



UK COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND COMPUTING

Student At Risk and Intervention Framework

Field	Detail
Policy no.	SLCC 6.14
Version no. & date	Version 1.0 – 23 October 2026
Author	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) Conditions of Registration B3 and C3
Linked policies	SLCC 6.8 Attendance and Engagement Policy; SLCC 6.5 Student Withdrawal, Suspension and Transfer Policy; SWS 7.1 Student Support and Wellbeing Policy; SWS 7.2 Fitness to Study Policy; SWS 7.7 Safeguarding and Prevent Policy; GA 3.2 Risk Management Framework
Audience	All enrolled students at UKCBC and staff involved in attendance, engagement and student support

1. Purpose

This framework establishes a comprehensive, institution-wide approach to the identification, monitoring and management of student risk, with particular focus on attendance, engagement and continuation.

It provides a structured mechanism through which:

- Student level risk is identified using real time operational data
- Interventions are delivered in a consistent, proportionate and timely manner
- Risk is escalated through defined governance structures
- Institutional oversight is maintained through integration with the Academic Risk Register

The framework is designed to ensure that operational student support activity is directly connected to academic quality assurance and corporate risk management, providing a clear line of sight from individual student engagement through to Board level assurance.

This approach reflects the College's responsibility to support student success while maintaining compliance with regulatory expectations relating to continuation, student protection and academic standards.

2. Scope

This framework applies to all students enrolled at UK College of Business and Computing (UKCBC) and to all staff involved in attendance, engagement and student support.

3. Definitions

For the purposes of this policy:

Student at risk: a student whose attendance, engagement, welfare or academic activity indicates a risk to their continuation or success.

True attendance: attendance at timetabled classes only.

Overall attendance: attendance including authorised absences.

Risk bands: the categories used to classify students as low risk, emerging risk, or high or critical risk (section 6.2).

Tiered intervention: the staged model of early stage, targeted, intensive and formal outcome interventions (section 7.2).

Case management: the recorded management of an individual student's interventions and support, led by the Student Support and Experience Officer.

4. Institutional Positioning

This framework does not operate in isolation. It is positioned as a cross-cutting mechanism that integrates four core institutional domains:

- Student engagement and support delivery

- Academic monitoring and intervention
- Registry processes and student status management
- Risk and governance oversight

It is underpinned by and operates in conjunction with:

- Student Attendance and Engagement Policy
- Student Withdrawal, Suspension and Transfer Policy
- Academic Risk Register and Risk Management Framework
- Corporate Academic Governance Framework

Within this architecture, the framework functions as the operational engine for continuation risk management, translating data into action and action into institutional assurance.

5. Conceptual Model

The framework is built around a **four-stage model**:

1. **Identification** – using attendance and engagement data to detect risk
2. **Intervention** – delivering structured, tiered support
3. **Escalation** – moving unresolved or systemic issues into governance structures
4. **Assurance** – monitoring effectiveness and informing institutional risk

These stages operate continuously and iteratively, rather than sequentially.

6. Identification of Students at Risk

6.1 Data Driven Identification

Students at risk are identified through the systematic use of institutional data, primarily via the Attendance and Engagement Dashboard.

This includes:

- Timetabled attendance data
- True attendance metrics reflecting meaningful participation
- Engagement indicators such as assessment submission and academic activity
- Contact and response patterns
- Welfare, safeguarding or administrative indicators

The dashboard provides both individual level visibility and cohort level analysis, enabling early identification of risk patterns.

The distinction between overall attendance and “true attendance” is particularly significant, as it highlights cases where presence does not equate to engagement, representing a latent continuation risk.

6.2 Risk Thresholds and Categorisation

Students are categorised into risk bands based on defined thresholds:

- Students with sustained high attendance and engagement are considered low risk
- Students with declining or inconsistent engagement are classified as emerging risk
- Students with sustained low attendance or disengagement are classified as high or critical risk

These thresholds are operationalised within the dashboard and used consistently across academic and support functions.

Where appropriate, these thresholds are aligned to intervention stages defined within the Attendance and Engagement Policy .

7. Intervention Framework

7.1 Principles of Intervention

Interventions are designed to be:

- **Early** – initiated at the first indication of risk
- **Proportionate** – aligned to the level and nature of risk
- **Coordinated** – delivered across academic and support teams
- **Recorded** – documented within institutional systems
- **Student centred** – supportive rather than punitive in initial stages

7.2 Tiered Intervention Model

The framework adopts a structured, tiered approach:

Early Stage Intervention focuses on light touch engagement, including contact, clarification of expectations and signposting to support.

Targeted Intervention introduces structured support plans, increased monitoring and coordinated input from academic teams and the Student Support and Experience Team.

Intensive Intervention involves formal case management, escalation to senior staff, and consideration of safeguarding, wellbeing or academic progression concerns.

