, the matter is managed under the Staff Disciplinary Policy.

12.10 Training and awareness

All staff receive training on safeguarding and on the College's sexual harassment and misconduct arrangements at induction and periodically thereafter. Staff in designated roles receive advanced training appropriate to those roles. All students enrolling at UKCBC from September 2025 onwards receive mandatory training on sexual consent and sexual misconduct, delivered in person and online and developed in collaboration with external providers, so that students receive consistent information on respectful behaviour, consent and available support pathways regardless of mode of study. Ongoing resources on harassment and sexual misconduct are available to students throughout their studies through designated College platforms.

12.11 Confidentiality and information sharing

Reports are handled on a need to know basis. Information is shared only where it is necessary to facilitate an appropriate investigation, to safeguard individuals, to provide support, or to meet the College's legal duties. Wherever possible the reporting party is informed before information is shared, explaining with

whom and for what purpose. Confidentiality is maintained within the limits of safeguarding and statutory obligation, and the College is transparent with parties about those limits.

12.12 Record keeping and governance oversight

Records are maintained on the secure case management system, with access controls aligned to role and with sensitive information protected by role based restrictions. The Student Support and Experience Manager reports on safeguarding, sexual harassment and misconduct activity to the Quality of Education Committee and, through Academic Board, into the Executive Leadership Team and Board of Governors, on the cadence described in Section 19.3. The College publishes an annual statement summarising the volume, themes and outcomes of sexual harassment and misconduct activity, in a form that protects the confidentiality of individuals.

12.13 Integration with the wider support system

Safeguarding, sexual harassment and misconduct activity does not sit outside the wider support system. Cases intersect with pastoral support, with academic engagement, with attendance monitoring and with reasonable adjustments. The shared case management system described in Section 10.5 enables coordinated support while protecting the sensitivity of safeguarding and misconduct records through role based access controls. This integration is critical to ensuring that students do not have to repeat their circumstances across disconnected services and that the College meets its holistic duty of care under Conditions B2, B3 and E6.

13. Integration with Teaching, Curriculum and Assessment

For a cohort with the characteristics described in Section 5, support that is positioned alongside teaching will be insufficient. Support must be delivered through teaching. This section articulates how teaching design, curriculum design and assessment design function as the primary vehicles of student support at UKCBC, and what is expected of academic staff in consequence.

13.1 Teaching practice as student support

Teaching staff at UKCBC are expected to design and deliver sessions in ways that support, rather than assume, student capability. This includes explicit signposting of learning outcomes and how the session connects to assessment; clear, jargon light explanation that supports students studying in English as an additional language; structured opportunities for students to formulate and articulate ideas; use of exemplars and unpacked assessment briefs; and structured feedback on formative activity. The Teaching and Learning Strategy, Cultivating Capability, sets out the professional expectations in detail; this framework records that those expectations are treated as core to student support delivery.

13.2 Curriculum design for support

Curriculum design at UKCBC is expected to front load confidence, clarity and foundational skills early in programmes; to sequence content and assessment so that academic literacy develops deliberately across the programme; to build formative assessment into every module so that difficulty surfaces early and is addressed within teaching; and to align assessment design with student reality by reducing unnecessary linguistic complexity and valuing applied demonstration of capability. Programme review activity under the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Framework scrutinises curriculum design against these expectations and generates actions where gaps are identified.

13.3 Assessment as support

Assessment is treated not only as a measurement of achievement but as an instrument of learning and of early identification. Assessment design across programmes is expected to include early, low stakes formative activity that produces diagnostic insight; clear marking criteria linked to learning outcomes; structured feedback that is returned within defined turnaround times and that is explicitly designed to be usable in subsequent assessment; and opportunities for students to discuss feedback with their Personal Academic Tutor or module team.

13.4 Expectations of academic staff

Academic staff contribute to student support in four specific ways. First, they design and deliver teaching in a manner consistent with Sections 9.1 to 9.3. Second, they monitor attendance, engagement and assessment participation within their taught sessions, following up with students in line with institutional thresholds and escalating via the Attendance Working Group where necessary. Third, they provide formative and summative feedback that supports learning. Fourth, they identify and refer students requiring additional support through defined academic and pastoral routes. These expectations are embedded within the job descriptions for Head of School, Senior Lecturer, Lecturer and Assistant Lecturer roles and are reviewed through performance conversations and annual monitoring.

14. English Language and Academic Skills Support

English language proficiency and academic skills development are treated as primary determinants of student success within UKCBC's cohort context. This section sets out how the College addresses them.

