

Degree awarding powers (DAPs) assessment report for The Engineering and Design Institute London

New degree awarding powers
end assessment

Provider legal name: The Engineering and Design Institute London

Provider trading name: TEDI-London

UKPRN: 10083403

Assessment conducted: 29 February to 15 August 2024

Reference: OfS 2025.36

Enquiries to: regulation@officeforstudents.org.uk

Publication date: 8 July 2025

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction and background	6
Context	6
Assessment process	9
Information gathering	9
New DAPs probationary period monitoring activities	9
Assessment of DAPs Criterion A: Academic governance	11
Criterion A1: Academic governance	11
Assessment of DAPs Criterion B: Academic standards and quality assurance	21
Criterion B1: Regulatory frameworks	21
Criterion B2: Academic Standards	27
Criterion B3: Quality of the academic experience	35
Assessment of DAPs Criterion C: Scholarship and the pedagogical effectiveness of staff	45
Criterion C1: The role of academic and professional staff	45
Assessment of DAPs Criterion D: Environment for supporting students	51
Criterion D1: Enabling student development and achievement	51
Assessment of DAPs Criterion E: Evaluation of performance	57
Criterion E1: Evaluation of performance	57
Degree awarding powers overarching criterion	61
Annex A: Abbreviations	63

Executive summary

Type of assessment	Quality and standards assessment for full degree awarding powers
For	The Engineering and Design Institute London

1. This report represents the conclusions of an assessment for degree awarding powers (DAPs) at The Engineering and Design Institute London ('the institute').
2. The institute currently holds new degree awarding powers (New DAPs) and is seeking authorisation for time-limited full DAPs for all taught awards (up to and including Level 7) across six specified subjects, following the end of its New DAPs probationary period. This assessment is referred to as the 'New DAPs end assessment'.
3. To carry out the assessment, the Office for Students (OfS) appointed an assessment team, which included three academic experts and one member of OfS staff. This report contains the advice and judgement of the team following its assessment.
4. The team concluded that the institute met all the criteria for a full DAPs authorisation (see Table 1). This report does not, however, represent any decision of the OfS to authorise these powers.

Table 1: Summary of advice against the DAPs criteria

Underpinning DAPs criteria	
Criterion A: Academic governance	Met
Criterion B1: Regulatory frameworks	Met
Criterion B2: Academic standards	Met
Criterion B3: Quality of the academic experience	Met
Criterion C: Scholarship and the pedagogical effectiveness of staff	Met
Criterion D: Environment for supporting students	Met
Criterion E: Evaluation of performance	Met
Overarching Full DAPs criterion	
The provider is a self-critical, cohesive academic community with a proven commitment to the assurance of standards supported by effective quality systems	Met

New degree awarding powers end assessment

The OfS may authorise a registered higher education provider to grant taught awards, or research awards, or both, under section 42 of the Higher Education and Research Act 12 (HERA).

A provider that has been delivering higher education for less than three years does not have a sufficient track record to apply for a full degree awarding powers (Full DAPs) authorisation. It can instead apply for a new degree awarding powers (New DAPs) authorisation.¹

A provider that has been authorised with New DAPs will enter a probationary period from the date on which the New DAPs order takes effect and will normally be eligible to seek time-limited Full DAPs at the end of the probationary period.

Providers may seek time-limited Full DAPs authorisation on a subject-specific basis or covering all subjects. A provider that has held Full DAPs for three years or more is normally eligible to apply to seek 'indefinite' DAPs, with no time limit.

Assessment and decision-making process

Before deciding whether to authorise a provider that holds New DAPs with time-limited Full DAPs, the OfS will undertake a New DAPs end assessment. The purpose of a New DAPs end assessment is to gather evidence to inform a judgement about whether a provider meets the DAPs criteria and has the ability to:

- provide, and maintain the provision of, higher education of an appropriate quality
- apply, and maintain the application of, appropriate standards to that higher education.

The full requirements of the DAPs criteria are detailed in Annex C of the OfS's regulatory framework.²

OfS officers first undertake an eligibility and suitability assessment of the provider. This initial assessment determines the scope and level of detail of the assessment, and an initial position on whether the assessment should be desk-based or include a visit to the provider.

Assessments for degree awarding powers are conducted by teams which include academic experts that the OfS has appointed. The outcome of the assessment is typically a report, produced by the assessment team, summarising its findings.

The report is then considered by the OfS's Quality Assessment Committee (QAC). The QAC is responsible for providing advice to the OfS under section 46 of HERA on the quality and standards applied to higher education being delivered by providers for which the OfS is considering granting, varying, or (in certain circumstances) revoking authorisation for DAPs.³

After considering the assessment report, the QAC provides advice to the OfS regarding quality and standards.

In making its decision about whether to authorise Full DAPs on the basis sought by the provider, the OfS will have regard to any assessment report and the QAC's advice. The OfS

¹For a summary of different types of degree awarding powers, see <https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/for-providers/registering-with-the-ofs/degree-awarding-powers/>.

² See Annex C of the OfS's regulatory framework: [Annex C – Guidance on the criteria for the authorisation for DAPs - Office for Students](#).

³ See [Higher Education and Research Act 2017, section 46](#).

will also consider its own risk assessment of the provider and will have regard to other advice received from others where this has been sought. It will also take into account other relevant considerations, such as the OfS's general duties under section 2 of HERA.⁴

Further information

We have published further information about providers seeking New DAPs and Full DAPs in Regulatory advice 12.⁵

5. The Engineering and Design Institute London (TEDI-London) ('the institute') was founded in 2019 by Arizona State University, King's College London and University of New South Wales (UNSW) Sydney as an engineering specialist higher education institute. The institute was awarded New DAPs by the OfS on 1 September 2021, for a period of three years and three months. The New DAPs order authorised the institute to grant the following specified taught awards, for a probationary period beginning on 1 September 2021 and expiring on 30 November 2024:
 - BEng in Global Design Engineering
 - BEng (Hons) in Global Design Engineering
 - MEng in Global Design Engineering
 - CertHE in Global Design Engineering
 - DipHE in Global Design Engineering.
6. In accordance with the OfS's regulatory framework and operational guidance on the assessment of DAPs⁶, the institute is eligible to be considered for Full DAPs because it has reached the end of its New DAPs probationary period and meets the eligibility criteria for Full DAPs set out in paragraph 249 of the OfS's regulatory framework.
7. The OfS appointed an external team on 12 February 2024 to undertake a desk-based New DAPs end assessment. The team was asked to give its advice about the quality of, and standards applied to, higher education courses at the institute and whether the institute has met the DAPs criteria through the implementation of its New DAPs plan during the probationary period.
8. The assessment team considered a range of information submitted by the institute in support of its request for time-limited Full DAPs, alongside evidence collected during monitoring activities throughout the institute's probationary period.

⁴ See: [Higher Education and Research Act 2017, section 2](#).

⁵ See: [Regulatory advice 12: How to apply for degree awarding powers - Office for Students](#)

⁶ See: [Operational guidance for providers on DAPs assessment \(officeforstudents.org.uk\)](#).

9. This report will be considered by the OfS's Quality Assessment Committee (QAC) at its meeting of 16 September 2024. QAC will formulate its advice to the OfS regarding quality and standards at the institute having considered this report.
10. The OfS will consider this assessment report, and QAC's advice in deciding whether to grant the institute's Full DAPs authorisation on the basis requested. The OfS will also consider its own risk assessment for the institute and have regard to the advice received from others where this has been sought, as well as other relevant considerations, such as the OfS's general duties under section 2 of HERA.

Introduction and background

11. This report represents the conclusions of an assessment for degree awarding powers (DAPs) at The Engineering and Design Institute London ('the institute').
12. The institute currently holds New DAPs and is seeking authorisation for time-limited Full DAPs for all taught awards (up to and including Level 7) in the following Common Aggregation Hierarchy (CAH) coded subjects, following the end of its New DAPs probationary period:
 - a. CAH10 Engineering and Technology
 - b. CAH11 Computing
 - c. CAH13 Architecture, building and planning
 - d. CAH17 Business and Management
 - e. CAH23 Combined and general studies
 - f. CAH25 Design and creative and performing arts.
13. This assessment is referred to as the 'New DAPs end assessment'. The OfS's Quality Assessment Committee will consider the report and formulate its advice to the OfS regarding the quality and standards at the institute.
14. The OfS will consider this assessment report, and QAC's advice in deciding whether to grant the institute's Full DAPs authorisation on the basis requested. The OfS will also consider its own risk assessment of the institute and will have regard to advice received from others where this has been sought. It will also take into account other relevant considerations, such as the OfS's general duties under section 2 of HERA.

Context

15. The Engineering and Design Institute London (TEDI-London) (also referred to as 'the institute' in this report) was founded by Arizona State University (ASU), King's College London and University of New South Wales, Sydney (UNSW) as an engineering specialist higher education institute. It was founded with the aim of addressing the shortage of engineers and enhancing the quality of engineering graduates with the 'right mix of technical and, crucially, social and contextual skills to tackle global challenges and help change people's lives. Targeting a more diverse cohort of students than traditional engineering degrees, TEDI-London aims to attract and empower socially aware and globally focused engineers through its innovative, industry informed and project-based curriculum.'⁷
16. The institute's current strategic plan, TEDI-London strategic plan 2020-25, sets out the three goals of:
 - a. 'We are changing lives through impactful and student-focused learning.'

⁷ See '[Strategic Plan 2020-2025 Phase 1](#)', The Engineering and Design Institute.