Formal Outcome Stage is reached where engagement does not improve, at which point processes relating to interruption, withdrawal or termination may be initiated in line with institutional policy.

8. Roles and Operational Responsibilities

8.1 Assistant Lecturer

The Assistant Lecturer plays a critical role in frontline engagement monitoring and early intervention.

The role is responsible for:

- Monitoring attendance and engagement within teaching contexts

- Initiating early contact with students demonstrating disengagement
- Supporting students to re-engage with academic activity
- Escalating concerns through defined academic and support channels

This reflects the dual academic and student engagement function of the role, operating across both teaching and support domains .

8.2 Student Support and Experience Officer

The Student Support and Experience Officer operates as the primary case management function within the framework.

Responsibilities include:

- Managing allocated caseloads based on defined risk thresholds
- Delivering structured, consistent and recorded interventions
- Maintaining accurate and auditable case records
- Providing first line pastoral support and guidance
- Escalating complex or high risk cases

The role is explicitly designed to operate within a data informed, threshold driven and auditable case management system, ensuring consistency and accountability .

8.3 Head of Student Support and Experience

The Head of Student Support and Experience provides strategic leadership and system design oversight.

The role is responsible for:

- Designing and implementing the engagement and continuation strategy
- Establishing intervention thresholds and escalation mechanisms
- Overseeing the case management framework
- Ensuring alignment with institutional risk and governance processes
- Leading reporting on engagement, continuation and support activity

The role operates within a matrix relationship with Registry, ensuring that engagement risk is aligned with formal institutional oversight and reporting structures .

8.4 Academic Staff

Academic staff contribute through:

- Monitoring academic engagement and assessment participation
- Providing academic support and intervention
- Identifying students at risk through academic performance indicators
- Collaborating with the Student Support and Experience Team

8.5 Registry

Registry retains responsibility for:

- Formal management of student status
- Administration of withdrawal, suspension and transfer decisions
- Maintaining accurate student records
- Ensuring regulatory compliance
- Capturing attendance, engagement and intervention data in the student record system and providing management information system (MIS) reports to support monitoring and the Attendance Working Group

Registry acts as the formal decision-making authority for status changes arising from sustained disengagement .

8.6 Attendance Working Group

The Attendance Working Group functions as the core operational coordination mechanism.

It is responsible for:

- Reviewing attendance and engagement data on a regular basis
- Identifying students at risk
- Coordinating cross-functional intervention activity
- Monitoring the effectiveness of interventions
- Escalating high risk or complex cases

The group ensures consistent communication and alignment between academic teams, student support and administration.

9. Escalation and Governance

9.1 Operational Escalation

Where student level intervention is not effective:

- Cases are escalated within the Attendance Working Group
- High risk or complex cases are referred to senior staff
- Safeguarding or wellbeing concerns are escalated through appropriate channels

9.2 Institutional Escalation

At an institutional level:

- Trends and patterns are reported to the Quality of Education Committee
- Systemic risks are captured within the Academic Risk Register
- Risks are scored and monitored in line with the Risk Management Framework

- Significant risks are escalated to Executive Leadership and Board level

9.3 Integration with Risk Register

Attendance and engagement data forms a core input into academic risk identification, particularly in relation to:

- Continuation rates
- Progression outcomes
- Student protection risks

This ensures that operational data is translated into formal risk oversight.

10. Systems and Data Integrity

All activity within the framework must be:

- Recorded within institutional systems
- Consistent across teams
- Capable of audit and review
- Used to inform reporting and decision making

The dashboard and case management systems must support:

- Real time visibility of risk
- Tracking of interventions
- Analysis of outcomes

11. Outcomes and Interface with Formal Processes

Where intervention is not successful, outcomes are managed through formal processes, including:

- Attendance disciplinary stages
- Intent to withdraw processes
- Termination of enrolment

These processes are governed by:

- Student Attendance and Engagement Policy
- Student Withdrawal, Suspension and Transfer Policy

12. Monitoring, Evaluation and Continuous Improvement

The effectiveness of this framework will be evaluated through:

- Attendance and engagement trends

- Continuation and progression rates
- Intervention success rates
- Student feedback and experience data

Findings will inform:

- Service design improvements
- Policy updates
- Risk mitigation strategies

13. Equality and Student Protection

All interventions must be delivered in a manner that:

- Is fair, consistent and proportionate
- Takes account of individual circumstances
- Supports inclusive practice
- Aligns with safeguarding and student protection requirements

Version History

Version	Date	Author	Summary of changes	Approved by
1.0	23 October 2026	Head of Student Support and Experience	Initial version. Registry responsibility for MIS data capture and reporting added to 6.5 (staff comment of 23 October 2026). Heading levels corrected, Scope and Definitions sections added, sections renumbered and external reference points completed, in line with GA 3.1 (26 October 2026).	Quality of Education Committee