14.1 Embedded English language support

English language support is embedded within the curriculum and is delivered through the taught programme rather than as a separate, optional service. Module level practice includes explicit scaffolding of subject specific academic vocabulary; structured opportunities for students to produce written and spoken academic language; formative feedback that addresses language alongside content; and the use of exemplars and unpacked assessment briefs to reduce linguistic barriers to assessment performance.

14.2 Structured academic skills provision

Every student is entitled to structured academic skills support covering academic writing, referencing and source use, research skills, critical thinking, assessment preparation and study planning. Provision is delivered through a combination of in class scaffolding by academic staff, dedicated academic skills workshops, one to one academic tutorials and digital self service resources. Assistant Lecturers play a central role in delivering and coordinating academic skills activity, operating under the academic oversight of Senior Lecturers and Head of School.

14.3 Risk based intensification

Where diagnostic activity, early assessment performance or tutor referral indicates that a student requires additional English language or academic skills support, intensified provision is arranged through the tiered intervention model set out in Section 15. Intensification may take the form of scheduled additional academic tutorials, targeted workshop attendance, structured drafting and feedback cycles or referral to specialist provision. All intensified activity is recorded within the institutional case management system and reviewed through the Attendance Working Group.

14.4 Assurance

The effectiveness of English language and academic skills provision is monitored through the indicators set out in Section 18, including early assessment performance, module pass rates, differential outcome analysis and student feedback. Trends are reviewed by the Quality of Education Committee through the Institutional Annual Monitoring Report and inform curriculum review and resourcing decisions.

15. Early Identification and Tiered Intervention Model

This section sets out how the College identifies students at risk, how it categorises that risk, and what happens when a student is identified at each tier. It replaces the timeline description used in earlier iterations with an explicit decision making model, in response to feedback that support delivery must be demonstrable as well as structured. The model is consistent with the Student At Risk and Intervention Framework and the Attendance and Engagement Policy, which provide the operational detail beneath this framework.

15.1 The four stage model

The framework operates through a four stage model drawn from the Student At Risk and Intervention Framework: identification, intervention, escalation and assurance. These stages operate continuously and iteratively, not sequentially, and every student is visible within the model from enrolment onwards.

15.1.1 Identification

Risk is identified through the systematic use of institutional data via the Attendance and Engagement Dashboard. The dashboard consolidates five categories of indicator: timetabled attendance; true attendance reflecting meaningful participation; engagement indicators including assessment submission and virtual learning environment activity; contact and response patterns to outbound communication; and welfare, safeguarding or administrative indicators. The dashboard provides both individual and cohort level visibility, enabling early identification of both individual risk and emerging pattern level risk.

The distinction between overall attendance and true attendance is material to the College's model. Physical presence is necessary but not sufficient; the dashboard therefore treats presence without sustained engagement as a latent continuation risk and flags it accordingly.

15.1.2 Intervention

Intervention is delivered through the tiered model set out in Section 15.3. All intervention is designed to be early, proportionate, coordinated, recorded and, in its early stages, supportive rather than punitive.

15.1.3 Escalation

Unresolved or systemic issues are escalated through defined governance structures. Operational escalation runs through the Attendance Working Group. Institutional escalation routes are described in Section 19.

15.1.4 Assurance

The effectiveness of identification, intervention and escalation is monitored through the indicators set out in Section 18 and is reported to the Quality of Education Committee. Findings inform service design, policy updates and, where material, entries to the Academic Risk Register.

15.2 Risk categorisation and thresholds

Students are categorised into risk bands based on thresholds operationalised within the Attendance and Engagement Dashboard. Low risk describes sustained attendance at or above eighty per cent and full assessment submission. Emerging risk describes attendance falling between sixty and eighty per cent,

non submission of formative or summative tasks, or declining engagement with the virtual learning environment. High or critical risk describes attendance falling below sixty per cent or module non submission rates exceeding sixty five per cent, consistent with the institutional escalation thresholds set within the Corporate and Academic Governance Framework (GA 3.3). Threshold calibration, compound indicator weighting and dashboard calculation logic are recorded within the Attendance and Engagement Policy and the accompanying operational specification, and are reviewed annually by the Quality of Education Committee.

15.3 The tiered intervention model

The College operates a four tier intervention model. Each tier defines the triggers, interventions, accountable roles, documentation requirements and expected timescales.

15.3.1 Tier One: Universal entitlement

Trigger: registration on a UKCBC programme. Intervention: the minimum support entitlements set out in Section 7.3, including structured induction and transition, Personal Academic Tutor allocation, embedded academic literacy provision, access to the Student Support and Experience function, and timely developmental feedback. Accountable roles: Head of School for academic delivery; Head of Student Support and Experience for induction and pastoral services; Personal Academic Tutor for allocated students. Documentation: Personal Academic Tutor records; induction attendance records; module engagement records. Timescale: continuous across the student lifecycle.