- b. 'We are engineering solutions for our global future.'
- c. 'We are enabling diverse and supportive environments for people to flourish.'
17. The institute was awarded New DAPs by the OfS on 1 September 2021 for a period of three years and three months and recruited its first cohort of students in September 2021. The New DAPs order authorised the institute to grant specified taught awards, for a probationary period beginning on 1 September 2021 and expiring on 30 November 2024. The institute was restricted to delivering the following programmes set out in its New DAPs Plan:
- BEng in Global Design Engineering
 - BEng (Hons) in Global Design Engineering
 - MEng (Hons) in Global Design Engineering
 - CertHE in Global Design Engineering
 - DipHE in Global Design Engineering.
18. The institute is planning to expand its provision into new programmes that align with its existing curriculum portfolio, so with a particular focus on engineering and design programmes. The institute confirmed that it is in at an early stage of exploring new programmes and will be presenting a business case to its board in November 2024. The institute has confirmed that the new programme areas would fall within the CAH coded subjects listed under paragraph 12, but that it would only be seeking to offer new provision that directly relates to engineering and design to align with the institute's overall strategy. CAH codes cover a breadth of standardised groupings of subjects which accounts for the inclusion of performing arts and architecture in this case.
19. Based on the latest available OfS 'Size and shape of provision data dashboard', the institute had a student population (headcount) in 2022-23 of 70 full-time students across all levels of higher education.⁸
20. In its New DAPs self-assessment document of 4 March 2024, the institute confirmed that it had seven academic staff members and had plans to expand its academic workforce.
21. The OfS's operational guidance on the assessment of DAPs sets out information regarding the monitoring of providers with New DAPs and the assessment process at the end of the probationary period. This guidance sets out that a typical monitoring schedule for a provider in its probationary period would see it undergo monitoring throughout this period, with a view to commencing assessment for Full DAPs towards the end of the probationary period. To supplement this, the timelines and process of the New DAPs end assessment follows the timescales and processes detailed in the OfS's regulatory framework and operational guidance on the variation of DAPs .⁹

⁸ Available at [Size and shape of provision data dashboard: Data dashboard](#).

⁹ See [Regulatory advice 12: How to apply for degree awarding powers](#).

22. In accordance with the OfS's regulatory framework and operational guidance on the variation of DAPs, the OfS undertook an initial eligibility and suitability assessment of the institute and decided that a desk-based New DAPs end assessment should be undertaken.¹⁰ The purpose of the New DAPs end assessment is to gather evidence to inform a judgement about whether a provider meets the DAPs criteria and has the ability to:
- a. provide, and maintain the provision of, higher education of an appropriate quality
 - b. apply, and maintain the application of, appropriate standards to that higher education.
23. The OfS appointed an assessment team on 11 February 2024 which consisted of three academic expert assessors and a member of OfS staff in the following roles:
- a. Mr Christopher Emmett - committee chair and lead assessor
 - b. Dr Ben Lishman - deputy committee chair and assessor
 - c. Dr Parveen Kaur Samra - deputy committee chair and assessor
 - d. Gemma Cadogan - committee member and assessment coordinator.
24. The OfS asked the team to give its advice about the quality of, and standards applied to, higher education courses at the institute and whether the institute has met the DAPs criteria through the implementation of its New DAPs plan during the probationary period.
25. The assessment team considered a range of information submitted by the institute in support of its request to seek time-limited Full DAPs, alongside evidence collected during monitoring activities throughout the institute's probationary period.

¹⁰ See Regulatory advice 17: Variation and revocation of degree awarding powers.

Assessment process

Information gathering

26. In accordance with the operational guidance on assessment for degree awarding powers outlined in Annex D of the OfS's guidance on how to apply for DAPs, the institute submitted a self-assessment document on 4 March 2024.¹¹ This set out how it considered it met the DAPs criteria through the implementation of its New DAPs plan during the probationary period.
27. To support the statements made in the self-assessment document on 4 March 2024, the institute submitted a range of documentary evidence. This included programme documentation, as well as information including course documentation, information related to academic policies and processes and governance.
28. Following the team's assessment of the institute's evidence submission, it requested further information and evidence from the institute. The institute submitted a response to this request on 26 April 2024.
29. Following a review of the additional information submitted, the assessment team sought further clarifications and evidence from the provider. The institute submitted responses to these requests on 18 June, 21 June, 2 July, 22 July and 30 July 2024.

New DAPs probationary period monitoring activities

30. In accordance with the operational guidance on assessment for degree awarding powers outlined in Annex D of the OfS's guidance on how to apply for DAPs, the team's assessment included a review of previous monitoring activities undertaken throughout the institute's New DAPs probationary period.
31. The probationary period monitoring activities and associated evidence that the assessment team considered includes the institute's New DAPs plan, seven self-assessment reports and associated documentary evidence submitted by the institute, and monitoring reports completed by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) in its former role as designated quality body in England.
32. During the first year of the institute's probationary period, the QAA undertook eight observations between 27 September 2021 to 24 June 2022. These observations included a meeting of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee, the Board of Trustee Directors, the Academic Board and the Student Experience Committee. The QAA also observed an assessment review panel and an admissions assessment centre.. The QAA undertook two visits to the institute on 20-21 October 2021 and on 31 August 2022.
33. During the second year of the institute's probationary period the QAA undertook seven observations from 7 September 2022 to 18 January 2023. These were observations of a staff development session, the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee, the strategic leadership team, the Academic Board, a weekly teaching team meeting, teaching and learning and the

¹¹ See [Regulatory advice 12: How to apply for degree awarding powers.](#)

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee. The QAA also undertook an online visit of the institute on 20 January 2023.

34. The evidence referred to throughout this report is listed in Annex A. This includes evidence collected during the probationary period, as well as evidence submitted by the institute to support the New DAPs end assessment.

Assessment of DAPs Criterion A: Academic governance

Criterion A1: Academic governance

Advice to the OfS

35. The assessment team's view is that the institute satisfies criterion A1: Academic governance because it meets subcriteria A1.1, A1.2, A1.3.
36. The assessment team's view is based on its review of evidence provided, which shows that the institute has effective academic governance and management structures. These demonstrate clear lines of accountability for its academic responsibilities.
37. This view is based on specific consideration of the evidence requirements for this criterion collated throughout the institute's probationary period, and for the purposes of this New DAPs end assessment, alongside any other relevant information.

Subcriterion A1.1

A1.1: An organisation granted degree awarding powers has effective academic governance, with clear and appropriate lines of accountability for its academic responsibilities.

Advice to the OfS

38. The assessment team's view is that the institute meets criterion A1.1 because it has effective academic governance with clear and appropriate lines of accountability for its academic responsibilities.
39. The assessments team's view is based on its review of evidence that shows that the institute met the evidence requirements for A1.1.

Reasoning

40. To inform the assessment team's consideration of the institute's academic governance arrangements, the institute provided the following contextual information about its governance and committee structures.
41. The institute's 2020 to 2025 strategic plan sets out its overall educational mission, vision and strategic aims.¹² It states its vision as 'Transforming engineering education to transform lives – both for students and for the users of the products they design and make'. The strategic plan is underpinned by three core goals which, broadly stated, are impactful and student-focused learning; engineering solutions; and enabling diverse and supportive environments. The three goals are further underpinned by a series of objectives. Each objective has a set of key performance indicators.

¹² See [TEDI-London-organisational-strategy-document_DIGITAL.pdf](#).

42. The Board of Trustee Directors is the institute's most senior decision-making authority responsible for overseeing the institute's academic mission, strategic direction, and operating activities.¹³ It sets out the overall framework of strategy and policy. The institute's website has pages introducing members of the Board of Trustee Directors and the 'Delegations policy', which provides further information on roles and responsibilities.¹⁴
43. The institute has established an Academic Board, which acts as the institute's academic authority, focusing on academic standards and quality. It reports to the Board of Trustee Directors and is responsible for the oversight and development of all academic activities including admissions, teaching, assessment, academic standards and awards. The Academic Board meets at least three times per year and meeting minutes are made available to the institute's staff and students.
44. To achieve implementation of the institute's mission and strategic plan, the Academic Board has established a number of subcommittees which include the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee, the Student Experience Committee and a Programme Approval and Review Committee. The Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee undertakes much of the detailed academic work, such as the scrutiny of programme amendment requests.
45. To examine whether the institute's higher education vision, mission and strategic direction and associated policies are coherent, published, understood and consistently applied, the assessment team reviewed the institute's:
46. strategic plan 2020 to 2025
- academic regulations and associated academic policies
 - minutes of Board of Trustee Directors and Academic Board meetings.
47. The assessment team found the strategic plan and associated academic policies to be clear, easily understood and easily accessible the institute's website.¹⁵ Minutes of the Academic Board demonstrate that the focus of the Academic Board consistently aligns with the strategic plan, because access and participation, student support, admissions and recruitment, and student feedback are among the areas considered in Academic Board meetings.
48. Similarly, minutes of board meetings indicate a focus on the strategy, such as the strategic goal of creating an inclusive culture. The assessment team found that the institute applies and monitors its policies and performance in a rigorous, consistent and effective manner. For example, the Academic Board Combined Papers of 3 November 2022 demonstrate consideration of policy and regulatory updates and discussion of a detailed report on governance, quality assurance and enhancement. The assessment team saw evidence of staff training sessions aimed at promoting understanding of the institute's regulatory and policy framework.

¹³ See [TEDI-London Governance | TEDI London](#).

¹⁴ See [The Engineering and Design Institute London, Delegations policy](#).

¹⁵ See [TEDI-London policies and regulations | TEDI London](#).

