

LTC11D067

Quality Code Part C: Information about Higher Education Provision

Consultation responses:

1.

Principle 1 is problematic insofar as it requires 'comprehensibility' for all possible audiences. There is a danger that over simplification can have a distorting effect on information being presented. It would be helpful to have clarification around what is meant by 'retrievable' in terms of historic data.

Principle 4 talks in terms of a 'fair reflection', the substitution of 'accurate' may help to avoid confusion as to the meaning of 'fair' in this case.

The expectations and indicators do broadly reflect the intent contained within the principles.

2.

The use of 'higher education experience' rather than 'higher education provision' is problematic since Part C is not concerned with the student experience alone but with institutions' information about provision in the broadest sense. Moreover, Universities do not offer 'an experience', they facilitate and partially deliver that experience, but the totality of the 'experience' is also dependant on the nature of the student's individual engagement with the provision.

The inclusion of 'useful' is problematic. The arbiter of usefulness is the end user of information while the validity, reliability and accessibility of information are within the control of the information provider. It may be better to simply remove 'useful' since material that fulfils the three other requirements is likely to be useful to most users. Alternatively, the Code should define or provide indicative guidance as to what is understood by the term 'useful' in this particular context.

3.

No

4.

No

Although not requested under this question we would note that the term 'all audiences' is problematic and it would be helpful to clarify what generic issues are likely to be of interest to all audiences. Additionally, it would be useful to remove the qualifier 'sufficient' since this is a notoriously difficult term to objectively determine.

5.

No

Although not requested under this question we would also note the following points:

Is there a clearly defined basis for not providing the bulk of the information, regarded within Part C as applicable to current students, also to prospective students?

Under Indicator 5 the phrase 'at appropriate intervals' could usefully be removed

Under Indicator 7 it is not clear, notwithstanding the importance of employability, why this area has been specifically mentioned. It would be better to require that institutions provide students with information about all student services. Additionally, Part C should not make reference in its indicators to the provision of guidance, but only to the provision of information.

6.

No

Although not requested under this question we would also note that the phrase, 'and its value' under Indicator 8 should be removed. The notion of 'value' beyond the credit and/ or mark awarded would require a post-hoc judgment rather than the provision of information from extant data.

7.

No

Although not requested under this question we would also note that the provision of details relating to collaborative provision (Indicator 10) may be problematic in a number of ways: Universities may, for instance, have commercially confidential arrangements with their partners

8.

Yes, although this will need to be kept under review

9.

Yes