15.3.2 Tier Two: Early stage intervention

Trigger: emerging risk indicators, including early attendance drop, non submission of formative tasks, non response to outbound communication or expression of difficulty within tutorial contact. Intervention: light touch proactive engagement, clarification of expectations, targeted signposting to academic or pastoral support, and agreement of re engagement actions. Accountable roles: Assistant Lecturer and Personal Academic Tutor for academic aspects; Student Support and Experience Officer for pastoral aspects; Attendance Working Group for case coordination. Documentation: outbound contact records, tutorial notes and case notes within the case management system. Timescale: contact initiated within the working week following threshold breach.

15.3.3 Tier Three: Targeted intervention

Trigger: sustained emerging risk, unresolved Tier Two concerns or compound indicators across attendance, engagement and assessment. Intervention: a structured support plan agreed with the student, coordinated input from academic and student support teams, intensified monitoring and scheduled review. Accountable roles: Student Support and Experience Officer holds the case; Head of School is informed in respect of academic risk; Personal Academic Tutor contributes to plan design and review. Documentation: written support plan, case record updates, and escalation notes where appropriate. Timescale: support plan agreed within two working weeks of Tier Three identification, reviewed at intervals not exceeding four weeks until the student returns to emerging or low risk, or escalates to Tier Four.

15.3.4 Tier Four: Intensive intervention and formal outcome

Trigger: sustained high or critical risk, failed Tier Three intervention, or the emergence of safeguarding, wellbeing or academic progression concerns requiring formal case management. Intervention: formal case management, escalation to the Head of Student Support and Experience and Head of School, involvement of the Student Support and Experience Manager where appropriate, and consideration of formal outcome processes including withdrawal, suspension or termination of enrolment where engagement does not recover. Formal outcome processes are governed by the Student Withdrawal, Suspension and Transfer Policy and the Student Attendance and Engagement Policy, and are

administered by Registry. Accountable roles: Head of Student Support and Experience; Student Support and Experience Manager where indicated; Head of School; Registry for formal status change. Documentation: formal case file; decision records; correspondence; Academic Risk Register entry where appropriate. Timescale: decisions taken within defined procedural timescales under the relevant policy.

15.4 Consistency across programmes

Consistency is achieved through four mechanisms. First, common thresholds operationalised within the Attendance and Engagement Dashboard. Second, shared training and supervision for Assistant Lecturers, Personal Academic Tutors and Student Support and Experience Officers. Third, the Attendance Working Group as the cross programme triage forum. Fourth, Quality of Education Committee scrutiny of intervention patterns, outcomes and differential impact across programmes.

16. Roles, Responsibilities and Resourcing

Under OfS Condition B7 the regulator will test whether the College has the capacity and resources to deliver its stated plans. This section explicitly articulates the roles accountable for delivery, the resourcing assumptions that underpin them and the mechanisms by which capacity is reviewed and adjusted. It draws on the approved job descriptions for the roles named, which together define the operating model for the framework.

16.1 Strategic accountability

Strategic accountability for this framework sits with the Executive Leadership Team, exercised through the Chief Academic Officer, who is responsible for ensuring that the framework is implemented, resourced and governed appropriately, and for presenting annual assurance to the Academic Board and Board of Governors that the College is discharging its Condition B2 duties.

16.2 Operational leadership roles

16.2.1 Head of Student Support and Experience

The Head of Student Support and Experience holds operational leadership for the framework. The role designs and delivers the structured engagement and continuation strategy aligned to learner profile need; designs and operates the tiered case management and triage model; establishes intervention thresholds and escalation mechanisms in collaboration with Registry and academic colleagues; and ensures that engagement interventions are relational and supportive while maintaining records that contribute to institutional oversight. The role leads the Student Support and Experience function and holds operational responsibility for the College's institutional response to sexual harassment and misconduct as set out in SWS 7.3. The Head of Student Support and Experience operates within a formal matrix relationship with the Academic Registrar regarding continuation risk oversight and escalation.

16.2.2 Student Support and Experience Manager

The Student Support and Experience Manager acts as the College's Designated Safeguarding Lead, holds operational responsibility for safeguarding, Prevent and harassment and sexual misconduct provision, and provides leadership for wellbeing, counselling, disability support and inclusive practice. The role oversees complex and high risk case management, supports Student Support and Experience Officers in specialist cases, and contributes to institutional understanding of student risk through analysis of case trends.

16.2.3 Head of School

The Head of School is accountable for School level performance against continuation, completion, progression and engagement indicators, and for implementing improvement activity where performance falls below expected thresholds. The role ensures that academic and pastoral support are integrated and responsive, that attendance, engagement and assessment submission are actively monitored across programmes, and that targeted intervention strategies are implemented where student engagement or performance falls below expected thresholds. The Head of School reports performance and risks through the Quality of Education Committee and responds to challenge and required action.