49. The assessment team also saw evidence of coherence between academic policies and the stated goals of the institute's strategic plan and was satisfied that the academic policies support the institute's higher education missions and aims. For example, the 'Learning and teaching strategy' aims to ensure the institute's curriculum 'develops students as professionals who are...creative problem solvers with a global, future focused outlook'. This reflects the strategic goals around global focus and engineering solutions. Similarly, the 'Recruitment policy' and 'Admissions policy' include an aim to 'attract a diverse body of engineering students' thus aligning with the institute's third strategic goal around enabling diversity.
50. The assessment team recognised that some more recently implemented policies, such as the 'Attendance and engagement policy' have had limited time to demonstrate impact. The assessment team also noticed potential overlap in focus between the 'Attendance and engagement policy' and the 'Student engagement policy'. While the two policies serve slightly different purposes, the institute has advised it is currently reviewing the student engagement policy and will clarify its purpose and name as part of this review.
51. The assessment team was able, through its review of a range of documentation, to discern clarity and differentiation of academic governance functions and responsibilities at all levels. This included:
- minutes of Board meetings
 - the institute's academic committee regulations
 - the updated Academic Board terms of reference
 - the institute's committee structure and its 'New DAPs self-assessment'.
52. The assessment team found that the institute has a well-developed academic governance structure with clear differentiation of functions at all levels. For example, there is clear division between the Academic Board and Board of Trustee Directors, with the Academic Board's terms of reference defining the responsibilities and accountabilities for each Board member.
53. The Board of Trustee Directors clearly discharges its responsibilities, which ensure the institute can deliver the strategy. The assessment team formed the view that the Board operates well, with all members fully engaged. Minutes of Board meetings evidenced the Board providing appropriate challenge and scrutiny across a number of areas, including finance and academic operations. The assessment team also found clarity and differentiation of functions across all levels of academic governance, as evidenced in the institute's academic committee regulations. These set out the terms of reference, rules of procedure, and reporting arrangements for the Academic Board and its key subcommittees.
54. A review of a sample of meeting minutes from the Academic Board, the Learning Teaching and Quality Committee, and an assessment panel review meeting, further evidenced the institute's academic governance structures operating with clarity and differentiation of functions. For example, minutes of the September 2021 Learning, Teaching and Quality committee meeting evidenced the committee considering a validation report in line with its terms of reference. Academic Board minutes evidence this committee having oversight of academic standards, in part through receipt and discussion of the Learning Teaching and Quality committee minutes. The team found the 'Portfolio update report' provides further

insight into governance and operations at the institute, including assuring that the Board of Trustee Directors is well managed and has independence from the Academic Board.

55. The assessment team also saw evidence of the institute reflecting on its governance arrangements and the effectiveness of its committees. For example, in November 2022 an academic governance review was conducted and recommendations from the review were approved by the Academic Board and subsequently implemented. In its 'New DAPs self-assessment document' the institute also advised its intention to undertake a further governance review in 2024. This demonstrated to the assessment team the institute's commitment to ensuring effective academic governance as well as a self-reflective approach.
56. To understand whether the functions and responsibilities of the senior academic authority are clearly articulated and consistently applied, the assessment team reviewed a range of documentation, including the academic committee regulations, minutes of Academic Board meetings, and Academic Board papers. It also reviewed the QAA monitoring team's observations of Academic Board meetings undertaken as part of the New DAPs probationary period monitoring. As mentioned earlier in this report, the academic committee regulations and the Academic Board terms of reference, clearly articulate the Academic Board's functions and responsibilities. The assessment team noted that the committee's schedule of business aligned with its terms of reference as it included consideration of matters such as the annual governance, quality assurance and enhancement report, annual programme monitoring, overview of the assessments process and student feedback.
57. A review of a sample of Academic Board meeting minutes and board papers demonstrated to the assessment team that the Academic Board's authority is clearly and consistently applied. For example, the minutes of the November 2022 meeting evidenced the committee approving a number of higher education programmes and giving consideration to future curriculum development. Similarly, the minutes of the March 2023 meeting, noted the Academic Board receiving minutes from the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee and approving updated terms of reference and membership for that committee. The assessment team also saw evidence of Academic Board minutes being considered by the Board of Trustee Directors, although it noted that this was not always consistent. However, the institute's June 2023 paper on academic governance provided reassurance to the Board on progress against recommendations of the 2022 academic governance review.
58. To assess the effectiveness of academic governance, the QAA monitoring assessment team conducted a series of observations and the current assessment team reviewed reports of these observations. The assessment team found that QAA observation monitoring reports identified that committee papers were circulated in sufficient time to prepare for meetings, actions were tracked and reported on, there were updates on the key portfolio areas (such as equality, diversity and inclusion, portfolio diversification, skills and employability, marketing and student recruitment), and updates from the Board of Trustee Directors. Members were observed to be engaged in detailed discussions that were appropriate to their leadership responsibilities. Reviewing the more recent minutes from the Board of Trustee Directors the assessment team found that progress against actions from previous meetings was monitored.
59. The assessment team noted that the QAA monitoring team observation report for the February 2022 Academic Board meeting highlighted engagement from members, including students and industry representatives, but that the QAA observation report from the

November 2022 meeting raised a concern about the effectiveness of communication between the committees and the Academic Board. However, the assessment team also noted that the same November 2022 QAA observation report highlighted that discussions related to academic standards and quality assurance were ‘detailed, robust and engaged all staff’. Overall, the assessment team formed the view that the Academic Board is well established and performing effectively and that its authority is clearly articulated and consistently applied.

60. The assessment team was aware that during the New DAPs probationary period there have been significant changes to the institute’s leadership, including a new Dean and Chair for Academic Board (as of January 2024) and a new Board of Trustee Directors Chair (as of 2023), as well as new independent trustee directors. The institute has been supported and guided through this period of change by senior colleagues from its founding partners: ASU and UNSW. The assessment team viewed representation and input from the founding members to the Board of Trustee Directors meetings and found that these have been well managed and provided good support.
61. The institute advised in its DAPs self-assessment that it continues to receive this support from founding partners, and that the new Dean and the new Board of Trustee Directors Chair have been able to provide stability in leadership. It also advised that the team is led by the Academic Director and that the leadership structure includes year leads, academic subject strand leads and module leads or co-leads.
62. The assessment team reviewed the institute’s organisational structure chart, senior leader and board member profiles available on the institute’s website,¹⁶ together with job description and staff CVs. The assessment team found that the senior leadership team has significant breadth and depth of senior-level higher education experience and relevant industry experience and knowledge. Taken as a whole, the assessment team considered this evidenced that the institute has in place appropriate academic leadership to support its academic functions.
63. The assessment team evaluated the extent to which policies and procedures are developed and implemented in collaboration with stakeholders. A review of the terms of reference of the Academic Board, alongside the meeting minutes, demonstrated that staff and students are involved in the development, implementation and communication of university policies and procedures through their membership of, and attendance at, the Academic Board. It was noted by the assessment team that ‘Policy and regulatory updates’ is a standing agenda item at Academic Board meetings.
64. The May 2022 meeting minutes evidence staff and student representatives present for a discussion about proposed updates to several policies, including the ‘Mitigating circumstances’ policy and the ‘Academic committee regulations’. The assessment team noted that all student-facing policies are available on the institute’s website.¹⁷ The assessment team saw evidence that the Registry will additionally facilitate education and training in policies where required.

¹⁶ See [Our people | TEDI London](#).

¹⁷ See [TEDI-London policies and regulations | TEDI London](#).

65. The institute designs and implements its policies and procedures in collaboration with its staff, students and external stakeholders. The process for communicating policies is managed by the policy owners and ownership of policies is clearly defined within each policy document. The Registry maintains a register of review timelines which is reported to the Board of Trustee Directors annually. Policy owners are responsible for reviewing their policies and communicating with the Executive Committee annually on updates.
66. The institute operates a Strategic Industry Advisory Group, the purpose of which is to provide industry input and advice to the institute through the Executive Dean on its approach to the development and delivery of its engineering provision. The group's terms of reference state its membership is expected to consist of 'prominent and respected executives or practitioners with significant experience in their sector'. Findings from this group inform discussions at the Academic Board and Learning Teaching and Quality Committee, where portfolio development is a standing agenda item. The assessment team was aware that the Academic Board terms of reference has provision for an industry member of the committee, although it appeared that this appointment was yet to be made.
67. The assessment team also observed that the institute has an Industry Curriculum Working Group, which is a platform for industry collaboration across curriculum development projects. Evidence indicated that the focus of the working group's April 2022 meeting had been consideration of industry practice and industry feedback. The evidence overall confirmed to the assessment team that the institute develops, implements and communicates its policies and procedures in collaboration with its staff and external stakeholders.
68. The assessment team saw evidence of the institute reflecting on and redefining its strategy. It also noted it had undertaken a review of its governance functions in November 2022 and that progress was being maintained against recommendations from that review. The assessment team is also aware that the Academic Board will be conducting a Board Effectiveness Review from June 2024, with a target date for completion of September 2024. The assessment team considers that this reflective approach to academic governance demonstrates that the institute is an effective self-critical organisation which places importance on clear reporting lines and appropriate decision-making. Alongside the evidence set out above that shows the effectiveness of the institute's academic governance arrangements, this demonstrated to the assessment team that the institute will continue to effectively manage its DAPs authorisation.

Conclusions

69. The assessment team has concluded that the institute meets criterion A1.1 as the evidence demonstrates that it has effective governance with clear and appropriate lines of accountability for its academic responsibilities. This is demonstrated through scrutiny of evidence relating to the Board of Trustee Directors, the Academic Board, and the standing committees. Our conclusion also considers reflections and changes made from governance reviews and structures. The institute's policies that support the delivery of the institute's strategic aims and activities centred on ensuring quality in curriculum; teaching learning and assessment; attainment and student outcomes; resourcing; ongoing quality monitoring; and health, safety and equal opportunities. These all appropriately form part of the of Academic Board's purview.

Subcriterion A1.2

A1.2: Academic governance, including all aspects of the control and oversight of its higher education provision, is conducted in partnership with its students.

Advice to the OfS

70. The assessment team's view is that the provider meets criterion A1.2 because all aspects of its academic governance, and its control and oversight of its higher education provision, are conducted in partnership with its students.
71. The assessments team's view is based on its review of evidence, which shows that the institute has met the evidence requirements for A1.2 and any other relevant evidence requirements.