16.2.4 Academic Registrar

The Academic Registrar, also the Designated Data Protection Officer, holds executive accountability for the integrity of the data infrastructure underpinning this framework. The role ensures that attendance, engagement and outcome data used for identification, intervention and governance is validated, traceable and auditable; maintains institutional ownership of the Academic Risk Register, ensuring that risks relating to continuation, student outcomes, assessment integrity and regulatory compliance are accurately recorded and escalated; and provides formal assurance statements to the Executive Leadership Team and Board of Governors on the integrity of regulatory data and academic risk reporting.

16.2.5 Head of Registry

The Head of Registry holds operational responsibility for the accuracy, completeness and auditability of attendance and engagement data used by this framework. The role ensures that the data infrastructure supports accurate identification, that anomalies are investigated, and that engagement data that presents funding or compliance risk is escalated to the Academic Registrar.

16.3 Frontline delivery roles

16.3.1 Personal Academic Tutor

Every student is allocated a Personal Academic Tutor drawn from academic staff. The Personal Academic Tutor delivers scheduled tutorial contact, supports developmental conversations about academic progress, contributes to early identification of emerging risk and participates in support plan design for students at Tier Three. The Personal Academic Tutoring Handbook sets out the model, contact expectations and documentation requirements.

16.3.2 Assistant Lecturer

The Assistant Lecturer operates across teaching and student engagement domains under a dual reporting model. Academic oversight is provided by the Senior Lecturer or Head of School; operational oversight for student engagement, attendance monitoring and outbound support is provided through the Student Support and Experience function. The role supports delivery of teaching and facilitated learning; delivers structured academic skills support including academic writing, referencing and assessment preparation; monitors attendance, engagement and participation; undertakes proactive outbound communication; and supports early identification and escalation of students at risk.

16.3.3 Student Support and Experience Officer

Student Support and Experience Officers operate as the primary case management and support delivery role. They manage allocated caseloads based on defined risk thresholds; deliver timely, consistent and recorded support interventions; provide first line pastoral support and guidance; recognise and respond to safeguarding concerns; support students navigating institutional academic processes; and operate within a multi channel, digital first service model.

16.3.4 Academic staff

Academic staff more broadly contribute to the framework through the expectations set out in Section 13.4, covering teaching design, monitoring of engagement and assessment, feedback and referral.

16.4 The Attendance Working Group

The Attendance Working Group functions as the core operational coordination mechanism for this framework. It is chaired by the Head of Student Support and Experience, with the Head of Registry as a standing member, and brings together Student Support and Experience Officers, academic representatives from each School and, where appropriate, the Student Support and Experience Manager. The Group reviews attendance and engagement data on a regular basis, identifies students at risk, coordinates cross functional intervention activity, monitors intervention effectiveness and escalates high risk or complex cases. The Group reports patterns and trends into the Quality of Education Committee.

16.5 Training and competence

Every role named in this section operates within a defined training and competence expectation maintained by the Head of People and Culture and endorsed by the Executive Leadership Team. Safeguarding and Prevent training is mandatory for all staff with student contact, at a frequency set by the Student Support and Experience Manager. Academic staff training includes teaching practice for inclusive delivery, support for English as an additional language and assessment literacy. Student Support and Experience Officer training covers case management, safeguarding first response, mental health awareness, inclusive practice and the institutional case management system. Compliance with training expectation is monitored through the People function and reported to the Executive Leadership Team.

16.6 Capacity review and adjustment

Capacity and resourcing assumptions are reviewed at least annually by the Head of Student Support and Experience in collaboration with the Heads of School, the Academic Registrar and the Head of People and Culture. The review draws on framework effectiveness indicators set out in Section 18, forecast enrolment, and operational observation of caseload pressure. The Executive Leadership Team receives the annual capacity review and adjusts resource allocation within the institutional planning cycle where required, with material issues reported to the Board of Governors through the Quality of Education Committee and Academic Board.

17. Data, Monitoring and Risk

This framework is data informed at every level. This section sets out the data infrastructure that supports identification and intervention, the governance of that data, and the integration of framework data with institutional risk reporting.

17.1 The Attendance and Engagement Dashboard

The Attendance and Engagement Dashboard is the primary operational data product underpinning this framework. It consolidates timetabled attendance, true attendance, assessment submission and virtual learning environment engagement, contact response patterns and welfare or safeguarding indicators into a single view. The dashboard is refreshed on a weekly cycle aligned to the Attendance Working Group review meeting, providing individual, cohort, module and programme level visibility and supporting drill down from institutional pattern to individual case. The dashboard's full functional specification, including threshold logic, compound indicator weighting and integration with the case management system, is maintained by the Academic Registrar and the Head of Registry, and is reviewed annually by the Quality of Education Committee.

17.2 Data governance

Responsibility for the accuracy, integrity and compliance of the data products supporting this framework sits with the Academic Registrar in their capacity as the institution's Designated Data Protection Officer, supported operationally by the Head of Registry. Data handling within the framework is governed by the College's Data Protection Policy, is subject to Data Protection Impact Assessment where required, and is conducted in accordance with UK GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018.

17.3 Framework indicators and reporting cadence

The effectiveness of the framework is monitored through a defined suite of indicators. Leading indicators include attendance rates, true attendance rates, assessment submission rates at formative and summative stages, engagement with Personal Academic Tutor activity and use of the Student Support and Experience function. Lagging indicators include continuation, completion and progression rates monitored against OfS Condition B3 numerical thresholds, differential outcome analysis by cohort characteristic, and student feedback collected through module, programme and institutional surveys. Reporting cadence is set out in Section 19.3.

17.4 Integration with institutional risk

The framework is integrated with the College's institutional risk architecture through the Academic Risk Register. Risks identified through framework monitoring, whether individual, pattern or systemic, are captured and scored within the Register in line with the Risk Management Framework, with material risks escalated through the Quality of Education Committee to the Academic Board and, where appropriate, to the Executive Leadership Team and Board of Governors. The escalation thresholds recorded within the Corporate and Academic Governance Framework include continuation falling below internal tolerance, attendance below sixty per cent, module non submission above sixty five per cent, differential outcome gaps exceeding agreed variance thresholds, and significant safeguarding or reputational incidents. Those thresholds apply to this framework.

18. Engagement and Student Voice

Student voice is treated as a core design input to this framework rather than a downstream consultation activity. This section describes the formal and informal mechanisms through which student experience shapes the design, operation and review of the framework.

18.1 Institutional representation structures

Student voice is channelled through three principal institutional structures. The Programme Committee, a staff student forum at programme level, considers curriculum design and delivery, assessment experience, learning resources and academic support, and programme specific student feedback, and reports to the Quality of Education Committee. The Student Council articulates institutional student priorities, provides structured feedback on policy and practice and contributes to governance discussions affecting the student body, reporting both to the Executive Leadership Team and directly to the Board of Governors. The Quality of Education Committee itself receives student voice inputs as part of its scrutiny of quality, standards, programme performance and academic support.

18.2 Feedback mechanisms

Feedback on the framework and the services it describes is collected through module evaluation, programme level surveys, institutional student surveys including national instruments where applicable, focused student consultation during annual review, and continuous qualitative feedback through case

notes, tutorial records and student enquiry trends. The Head of Student Support and Experience maintains a feedback log and reports thematically to the Quality of Education Committee.

18.3 Closing the loop

The College closes the feedback loop by documenting the actions taken in response to feedback, communicating those actions back to students through institutional and programme channels, and evidencing impact through subsequent feedback cycles. Actions arising from feedback are logged within the institutional action tracker and reported on schedule through the governance structures set out in Section 19.

19. Governance, Oversight and Accountability

This section maps the framework to named governance bodies, clarifies ownership, escalation and decision rights, and shows how governance functions to challenge effectiveness and require action. It is consistent with the Corporate and Academic Governance Framework (GA 3.3) and provides the institutional grip that OfS registration requires.

19.1 Governance ownership

The Quality of Education Committee is the deliberative committee of the Academic Board and operates as the principal governance owner of this framework. QoE is responsible for detailed scrutiny of quality assurance and enhancement activity, programme performance and student outcomes, compliance with OfS Condition B requirements, and student feedback, engagement and academic support. QoE escalates recommendations, risks and assurance to the Academic Board. The Academic Board reports directly to the Board of Governors and is not subordinate to the Executive Leadership Team, safeguarding academic independence in the scrutiny of student support.

19.2 Governance architecture for this framework

The reporting flow for this framework follows the structure articulated in the Corporate and Academic Governance Framework. Programme Committees provide programme level scrutiny and student voice, reporting to the Quality of Education Committee. QoE scrutinises framework performance, risks and enhancement activity and reports to the Academic Board. The Academic Board provides academic assurance and standards oversight and reports to the Board of Governors. The Executive Leadership Team consolidates operational assurance on framework delivery, capacity and resourcing and reports to the Board of Governors. The Audit and Risk Committee receives assurance on data integrity and regulatory compliance. The Student Council provides direct student voice to both the Executive Leadership Team and the Board of Governors.