Reasoning

72. To understand the extent to which students are engaged as partners in the governance and management of the institute, the team reviewed a range of evidence. This included:
- the academic committee regulations
 - terms of reference for the key committees
 - Board of Trustee Directors and Academic Board meeting minutes
 - student representative training.
73. The assessment team found that students individually and collectively are engaged in the governance and management of the organisation and its higher education provision and provide a clear student voice in the decision-making process. Student input into academic governance is achieved through a variety of student-led roles and mechanisms such as student committee membership and the student representatives and schemes. 'Student voice leaders' and student representatives (who have specific areas of responsibility, such as international students, or for equality and diversity) represent their fellow students and have the power to make changes on their course and the institute more widely. They work directly with institute staff and attend the Student Experience Committee, which is embedded within the institute's academic governance structure and is soon to be re-named as the Student Voice Forum. Students are supported to engage effectively as outlined in the student representative training document. The training sets out the institute's committee structure, defines the roles and responsibilities of the varying forms of student representation, and addresses the key skills required to be an effective committee member.
74. Students are also provided with a mentor and can meet with their mentor before each committee meeting. They are also given space to speak within meetings or to give their feedback before or after meetings. The assessment team found the institute's approach to student engagement has evolved over the probationary period and, from academic year 2024-25, the Student Voice Forum minutes are to be shared as part of the consideration and discussions at Academic Board. This highlights the institute's continuing commitment to operating academic governance in collaboration with its students.

75. The assessment team saw evidence that the institute has provision for student representation on a number of academic governance committees, including Academic Board, the Student Experience and the Programme Approval and Review committees. A student also co-chairs the Student Experience Committee. Evidence of student engagement in these committees was found in corresponding committee minutes. For example, the minutes of the November 2022 Student Experience Committee capture student input into discussions on Welcome Week activities, including students' suggestions for future improvements.
76. Similarly, minutes of the November 2022 Learning Teaching and Quality committee meeting indicated student engagement with curriculum development discussions. The assessment team also saw confirmation of student input into a number of key academic processes. For example, the 'Programme monitoring and review policy' states that student views are a core part of the programme-review process and their feedback is shared with the Learning Teaching and Quality committee for consideration. Similarly, the annual course monitoring process, demonstrates the institute's commitment to student representation, delivering on a 'you said, we listened' model. The 'Programme development guidance' also requires that students are actively involved in the course design process and that explicit consideration is given to how students' views have been accounted for in curriculum design.
77. The institute frequently uses student surveys, focus group meetings, workshops, or formal consultations to elicit feedback, improve teaching and learning and generally to inform practice across the institute.

Conclusions

78. The assessment team has concluded that the institute meets criterion A1.2 as the evidence demonstrates that academic governance is conducted in partnership with students and that students are individually and collectively engaged in the governance and management of the institute and its higher education provision. Furthermore, students are effectively supported to be able to engage meaningfully.

Subcriterion A1.3

A1.3: Where an organisation granted degree awarding powers works with other organisations to deliver learning opportunities, it ensures that its governance and management of such opportunities is robust and effective and that decisions to work with other organisations are the result of a strategic approach rather than opportunism.

Advice to the OfS

79. The assessment team's view is that the institute meets criterion A1.3 because the evidence indicates that should the institute decide to work with other organisations to deliver learning opportunities, the institute has the structures already in place to ensure that its governance and management of such opportunities would be robust and effective and that decisions to work with other organisations would be the result of a strategic approach rather than opportunism.
80. The assessments team's view is based on its review of evidence which shows that the institute can meet the evidence requirements for A1.3.

Reasoning

81. To evaluate the institute's approach to delivering learning opportunities in partnership with other organisations, the assessment team reviewed a range of documentation including the institute's strategic plan, its partnership strategy and its due diligence policy.¹⁸
82. The institute's strategic plan states its intention to work with global partners and industry professionals to offer global and skills-based learning opportunities to its students.¹⁹ During the New DAPs probationary period, the institute introduced a study-abroad component to all programmes at the founding partners institutes of ASU and UNSW. These opportunities were offered in 2024 to year three students who demonstrated good overall attendance and academic achievement, and were successful in the application and selection process. The institute also actively seeks to develop suitable learning opportunities with industry partners, such as project co-development initiatives that facilitate the scoping, development and delivery of skills-based learning projects.
83. An example, of these co-developed projects can be seen in the year one 'Campus Project'. This project had input from many industrial collaborators such as Global Generation, London Grow and British Land. Innovation through partnership and project is core to the institute's strategy and underpins the way it delivers education for engineers. The institute intends to upscale partnership working over time. The assessment team reflected that the partnership strategy clearly underpins the institute's organisational goals and objectives and evidenced that the approach to partnership working was strategic rather than opportunistic.
84. The assessment team reviewed the institute's 'Due diligence policy' relating to partnerships. The policy sets out the institute's approach to conducting due diligence and assessing risk related to partnership opportunities. This policy is intended to help the institute with decision-making and to operate within its risk appetite, by creating a consistent approach across the institution to conducting due diligence and assessing risks related to partnership opportunities. The approach includes regular reporting through established management and governance structures.
85. This policy applies to the institute's relationship with Engineers Without Borders which was established in April 2021. The assessment team reviewed the 'Engineers Without Borders partnership agreement'. It found the partnership established a support network from April 2021 to March 2024 to:
 - upskill and create more globally responsible engineers
 - raise awareness of disruptive approaches to inspire change
 - realise a positive impact that engineering can have on the planet
 - integrate support for academics and students for sustainable development and extra-curricula experience.

¹⁸ See [Strategic plan | TEDI London](#).

¹⁹ See [Strategic plan | TEDI London](#).

86. The team found that throughout the probationary period there was clear evidence that the partnership was sound and managed appropriately under the institute's governance arrangements. For example, evidence that the institute and the partner worked together was found in the assessment for ENG1101 Introduction to Engineering Design where the Engineering Without Border assessment brief was used to formulate a design challenge. This activity forms part of module assessment on the course, the results of which are fed back to the Assessment Board which is part of Academic Board purview.

Conclusions

87. The assessment team has concluded that the institute's academic governance and management structures currently demonstrate sufficient robustness to ensure that if it should decide to work with other organisations, these arrangements will be led by a strategic approach and that the governance and management of such opportunities would be effective. Therefore, the assessment team has concluded that the institute meets criterion A.
88. Overall, the conclusion was that the institute has effective academic governance and management structures that demonstrate clear and appropriate lines of accountability. The institute effectively engages students as partners in the academic governance (as noted under section A1.1 and A1.2) and management of academic standards and quality. The assessment team is satisfied that there are clear responsibilities associated with the Board of Trustee Directors and the Academic Board in terms of their reporting lines and how the institute operates. A number of committees have been established to ensure the delivery of effective academic governance. The institute develops, implements and communicates its academic policies and procedures in collaboration with its staff, students and external stakeholders.

Assessment of DAPs Criterion B: Academic standards and quality assurance

Criterion B1: Regulatory frameworks

Advice to the OfS

89. The assessment team's view is that the institute meets criterion B1: Regulatory frameworks because it meets subcriteria B1.1, B1.2.
90. The assessment team's view is based on its review of evidence, which shows in summary that the institute has in place a comprehensive set of academic frameworks and regulations to govern how it awards its qualifications. The assessment team is satisfied that the institute maintains a robust and definitive record of each programme and qualification that it approves, and that these records are the basis for delivery and assessment of its programmes, and provision of records to students and alumni.
91. This view is based on specific consideration of the evidence requirements for this criterion collated throughout the institute's probationary period, and for the purposes of this New DAPs end assessment, alongside any other relevant information.

Subcriterion B1.1

B1.1 An organisation granted degree awarding powers has in place transparent and comprehensive academic frameworks and regulations to govern how it awards academic credit and qualifications.

Advice to the OfS

92. The assessment team's view is that the institute meets criterion B1.1 because it has in place transparent and comprehensive academic frameworks and regulations to govern how it awards academic credit and qualifications.
93. The assessments team's view is based on its review of evidence, which shows that the institute has met the evidence requirements for B1.1.

Reasoning

94. To understand whether the institute has in place transparent and comprehensive academic frameworks and regulations, the assessment team reviewed the institute's 'Academic regulatory framework'; 'Academic awards framework'; 'Assessment regulations'; 'Academic award and progression regulations'; and 'Academic committees' regulations', alongside the quarterly reports compiled by the QAA assessment teams during its probationary period. The assessment team considered that these documents set out in sufficient detail how the awarding of academic credit and qualifications is governed.
95. Overall, the team found the framework and regulation documents to be clear, comprehensive and appropriate to the subjects and levels of study offered. The team was also satisfied that

the framework and regulations are written in an accessible way for students to comprehend, are transparent and are easily accessed on the institute's website.

96. The team considered evidence of the 2022-23 external examiner's report, a QAA monitoring assessment team's observation of a June 2022 assessment board, and minutes from a January 2022 Assessment Review Panel. It found that the evidence demonstrated that the regulations governing the awarding of credit at the institute are applied in practice and are implemented consistently. For example, the external examiner confirmed in their report that the assessment board they attended was conducted in accordance with the institute's academic regulations and procedure. In addition, the QAA monitoring assessment team noted in the record of the observation of the June 2022 Assessment Board that 'the published academic frameworks and regulations covering assessment and progression are appropriate and were implemented fully and consistently'. The team cross-referenced this evidence with a review of the January 2022 Assessment Review Panel which supported the findings of the external examiner and the QAA monitoring assessment team.
97. To determine whether the institute has in place frameworks and regulations governing student admissions, assessment, progression, awards, appeals and complaints, the assessment team reviewed the institute's:
- academic frameworks and assessment regulations
 - 'Admissions policy'
 - 'Quality manual'
 - 'Academic appeals policy'
 - 'Complaints policy'.
98. The team considered that the evidence reviewed demonstrated that the institute has clearly set out how it governs and manages matters such as admissions, appeals and complaints. It also considered that the way the institute does this is appropriate to its status.
99. The team found evidence that the policies are reviewed and updated regularly. For example, the institute amended its admissions policy to remove the 'assessment centre requirement' to make the application process simpler and more inclusive for candidates. Further, the institute implemented an 'Early reassessment policy' to improve progression following findings and feedback that students faced challenges with summer reassessments due to the reassessments taking place when there is no scheduled teaching. The team also reviewed the institute's 'Mitigating circumstances policy' and associated process update to improve the speed of response to students applying for mitigating circumstances. The team found that this evidence demonstrated that the institute regularly monitors and updates its frameworks and policies to ensure they remain effective, appropriate and current.
100. The team also reviewed associated student policies such as the institute's 'Equality, diversity and inclusion policy', 'Student disability support policy' and 'Attendance and engagement policy'.²⁰ The team considered that this evidence further demonstrated that the institute has a

²⁰ See [Student-Disability-Support-Policy-v1-Final-2023-24.pdf \(tedi-london.ac.uk\)](#).

comprehensive set of clear and appropriate policies to govern all aspects of its delivery and responsibilities. Overall, the evidence reviewed by the team demonstrated that the academic frameworks and regulations governing the institute's higher education provision are appropriate to its status and are implemented fully and consistently, aligning with the criteria and UK standards.

101. The evidence reviewed demonstrated to the team that the institute has created academic frameworks that are appropriate for the granting of its qualifications. For example, the team considered that the institute's frameworks and policies are applied in practice, such as the 'Academic awards framework', 'Assessment regulations', 'Academic award and progression regulations' and its 'Quality manual'. The implementation of these policies also demonstrated that the institute's staff are familiar and engaged with the regulations and associated processes.
102. For example, the 'Programme monitoring report' was led by academic staff. The team also considered that the institute's academic frameworks align with regulatory requirements and standards, such as OfS conditions of registration, sector-recognised standards, and the Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ), alongside benchmarks the institute considers appropriate such as the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.²¹ Evidence of this was found in the institute's 'Programme development guidance'. The assessment team considered that the frameworks and policies in place ensure that the institute clearly governs and manages the way it grants its higher education qualifications.
103. The team noted that the institute intends to expand the subjects of its higher education qualifications beyond its current delivery of its BEng and MEng in Global Design Engineering degrees. The institute has informed the OfS that it is in the early stages of planning for the introduction of additional programmes that will be considered at its Academic Board in November 2024. The institute has reported that the additional programmes form part of its forthcoming five-year business plan and they will be in subjects very closely aligned with its existing provision within engineering, design and innovation-related areas.
104. During the assessment the team sought clarification from the institute regarding its plans to support and manage the diversification of its curriculum and programmes. In response, the institute provided a statement on 'Diversified curriculum'. After reviewing this statement, the team was satisfied that it demonstrated that the institute's existing academic frameworks will support the management of its planned curriculum diversification and growth in student numbers, while ensuring there will be appropriate adequate quality control, staffing, and physical resources. For example, the institute reported that its goal is to grow 'in a manner that preserves the essence of our educational approach'.
105. This evidence also demonstrated to the team that the institute shows a clear understanding of the risks involved in its planned growth and diversification of curriculum and the balance of ambition and prudence required to manage this successfully, while seeking engagement from students, staff and external stakeholders to do so. The institute also acknowledged that it may

²¹ See Conditions of registration; Sector-recognised standards; Qualifications Frameworks; and UK Quality Code.

need to review and amend its academic frameworks and regulations to ensure they are relevant and appropriate for its expanded provision.

106. The assessment team was therefore satisfied that, so long as any additional necessary staffing and physical resources are in place, the institute has the appropriate and required governance and quality structures in place to securely expand and diversify the subjects of its higher education provision to a high standard.

Conclusions

107. The team concluded that the institute meets criterion B 1.1 as the evidence demonstrates that the institute has transparent and comprehensive academic frameworks and regulations which govern how it awards academic credit and qualifications, and that they are appropriate, accessible and applied in practice.

Subcriterion B1.2

B1.2: A degree awarding organisation maintains a definitive record of each programme and qualification that it approves (and of subsequent changes to it) which constitutes the reference point for delivery and assessment of the programme, its monitoring and review, and for the provision of records of study to students and alumni.

Advice to the OfS

108. The assessment team's view is that the institute meets criterion B1.2 because it maintains a definitive record of each programme and qualification that it approves (and of subsequent changes to it) and that these constitute the reference point for delivery, and assessment, monitoring and review of each programme. These records are also the reference point for the provision of records of study for students and alumni.

109. The assessments team's view is based on its review of evidence, which shows that the institute has met the evidence requirements for B1.2.

Reasoning

110. The team considered a range of evidence to demonstrate how records for qualification are awarded and maintained, and how such records are used as the basis for the delivery and assessment of each programme. The evidence included:

- a. QAA monitoring assessment team reports
- b. BEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering programme specification for the 2022-23 academic year
- c. a sample of three BEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering module specifications
- d. a sample of two BEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering assessment briefs
- e. a BEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering module handbook
- f. a BEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering assessment feedback sheet

g. QAA assessment team observation noted from a 2022 assessment board

h. an external examiner report from the 2022-23 academic year.

111. The team found that this evidence demonstrated that the curriculum and assessment is clearly described and defined within the programme and module documentation. The team considered that such records of programmes are used as the basis for delivery and assessment, which are also demonstrably consistent with the published programme specifications and assessment regimes.
112. The team considered how the institute manages and maintains changes to programmes and reviewed the institute's 'Programme development guidance', which sets out the design and approval processes for new programmes and the processes for making changes to existing programmes (the 'programme amendment process'). The team found that this process includes three types of amendments – 'editorial', 'minor' and 'major', which are set out and explained clearly. The policy also sets out how the institute maintains an 'incremental amendments log', which is managed by the Registry to maintain an accurate and definitive record of all amendments made to programmes and which supports staff to ensure module and programme specifications are updated.
113. The team reviewed a sample of programme amendment forms, an incremental amendments log from the 2021-22 academic year, and minutes from the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee and found that there is a clear and well-documented process for the ongoing development and amendments of modules and programmes. The team found that there is evidence of approval of changes, secure reporting and record-keeping, including the tracking of incremental development through amendments. The team noted that the programme amendment forms it reviewed provide appropriately detailed rationale for the proposed amendments. The team considered that the evidence reviewed also provides assurance that amendment proposals are submitted to the Registry for consideration and submitted to the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee for consideration and approval or rejection. The amendments are recorded within the programme amendments form, in the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee minutes and in the incremental amendments log. The team's view was therefore that the institute maintains a definitive and up-to-date record of each qualification to be awarded and each programme being offered, including changes made to these programmes.
114. The assessment team's view is that the evidence reviewed demonstrated that students are reliably, personally and accurately informed of assessment results and academic progress and that students and alumni are provided with records of study. For example, the team reviewed evidence of previous reports from QAA monitoring assessment teams (which found that students are clearly informed of results following assessment boards) and that the 'Your Marks' mobile phone application appropriately provide individual marks and feedback following assessments. The accuracy and reliability of such records are safeguarded by the institute's student records system. The team considered that during the institute's probationary period the institute experienced some issues with the development of the student record system, such as a delay in all functionalities being implemented.
115. However, the evidence reviewed demonstrated to the team that the student records system is now fully implemented and functioning as intended. For example, the institute provided an

update of the outcomes of the Student Records System Working Group and a demonstration of the student records system. The team found that the institute's records management system ensures that it is maintaining definitive and up-to-date records of each qualification it awards each programme it offers. The team concluded that the institute meets criterion B1.2 as the evidence demonstrates that the institute maintains a definitive record of each programme and qualification that it approves.

Conclusions

116. The assessment team concluded that the institute has in place transparent and comprehensive academic frameworks and regulations to govern how it awards academic credit and qualifications.
117. The institute maintains definitive records of its programmes and qualifications and ongoing modifications to them, and these records are used reliably and consistently as the reference point for delivery, assessment, monitoring and review, and the recording and provision of records of study to students and alumni. The team therefore concluded that the institute meets criterion B1.

Criterion B2: Academic Standards

Advice to the OfS

118. The assessment team's view is that the institute meets criterion B2: Academic Standards because it meets subcriteria B2.1, B2.2.
119. The assessment team's view is based on its review of evidence, which shows in summary that the institute has clear and consistently applied mechanisms for setting and maintaining the academic standards of its qualifications. It has demonstrated that it can design and deliver courses and qualifications that meet sector-recognised standards and the FHEQ and has demonstrated that it sets and maintains standards above the threshold, comparable to those set and achieved by other UK degree awarding bodies.
120. This view is based on specific consideration of the evidence requirements for this criterion collated throughout the institute's probationary period, and for the purposes of this New DAPs end assessment, alongside any other relevant information.

Subcriteria B2.1 and B2.2

B2.1 An organisation granted degree awarding powers has clear and consistently applied mechanisms for setting and maintaining the academic standards of its higher education qualifications.

B2.2 Organisations with degree awarding powers are expected to demonstrate that they are able to design and deliver courses and qualifications that meet the threshold academic standards described in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ). Organisations with degree awarding powers are expected to demonstrate that the standards that they set and maintain above the threshold are reliable over time and reasonably comparable to those set and achieved by other UK degree awarding bodies.

Advice to the OfS

121. The assessment team's view is that the institute meets criterion B2.1 because it has clear mechanisms for setting and maintaining the academic standards of its higher education qualifications, and that these are consistently applied. The institute's engagement with external partners, its founding institutions, industry bodies and its external examiner ensures a reliable context for the maintenance of standards.
122. Further, the assessment team's view is that the institute meets criterion B2.2 because it demonstrates that it designs and delivers courses and qualifications that meet the threshold academic standards described in the FHEQ. The team's view is that these are reliable over time and reasonably comparable to those set and achieved by other UK degree awarding bodies. Its programme approval arrangements are robust and ensure that academic standards are set at a level which meets the UK threshold standard for the qualification and are in accordance with its own academic frameworks and regulations. There is extensive and clear

guidance provided to those entrusted with these duties, and evidence of appropriate programme review and monitoring to ensure that standards are maintained.