19.3 Reporting cadence

Operational case and trend data is reviewed by the Attendance Working Group on a regular cadence. The Quality of Education Committee receives scheduled framework reports at least termly, covering performance against leading and lagging indicators, intervention activity, emerging risk patterns, student feedback themes and continuous improvement activity. The Academic Board receives framework assurance at least annually through the Institutional Annual Monitoring Report. The Board of Governors receives consolidated assurance through the Academic Board and through the Executive Leadership Team's Quarterly CEO Report, which incorporates risk, student outcomes and compliance status.

19.4 Escalation

Escalation within the framework follows the institutional escalation mechanism. Matters identified at functional committee level are logged in the Academic Risk Register with red, amber, green (RAG) status, escalated to the College Management Team or Executive Leadership Team with a mitigation plan, and, where material, formally reported to the Academic Board or Board of Governors. Reportable events under OfS registration requirements are identified, assessed and submitted in accordance with the institutional reportable events process, which sits with the Accountable Officer under delegation from the Board.

19.5 How governance drives improvement

Governance does not only receive reports. It challenges the quality of delivery, requires action where performance falls short, and scrutinises the evidence of improvement. The Quality of Education Committee operates with scrutiny expectations that include interrogation of outlier performance by programme, School and student characteristic; challenge to the credibility and traceability of remedial actions; and satisfaction testing of whether intervention activity has produced the expected change. Where the Group is not satisfied, it records actions, assigns owners and timescales, and tracks completion to evidence. Unresolved or material matters escalate to the Academic Board and, where necessary, to the Board of Governors through the Corporate and Academic Governance Framework escalation mechanism.

20. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion

Support delivered under this framework is designed to be fair, consistent, proportionate and inclusive. This section articulates the expectations and safeguards that operationalise the College's commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion within student support.

20.1 Principles

All interventions, decisions and services delivered under this framework must be proportionate to individual circumstance, respectful of student identity and background, accessible in format and channel, and consistent with the College's statutory obligations under the Equality Act 2010.

20.2 Inclusive design

Service and intervention design is led by inclusive practice. Channels of access include in person, telephone and digital routes to accommodate diverse student preferences and circumstances. Communication is written in plain English with consideration of linguistic accessibility. Reasonable adjustments for disabled students are made through the Student Support and Experience Manager in line with the Reasonable Adjustments Policy.

20.3 Differential outcome analysis

Framework indicators are routinely disaggregated by student characteristics where data permits, including age, ethnicity, disability status, domicile and widening participation indicators. Differential outcome gaps exceeding agreed variance thresholds are treated as escalation triggers in accordance with the institutional escalation framework, are logged within the Academic Risk Register and trigger targeted intervention through the governance route described in Section 19.

20.4 Training and culture

All staff operating within the framework undertake inclusive practice training as part of the institutional training expectation. The Head of Student Support and Experience and the Student Support and

Experience Manager are jointly responsible for ensuring that the culture of the Student Support and Experience function is inclusive, student centred and alert to the risks of differential treatment.

21. Outcomes, Impact and Theory of Change

This section articulates how the framework is expected to produce improved outcomes for students, through what chain of cause and effect, and on what evidence base. It replaces implicit claims about outcomes with an explicit theory of change, in response to feedback that the College must evidence not only that support occurs but that it works.

21.1 Theory of change

The framework's theory of change is as follows. A cohort informed understanding of academic risk leads to the design of a proactive, embedded and structured support model. That model is operationalised through five strategic levers: embedded academic literacy and English language support, structured Personal Academic Tutoring, proactive engagement monitoring and outreach, integrated pastoral and safeguarding provision, and student voice. Delivery of these levers, at the intensity proportionate to individual risk, raises academic confidence, improves engagement and strengthens assessment performance. Improved engagement and performance, evidenced through leading indicators, produce improved continuation, completion and positive progression outcomes, evidenced through lagging Condition B3 indicators. Where evidence indicates that a lever is not producing its expected effect, the framework's governance drives refinement or re design.

21.2 Intended outcomes and numerical targets

The framework's intended outcomes, and the institutional numerical targets against which delivery is assessed, are drawn from the UKCBC Company Wide KPI Matrix approved under Strategy 2030. These targets are:

- Student continuation rate at or above eighty five per cent, consistent with the OfS Condition B3 numerical threshold.
- Student completion rate at or above seventy five per cent, consistent with the OfS Condition B3 numerical threshold.
- Student progression into employment or further study at or above sixty per cent, consistent with the OfS Condition B3 numerical threshold.
- Access and Participation Plan outcome achievement gap across all monitored characteristics of no more than six and a half per cent.
- First time module pass rate of at least eighty per cent per academic year.
- Average module grade of at least fifty five per cent per academic year.
- Student satisfaction with learning and support of at least eighty five per cent as measured by the National Student Survey question twenty seven and the annual institutional survey.
- Learner sense of belonging index of at least eighty per cent through the annual institutional survey.
- At risk student intervention rate of at least ninety per cent of identified students receiving documented support within ten working days.
- Active student voice representation of at least eighty five per cent of live programmes with a confirmed student representative.
- Student enquiry first response at or above ninety five per cent acknowledged within three working days.