123. The assessment team's view is based on its review of evidence, which shows that the institute has met the evidence requirements for B2.1 and B2.2.

Reasoning

124. To determine if the institute's higher education qualifications reflect the appropriate levels of the sector-recognised standards and correspond to the relevant levels of the FHEQs, the assessment team reviewed the BEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering and MEng (Honours) Global Design Engineering programme specifications and a sample of module specifications from both programmes. The team was satisfied that the institute's qualifications adhere closely to the FHEQ framework levels. For example, the qualifications awarded for the institute's BEng programme is located at the correct level of study and the language of the learning outcomes in the course and module specifications accurately reflects the appropriate FHEQ levels framework. In the development of the institute's current programmes, BEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering and MEng (Honours) Global Design Engineering, the institute engaged with its founding institutions ASU, UNSW and King's College London to seek advice and input on the design of curriculum and the setting of its academic standards, which were initially validated by King's College London. This evidence, cross-referenced with the team's review of the programme and module specifications, demonstrated to the team that the institute's qualifications reflect the levels that would be expected, in line with the sector-recognised standards.
125. Furthermore, the team considered a sample of two BEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering assessment briefs, an example of a BEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering assessment feedback rubric and moderation form, and an assessment verification form from the BEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering year one 'Prototypes' module. The team cross-referenced this evidence with observation notes from a QAA monitoring assessment of a 2022 assessment board and found that the evidence reviewed appropriately reflects the levels at which the qualifications would be expected, in line with the sector-recognised standards and the standards in the FHEQ.
126. The team found that the institute ensures that it takes appropriate account of relevant external points of reference and external and independent points of expertise in the setting and maintaining of its academic standards. For example, the assessment team found that the institute currently engages one external examiner who has affirmed, in their most recent 2022-23 report, that the academic standards and threshold levels set are offered at levels in line with FHEQ and sector-recognised standards. There is also evidence that external examiner feedback and advice has been acted upon in respect of minor modifications. The external examiner also confirmed that the academic standards align with the relevant national Subject Benchmark Statements, which the institute also uses as a further external framework for benchmarking standards as set out in its 'Programme development guidance'.²²
127. The team noted that, to date, the institute has engaged with one external examiner, and the team considered that this has been appropriate given the small range of its programmes and modest student cohort sizes. However, the team considers that as the institute grows in size, it

²² See [Subject Benchmark Statements](#).

will need to engage with more external examiners. The team note that the institute may wish to consider adopting the practice of including external examiners from an industrial context, alongside academic examiners, to ensure feedback about relevance to the current commercial context and employability attributes of its programmes. The team's view was that the institute has processes in place to appoint appropriately experienced external examiners, as evidenced by the current external examiner and through the external examiner policy and nomination form, which sets out the required criteria. The institute's external examining procedures are discussed further under criterion B3.

128. The team considered how the institute manages the design and approval of programmes to ensure that academic standards are set at appropriate levels. It reviewed the institute's 'Programme development guidance', which sets out the design and approval processes for new programmes. The team found that this guidance presents a comprehensive and robust document, which sets out the processes and requirements for staff to follow when developing new programmes. The guidance states that the Academic Board must give proposing members of staff outline approval to start developing new provision. The team found that the guidance clearly sets out how new programmes should align with its own academic frameworks as well as sector-recognised standards. For example, the guidance lists 'considerations when planning a new programme' which refers to its academic awards framework and the FHEQs, as well as the QAA Subject Benchmark Statements and QAA Quality Code.
129. The team noted that the guidance also clearly sets out requirements for consideration of inclusivity and diversity, with links to helpful current resources. The team considered that the institute's procedures for programme development approval and review, together with the institute's BEng and MEng programme and module specifications and evidence of the proposed Certificate and Diploma of Higher Education in Engineering, demonstrated that the programme approval arrangements are robust, effective and consistently applied. The processes in place and evidence reviewed also explicitly address whether the UK threshold academic standards are achieved and whether the academic standards required by the individual degree awarding body are being maintained.
130. The team found that the institute's 'Programme development guidance' sets out that the views and needs of relevant employers, external stakeholders and professional organisations should be actively sought to inform programme development, and that external advisers form part of the programme-approval process. In addition, it sets the requirement that students must be engaged in the design and development of the programmes and curriculum. The institute reported that, during the initial development of its BEng (Hons) and MEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering programmes, student consultation took place through feedback gathered during its summer school. As the development of the programmes pre-dates the New DAPs probationary period, the team considered that the description of how students are to be engaged in programme development to be appropriate if implemented as described.
131. The team also noted that the institute operates a Student Experience Committee and minutes from the February 2022 meeting of that committee show that students contribute, have their voice heard and can expect actions in response. Further, student representatives are members of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee, which is the approving committee of programme development papers and programme amendments. The team found evidence of regular student attendance and engagement in this committee through its review of

minutes. This demonstrated that appropriate external and independent expertise, including students, is proactively sought in the setting of academic standards at the institute.

132. The Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee has oversight and responsibility for the approval of new programmes as well as approval of amendments made to existing programmes. This oversight involves ensuring that all relevant standards, policies and regulations are considered in the design or amendment of programmes and modules and that thorough and comprehensive consideration and review is applied. The team found evidence of this being applied in practice through a review of a sample of Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee minutes and a record of programme amendments scrutiny. The team found that the Programme amendments form document submitted to the committee clearly explains the rationale for the proposed amendments and details how students have been involved.
133. The amendments proposal form also sets out whether or not the proposed amendments would impact professional body accreditation and confirms that the Registry has been consulted. Anticipated benefits and risk are also noted, as are possible impacts on staff and physical resources. The minutes of the meeting of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee (where the amendment proposals were presented) clearly show that the content of the proposal form was considered in detail and approval was explicitly noted. This evidence further supported the team's view that the institute's programme approval and review arrangements are robust and applied consistently.
134. The team also reviewed a completed new programme planning request form proposing a standalone Certificate and Diploma of Higher Education in Engineering. It found that it demonstrated a thorough practice of consideration in the development and design process, as well as a clear recording of development progress through several stages of meetings and committees. This included engagement with external advisers and stakeholders for both academic and industry standards, alongside student input. The team noted that a review of minutes from the Strategic Industry Advisory Group provided further evidence of the extensive and detailed contributions from industry figures in this process.
135. To ensure the institute takes an appropriate and broad account of relevant external and independent points of expertise, the institute has a Strategic Industry Advisory Group, which consists of members from across the engineering industry. The group's purpose is to provide 'industry input and advice' to inform the institute's 'strategic objectives, priorities, and delivery approach for educating the next generation of engineers'. The group meets twice a year. Scrutiny of the Strategic Industry Advisory Group's terms of reference and a sample set of minutes of a meeting of the Strategic Industry Advisory Group demonstrated to the team that there is evidence of in-depth discussion closely related to the relationship between education for engineering at the institute, and the commercial sector's requirements of graduates. In addition, the team reviewed the institute's staff expertise and affiliate professional registration mapping document and considered this evidence, together with the Strategic Industry Advisory Group, Quality Manual and samples of programme and module specifications. It considers that this provides sufficient evidence that the institute takes appropriate account of relevant external points of reference and external and independent points of expertise through its programme development and review processes.
136. The institute sets the professional standards relevant to its programmes to align with the requirements of relevant Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs), The

Institution of Engineering and Technology, and The Institution of Engineering Designers, with whom the institute is currently seeking formal accreditation from. Based on the team's experience in the subject and sector, it found that the institute's programme specifications, academic standards and curriculum demonstrate evidence of professional standards in practice. Further, the external examiner also confirmed that they found that students who achieve credit at the various levels of study are achieving the required sector-recognised professional standards.

137. The institute reported that The Institution of Engineering and Technology and The Institution of Engineering Designers have confirmed that they will visit to assess the institute at the first available opportunity, once the first cohort of its students have graduated. In the meantime, the institute reported that The Institution of Engineering Designers is using the institute's programme documentation as a training tool for its accreditation panel members, demonstrating to the team that the professional body regards the institute's programmes as high quality and relevant to the current commercial and industrial context. Overall, the team considered that the institute's programme-approval arrangements are robust, applied consistently, ensure that academic standards are set at a level which meets the UK threshold standard for the qualification, and are in accordance with their own academic frameworks and regulations. The team also considered that the setting and maintaining of academic standards takes appropriate account of relevant external points of reference and external and independent points of expertise, including students. The team found that as the institute develops its new subject areas and expands its programmes, it will apply the same processes and policies in place to assure the appropriate setting and maintenance of academic standards.
138. To consider if the institute's credit and qualifications are awarded only where the achievement of relevant learning outcomes has been demonstrated through assessment, the team considered the following evidence:
- a. BEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering and MEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering programme specification for the 2022-23 academic year
 - b. a sample course and of three BEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering module specifications
 - c. a sample of two BEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering assessment briefs
 - d. the institute's 'Academic regulatory framework'
 - e. the institute's 'Academic awards framework'
 - f. the institute's 'Assessment regulations'
 - g. the institute's 'Academic award and progression regulations'
 - h. an assessment verification form from the BEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering year one 'Prototypes' module
 - i. the external examiner report

j. the QAA assessment team observation of a 2022 assessment board.

139. The assessment team was satisfied that this evidence demonstrated that the institute has appropriate frameworks, policies and processes in place to conduct the scrutiny and awarding of credit and qualifications. The team considered that, while the institute is yet to award qualifications to its first student cohort since gaining New DAPs, it has the appropriate, robust procedures in place to securely do so. For example, the use of the assessment verification form is a tool that enables staff to confirm the suitability for an assessment instrument. In addition, the assessment team considers that the external examiner's report is thorough and clear in confirming that assessment standards and assessment board processes ensure that credit is only awarded when the learning outcomes that reflect the FHEQ and sector-recognised standards have been met. The assessment team has therefore found that the programme and module learning outcomes set out in the specifications, and associated assessment regulations and instruments reviewed, ensure that credit will only be awarded when the required standards for modules and programmes are achieved.
140. In addition, the assessment team reviewed a sample of student work submitted for assessment and the associated marks and feedback for three modules: ENG1201 Prototyping, ENG2202 Ecological Design, ENG3302 Professional and Personal Portfolio. The student submissions were selected to include individual work, group work and submissions at Levels 4, 5 and 6 for the 2023-24 academic year. The team reviewed this student work alongside the associated module specifications, module handbooks, assessment briefs, together with the internal moderation forms and feedback to students. The team's view is that for each module sampled and each assessment task reviewed, there was evidence of the task being assessed against the learning outcomes accurately and that the student work was accurately marked according to the requirements of the brief and learning outcomes.
141. Further, the team was also of the view that the work was assessed in line with the relevant FHEQs and the sector-recognised standards. In the view of the team there was a clear moderation process in place and feedback was relevant to the work submitted, and constructive, with clear actions on how to improve. The team also found that the student work reviewed demonstrated skills, knowledge and abilities that equip students for employment in the sector. Therefore, the team was satisfied that credit is awarded only where the achievement of relevant learning outcomes has been demonstrated through assessment, and both the UK threshold standards and the academic standards of the institute have been satisfied.
142. To ensure that its programmes and curriculum are monitored and reviewed to ensure academic standards are maintained, the institute has in place a Programme monitoring and review policy'. This is an annual monitoring process that takes place following completion of a full academic year of delivery and on receipt of the external examiner's report and scrutiny of outcomes and feedback. The team found that the policy has been developed in line with appropriate external points of reference, such as the OfS conditions of registration, and other reference points selected by the provider, such as the QAA Quality Code. The monitoring process involves the production of an annual programme monitoring report, led by the academic director, and submitted to the institute's Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee, which acts on behalf of the Academic Board. The 'Programme monitoring and review policy' also sets out in detail how the institute will conduct a periodic review, at five-yearly intervals. The process, evidence and data to be considered at the review are clearly set out in the

policy, including how students must be involved in the process. Although such a review is yet to be conducted, the process outlined, if followed, would lead to a robust, evidence-led consideration of whether standards are being maintained at the institute with appropriate use of external and independent expertise.

143. The team reviewed the 2022-23 academic year programme monitoring report for the BEng and MEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering programme and a sample of assessment panel review minutes. It found that this demonstrated that the institute regularly reviews its programmes and curriculum to ensure that standards are maintained against the FHEQ. For example, the 2022-23 programme monitoring report tracks feedback from external examiners, programme performance against institute-set KPIs and benchmarks, and includes an action plan with a tracking log of all amendments made to the programme. The team considered the programme monitoring report and found it had substantial narrative content, which enabled effective reflection and action-planning.
144. The team noted that the programme monitoring report also included a 'student engagement' section, detailing how students have contributed to the programme review through various feedback mechanisms such as student voice surveys and the Student Experience Committee. Overall, the team found that the student voice is foregrounded in the document, with a record of staff considering student feedback and suggestions and stating that actions in response will be taken (for example, by taking action to extend inductions and developing a student 'buddy' system).
145. The assessment team's view is that the institute successfully initially found assurance that its academic standards were comparable with other UK higher education degree awarding providers through liaison with its UK founding and validating institution, King's College London. Its external examiner assesses the maintenance and assurance of these standards critically and externally. Additionally, there is an external member of the Academic Board, and the staff body comprises academic staff with previous experience at other UK higher education institutions.
146. As discussed earlier in this section, the team's view is that the assessed work of students, academic frameworks, and programme and module specifications reflect the relevant FHEQs and sector-recognised standards. Therefore, based on the evidence reviewed and discussed, the assessment team has found that the institute's programme approval, monitoring and review arrangements are robust, applied consistently and do explicitly address whether the UK threshold academic standards are achieved and whether the academic standards required by the individual degree-awarding body are being maintained. Further, the team found that in establishing, and then maintaining, threshold academic standards and comparability of standards, it makes use of appropriate external and independent expertise, as well as the expertise of students.

Conclusions

147. The assessment team concluded that the institute meets criteria B2.1 and B2.2 as it has clear mechanisms for setting and maintaining the academic standards of its qualifications.
148. Further, the evidence demonstrates that the institute designs and delivers courses that meet FHEQ threshold standards, and that those standards are maintained over time and comparable with the standards of other UK higher education awarding bodies.

149. Therefore, the team concluded that the institute meets criterion B2.

Criterion B3: Quality of the academic experience

Advice to the OfS

150. The assessment team's view is that the institute meets the requirements for criterion B3: Quality of the academic experience.
151. The assessment team's view is based on its review of evidence. This shows in summary that the institute effectively designs courses and qualifications that provide a high quality academic experience for all students, irrespective of background, mode of study and circumstances. The evidence also shows that there is consistent and rigorous quality assurance of the institute's provision.
152. This view is based on specific consideration of the evidence requirements for this criterion collated throughout the institute's probationary period, and for the purposes of this New DAPs end assessment, alongside any other relevant information.

Criterion B3

B3.1 Organisations with degree awarding powers are expected to demonstrate that they are able to design and deliver courses and qualifications that provide a high quality academic experience to all students from all backgrounds, irrespective of their location, mode of study, academic subject, protected characteristics, previous educational background or nationality. Learning opportunities are consistently and rigorously quality assured.

Advice to the OfS

153. The assessment team's view is that the institute meets criterion B3.1 because it has demonstrated that it designs and delivers courses and qualifications that provide a high quality academic experience to all students from all backgrounds. The team's view is that all learning opportunities are consistently and rigorously quality assured, and the institute operates effective processes for the design, development and approval of programmes. Overall, the assessment team found the mechanisms for assurance of the quality of the academic experience to be robust and effective.
154. The assessments team's view is based on its review of evidence, which shows that the institute has met the evidence requirements for B3.1.

Reasoning

Design and approval of programmes

155. To inform the assessment team's consideration of the institute's delivery of academic experience to students from all backgrounds, with learning opportunities that are consistently quality assured, the assessment team considered the following evidence:
- QAA monitoring team assessment reports
 - the institute's 'Programme development guidance'

- the institute's 'Academic awards framework'
- the institute's 'Assessment regulations'
- the institute's access and participation plan
- a sample programme and module specifications for the BEng and MEng programme.

156. Consideration of the institute's design, development and approval of programmes procedures is given in full under criterion B2. There is evidence of a well-designed, comprehensive and quality assured approach to the design, development and approval of programmes. This was demonstrated through the high quality course documentation produced by the institute for the BEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering and MEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering programme specification for the 2022-23 academic year, along with the associated module specifications. As discussed in detail under criterion B2, the institute's programme development and review guidance and templates are appropriate, and the team considered that these are effective and applied in practice.

157. The team found that the 'Programme development guidance' and templates encourage good pedagogical practice by asking staff to consider learning, teaching and assessment strategies appropriate for the relevant curriculum, level and all students. Further, they encourage staff to consider differing needs and learning styles. In addition, as discussed under criterion B2, the responsibilities for approval of new programmes are clearly assigned to the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee, reporting to the Academic Board.

158. The assessment team reviewed the terms of reference of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee and is satisfied that responsibility for approving new programme proposals is clearly assigned in the document, and that subsequent programme development activity is tracked. External advisers and students are required to engage with the process and the team considered evidence that confirms this takes place in practice and that subsequent actions are fed back to students, and external feedback is taken and monitored. This demonstrated that the institute operates effective processes for the design, development and approval of programmes and that responsibility for approving new programme proposals is clearly assigned, including the involvement of external expertise.

159. The team found that the institute's 'Programme development guidance' sets out requirements that new programmes must appropriately reflect the correct FHEQ and sector-recognised standards, as well as the institute's own academic and assessment regulations and associated policies, including ethics, inclusivity and diversity. The team cross-referenced its findings with reports produced by QAA monitoring assessment teams. They also demonstrated that the institute's programme development policy and guidance were effective and being applied in practice.

160. The team considered that the 'Programme development guidance' is very clear in setting out the sequence of actions for the various people involved, and the associated timescales and deadlines. For example, the guidance sets out a proposed development timeline with clearly set out actions, targets and responsibilities for the full process. As discussed under criterion B2, the team reviewed a completed new programme planning request form proposing a standalone Certificate and Diploma of Higher Education in Engineering. The team found that it provided evidence that staff are well informed and engaging with the programme design and

approval procedures and that the process is effective in practice. In addition, the team noted that the 'Programme development guidance' document requires the maintenance of an incremental amendments log for each programme, to ensure that overall programme learning outcomes continue to be met when there are a series of amendments at module level. The team considered this to be effective practice and that it ensures clear tracking of developments.