- Wellbeing and counselling service access of at least ninety per cent of referred students receiving an initial appointment within five working days.
- Reasonable adjustment implementation rate of one hundred per cent confirmed to students and academic teams within ten working days of assessment.
- One hundred per cent compliance with published institutional timelines for cases managed under OfS Condition E6 on harassment and sexual misconduct.
- National Student Survey (NSS) Overall Satisfaction and Teaching on Course theme scores at or above the published sector benchmark for the provider type.
- Year on year reduction in formal student complaint volume against the prior year baseline.

These targets are applied consistently in annual evaluation of the framework, in reporting to the Quality of Education Committee and the Academic Board, and in institutional assurance statements to the Board of Governors.

21.3 Evidence base for improvement

The framework is designed to improve in response to evidence. Indicator performance, intervention effectiveness, differential outcome analysis, student feedback and staff insight are reviewed through the governance cycle described in Section 19. Where evidence indicates that an aspect of the framework is underperforming, revisions are designed, resourced, implemented and evaluated in the next cycle. The framework is therefore neither static nor assumed to succeed; it is actively tested and iteratively improved.

22. External Quality Alignment

This section draws together the external reference points to which this framework aligns and explains how that alignment is evidenced.

22.1 OfS Conditions of Registration

Condition B2 (academic experience and support): the framework articulates the baseline entitlement, the additional support calibrated to cohort need, and the resource and governance assumptions that make both credible. Condition B3 (student outcomes): the framework is designed to produce continuation, completion and positive progression outcomes and monitors performance against the published numerical thresholds, with escalation where performance falls below tolerance. Condition B1 (academic experience and teaching): the framework articulates the role of teaching practice and curriculum design as student support. Condition B7 (quality assurance of student outcomes, and resource, financial, management): the framework sets out capacity, resourcing, training and governance arrangements such that the credibility of delivery can be tested. Condition E6 (harassment and sexual misconduct): the framework integrates safeguarding, harassment and sexual misconduct provision through the Student Support and Experience Manager, who holds operational responsibility under this condition.

22.2 QAA Quality Code: Principle 10

The framework gives operational meaning to each of the expectations embedded within Principle 10. Information about the College and its support services is accessible, timely and relevant. Support is provided at transition points including induction, early study, formative assessment, summative assessment and progression. Students are aware of available academic, professional and pastoral services and are encouraged to use them. Staff are appropriately qualified, trained and supported. Activities beyond the formal curriculum are recognised as contributing to belonging and to the development of transferable capability.

22.3 Partnership and awarding body expectations

Where UKCBC delivers provision in partnership, the framework operates in a manner consistent with the requirements and expectations of the awarding partner. Partner specific requirements are recorded and managed through the Partnership Quality Assurance arrangements maintained by the Academic Registrar. Where there is conflict or tension between the College's framework and a partner requirement, the matter is escalated through the Quality of Education Committee and resolved in a manner that maintains regulatory compliance and student interest.

23. Monitoring, Evaluation and Continuous Improvement

The framework is explicitly designed to be evaluated and improved. This section sets out how that evaluation occurs and how improvement is operationalised.

23.1 Evaluation approach

Evaluation is conducted at three levels. Operational evaluation, conducted by the Attendance Working Group and the Student Support and Experience management team, reviews case level and pattern level activity and effectiveness on a regular cadence. Institutional evaluation, conducted through the Quality of Education Committee, reviews framework effectiveness at programme, School and institutional level at least termly, and considers differential outcomes, trends and material risks. Strategic evaluation, presented at least annually to the Academic Board and the Board of Governors through the Institutional Annual Monitoring Report, reviews the framework as a whole against its intended outcomes and regulatory positioning.

23.2 Evidence base

Evaluation draws on the leading and lagging indicators described in Section 17.3; performance against the numerical targets set out in Section 21.2 and in the UKCBC Company Wide KPI Matrix; qualitative case record themes; student feedback from module, programme and institutional instruments; staff insight captured through operational forums including the Staff Town Hall; external examiner and awarding body input; and benchmarking against sector data where available.

23.3 Continuous improvement

Findings are translated into action through the institutional action tracker and the Institutional Quality Improvement Plan. Each action has an owner, a timescale and an evidence requirement to close. Closure requires the governance body that set the action to be satisfied with the evidence of impact. Where improvement activity requires additional resource, the requirement is fed into the annual planning cycle through the Executive Leadership Team.

23.4 Framework review cycle

This framework is reviewed at least every two years or earlier where required by regulatory or operational change, in accordance with the Policy Preparation and Version Control Guidance (GA 3.1). Review is led by the Head of Student Support and Experience in collaboration with the Academic Registrar, the Heads of School and the Head of People and Culture, and is signed off by the Academic Board.

24. Regulatory Positioning and Assurance Statement

This section provides the external facing summary of how the framework discharges the College's regulatory obligations.

24.1 Sufficiency statement

The College is satisfied, on the evidence of this framework, that each cohort of students receives academic experience and support sufficient to enable success, in accordance with OfS Condition B2. The sufficiency statement rests on the minimum entitlement articulated in Section 7.3; the additional proportionate support delivered through the tiered intervention model described in Section 15; the teaching, curriculum and assessment expectations articulated in Section 13; the capacity, resourcing and training arrangements described in Section 16; and the governance and assurance described in Section 19.

24.2 Credibility statement

The College is satisfied that the plans described in this framework are credible and capable of delivery in practice, in accordance with OfS Condition B7. Credibility rests on the named accountable roles, the explicit operating model, the capacity and training expectations, the governance architecture, and the ongoing review mechanism set out in this framework and its supporting policies.

24.3 Outcomes statement

The College is satisfied that, if delivered as described, the framework is likely to produce positive student outcomes under OfS Condition B3, measured through continuation at or above eighty five per cent, completion at or above seventy five per cent and progression at or above sixty per cent, and that mechanisms exist for early detection and correction where outcomes drift below tolerance. The full suite of numerical targets against which delivery is monitored is set out in Section 21.2 and in the UKCBC Company Wide KPI Matrix. The College commits to the continuous improvement cycle set out in Section 23 as the means by which correction is operationalised.

24.4 Safeguarding and student protection statement

The College, through the Student Support and Experience Manager acting as Designated Safeguarding Lead and through the operational oversight of the Head of Student Support and Experience, discharges its safeguarding, Prevent and harassment and sexual misconduct responsibilities in accordance with statutory duties and OfS Condition E6, as evidenced through the Safeguarding Policy, the Harassment and Sexual Misconduct Policy and the Student Protection Plan.

25. Linked Policies

This framework is read and operated alongside the following College policies and frameworks. Where there is perceived tension between documents, the matter is escalated to the Quality of Education Committee for resolution.

- UKCBC Strategy 2030
- UKCBC Company Wide KPI Matrix
- Teaching and Learning Strategy: Cultivating Capability (ASQ 1.4)
- Student At Risk and Intervention Framework
- Personal Academic Tutoring Handbook
- Student Attendance and Engagement Policy
- Student Withdrawal, Suspension and Transfer Policy
- Academic Risk Register and Risk Management Framework
- Corporate and Academic Governance Framework (GA 3.3)

- Policy Preparation and Version Control Guidance (GA 3.1)
- Quality Assurance and Enhancement Framework
- Safeguarding Policy and Prevent Duty arrangements
- Harassment and Sexual Misconduct Policy
- Student Protection Plan
- Reasonable Adjustments Policy
- Data Protection Policy
- Academic Appeals and Complaints Policy
- Partnership Quality Assurance arrangements

26. External References

- Office for Students (OfS), Regulatory Framework for Higher Education in England, Conditions of Registration, in particular Conditions B1, B2, B3, B7 and E6.
- Office for Students (OfS), OfS Condition B: Quality and Standards guidance.
- Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA), UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Principle 10: Supporting students to achieve their potential.
- Equality Act 2010.
- UK General Data Protection Regulation and Data Protection Act 2018.
- Competition and Markets Authority (CMA), Higher education: consumer law advice for providers.
- Prevent Duty Guidance for further and higher education.
- Keeping Children Safe in Education, where relevant to safeguarding provision for any student under 18.

27. Version Control Table

Version History

Version	Date	Author	Summary of changes	Approved by
1.0	23 October 2026	Chief Academic Officer	Initial version; section 4.1 The Student Experience added following staff comment (25 October 2026) Abbreviations spelt out at first use, in line with GA 3.1 (26 October 2026). Version History table aligned with the suite (26 October 2026). Approval aligned to the Quality of Education Committee (CAO decision, 26 October 2026). Sentences deferring detail to the next revision removed from sections on financial support, service level expectations and digital reporting; section 16.5 (capacity and resourcing assumptions, placeholders only) removed and	Quality of Education Committee

Version	Date	Author	Summary of changes	Approved by
			sections 16.6 and 16.7 renumbered (26 October 2026).	