161. The assessment team cross-referenced its review of programme development evidence with observation records of a 2022 staff development session undertaken by QAA monitoring assessment teams. The team noted that the QAA observation record found that relevant staff know about and receive suitable guidance and support, which covers curriculum development, approval and quality assurance, and the roles and responsibilities of staff. Additionally, the team noted that there is appropriate senior ownership of these procedures. The Academic Director and Registrar have responsibility for further guidance on the processes where necessary.
162. Furthermore, the assessment team reviewed the institute's staff recruitment plan, statement on staff experience in curriculum design, maximising performance policy and noted the in-house staff development opportunities outlined in the latter document. The team found that this evidence demonstrated that there is a staff body sufficient in number and expertise to design programmes of learning, curriculum and assessment that are fit-for-purpose and abreast of latest good practice in the sector. Overall, the team's view is that relevant staff are informed of and provided with guidance and support on programme design and development procedures and their roles and responsibilities in relation to them. The appropriateness of staff experience is discussed further under criterion C1.
163. The assessment team considers that the institute's adherence to the 'Programme development guidance', and oversight by the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee, ensures the coherence of programmes with multiple elements or alternative pathways (for example, alternative start points, and exit awards). The team found that any proposals for such diversification would be appropriately considered, approved, or otherwise recorded in accordance with the institute's programme development and amendment guidance and academic regulations. Currently, the institute's programmes do not offer optional or elective modules. As such, all modules are compulsory and therefore there is a clear coherence of across the programmes. The team's view is that the coherence of the institute's programmes will continue to be maintained and any future programmes with multiple elements or alternative pathways will be coherent, secured and maintained through adherence to this process.
164. The assessment team observed that there are close links between learning support services and the institute's programme planning and approval arrangements. For example, the team found that the Student Experience Team is represented on the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee, which has approval responsibility of all new programmes and amendments made to existing programmes. Furthermore, the institute's programme development guide requires staff to consider what additional services and resources may be required when developing new curriculum and modules. In addition, during its assessment the team requested clarification from the provider to ascertain further how its learning support staff and services are engaged in curriculum design and development. The institute clarified that learning support staff are engaged in programme development and design at an early stage to

ensure that proposals comply with the institute's regulations and associated policies. The institute provided further assurances to the team in this area as it reported that learning support teams design and deliver staff development sessions. These include guidance in the construction of schemes of learning that embody good practice in respect of consideration of and support for all learning styles and needs.

165. Overall, the team's view was that the institute's approach to the design and approval of courses contributes to a high quality experience for students, irrespective of their background.

Learning and teaching

166. The assessment team reviewed the institute's 'Learning and teaching strategy document' and found that it describes pedagogical practice that is in line with current understandings of best and most effective practice, and that it is student-focused. Based on its experience, the team found that the institute's project and problem-based approach to curriculum design and delivery is especially suited to disciplines such as engineering and design. The team found that this approach and strategy clearly align with the institute's stated academic objectives and is likely to enhance the employability of graduates. The team triangulated this evidence with teaching observation records from a QAA monitoring assessment, undertaken during the institute's probationary monitoring. The observation records stated that teaching delivery is sound in practice. The team therefore found that the institute articulates and implements a strategic approach to learning and teaching which is consistent with its stated academic objectives.
167. The assessment team reviewed evidence from visits to the institute's premises by QAA monitoring assessment teams and found this sufficiently confirmed that the physical and virtual learning environments (VLE) the institute uses in teaching are safe, accessible and reliable for every student. This previous assessment found that the tour of facilities demonstrated a wider set of physical, virtual and social learning environments, each of which was similarly safe, accessible and reliable for every student. In addition, the previous assessment found that the signage, documentation and real-time use of these spaces indicated that dignity, courtesy and respect are considerations in their ongoing use.
168. The team noted that the institute has delayed plans to expand provision, due to lower-than-expected student numbers and covid-related constraints. The assessment team requested an update from the provider on its growth plans and the institute reported that it does not expect to require additional space until September 2027 as it is in the early stages of considering its expansion of provision and programmes. The team noted that the institute states that its lease arrangements with its landlord guarantee the possibility of expansion at its current site, and it is considering additional options through institutional partnerships to enable access to specialist facilities at alternative nearby sites. The institute has stated that it is confident that it could make sufficient new physical resources available for teaching in a 12-month timescale, when – or should they be – required. The assessment team is therefore satisfied that the institute has a sufficient awareness of the need to manage risk that it would not expand provision without required resources.
169. Concurrently, the assessment team is aware of the risk to student experience of small cohorts, as evidenced by student feedback reported within the February 2023 Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee. The team noted that the institute has taken steps to improve the situation by rearranging student grouping and has stated that it will conduct ongoing monitoring of

similarly very small cohorts. The assessment team considers that this should continue to be assessed should the institute be considered for indefinite DAPs, but at this stage it does not prevent the institute from meeting the DAPs criteria.

170. The assessment team has considered whether robust arrangements exist for ensuring that the learning opportunities provided to students who may be studying at a distance from the organisation are effective. The institute does not currently offer distance learning courses and so the need to support students learning at a distance is restricted to students temporarily or occasionally unable to attend, and to support for self-study, including while on placement or studying abroad. The assessment team found that the evidence reviewed indicates that this is well supported through the VLE as reported by the QAA monitoring assessment teams. The QAA observations of the institute's VLE reported that the learning platform was re-engineered and improved in respect of interactivity.
171. The assessment team saw evidence that students can monitor their progress and further their academic development against the standards required to achieve learning outcomes. This is done through module specifications, module handbooks and assessment briefs and these documents are set out in clear, student-facing language. The team noted that module handbooks not only reproduce the module learning outcomes but also clearly explain what the learning outcomes mean in terms of what a student must do to demonstrate that they have met them. The module handbooks also state when students can expect to receive in-module formative feedback. The student handbook invites students to contact their personal tutor if they have any concerns about their progress through their course. Therefore, expectations of learning performance before summative assessments are clear and students can monitor and seek support to understand how to further their academic development. Students are also enabled to monitor progression through the publication of assessment results and feedback, via the student records system and 'Your Marks' mobile phone application.
172. Overall, the team's view was that the institute's approach to the learning and teaching of its courses delivers a high quality experience for students and that learning opportunities are consistently and rigorously quality assured.

Assessment

173. The team considered the institute's 'Learning and teaching strategy', 'Academic awards framework', the 'Assessment regulations', and 'Academic award and progression regulations' and found that the institute's assessment processes are sound, reliable and constructed as a valuable part of learning. In addition, the team reviewed a sample of two BEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering assessment briefs and from this found that assessment tasks are clear and detailed. The team further considered an assessment verification form from the BEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering year one 'Prototypes' module. This confirmed that assessment approaches are reviewed internally and reviewed and approved in advance by the external examiner. The team considers this to be effective and good assessment practice. The purpose and learning value of all assessment tasks is clearly communicated through the module handbooks, which also set out information to students regarding when they will receive formative feedback. The team also found that assessment briefs set out clearly what is expected of students to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes and, where appropriate, exhibit good practice in providing visual examples of what a submitted assessment item might look like and this helps to support differing learning styles. The

assessment team considered that this evidence demonstrated how the institute operates valid and reliable processes of assessment, which enable every student to demonstrate the extent to which they have achieved the intended learning outcomes for the credit or qualification being sought.

174. The team considered that institute's assessment regulations are suitable for the institute's subjects, curriculum and awards. It found evidence that regulations and associated policies are reviewed and amended when there are opportunities to improve them in the interests of students. For example, the institute introduced an additional early reassessment opportunity in circumstances whereby students fail to submit or submit late. While this opportunity is only available in the event of non-submission, and with the resulting mark limited to a pass mark, the team considered that this policy maintains academic standards while accommodating students' circumstances. The team considered this to be effective assessment practice.
175. Assessment is anonymous, where possible. Where it is not possible, the institute follows the practice of double marking, whereby two members of staff each mark the student work without knowledge of the other's marking decision. Double marking is also employed for assessments in modules that are being delivered for the first time. Following improvements to the student records system, marks from first marking, double marking and moderating markers are now able to be recorded together within the system. Comments from staff are also captured within the records system to generate a feedback document for students. This process has now been automated ensuring that students receive clear and detailed feedback explaining their grade and the possibility of human error is minimised. This evidence supported the team's view that processes for marking assessments and for moderating marks are clearly articulated.
176. The team reviewed the institute's 'Admissions policy' to consider the assessment of applicants and their prior learning and, based on its experience across the sector, found the policy to be clear and appropriate. Applicants with 'prior learning' are those applying to the provider who already have higher education credits from another institution. They apply for entry to year two and ask to have their existing credits from their previous institution to be recognised, so that they do not have to repeat levels of study. The provider must scrutinise the learning previously achieved to ensure that it is comparable to what the applicant would have learned on its own programme, to ensure that the applicant has the same prospects of success on the course as a student entering at the start of year one. The team reviewed the 'Accreditation of prior learning applicant form' and considered that the institute has, to date, processed one such applicant.
177. In its self-assessment for the New DAPs end assessment the institute set out the process for consideration of prior learning applications and the team considered that this provided evidence of a rigorous process that took into consideration the individual applicant's circumstances. For example, the institute reported that those scrutinising the applications for prior learning determined that the applicant had sufficient credit to enter at year two, Level 5, but found that scrutiny of the applicant's prior learning meant the applicant was required to undertake a specific year-one, Level 4 module to ensure that they could progress with a similar knowledge base as the students progressing from the institute's year-one cohort. This evidence supported the team's view that the institute operates valid and reliable processes of assessment of the recognition of prior learning, which enable every student to demonstrate

the extent to which they have achieved the intended learning outcomes for the credit or qualification being sought.

178. The team found evidence of detailed assessment criteria, grade descriptors, assessment feedback rubric and processes of marking moderation which demonstrated how staff and students engage in dialogue to promote a shared understanding of the basis on which academic judgements are made. For example, the team observed evidence that assessment criteria, assessment feedback rubrics and moderation practices are applied consistently through its review of a Level 5 assessment feedback rubric and moderation forms from a sample of three modules across Levels 4, 5 and 6. The institute's module handbooks, student handbook and assessment briefs clearly set out the required assessment outputs against the learning outcomes. Students have access to these documents from the start of each module. The team found there are clear explanations of what is meant by the requirements for submitted work for assessment, including visual illustrations of suitable formats for submission of assessment components. In the view of the team, the assessment feedback rubric enables students to understand clearly why they have been awarded their received grades. Furthermore, the team noted that the assessment feedback was thorough and included both positive comments and clear 'how to improve' feedback, together with a clear rationale for how the individual and overall grades were awarded. In addition, regular in-session formative assessment and open access to personal tutors also enable students to seek clarification prior to submission. This demonstrated further that processes for marking assessments and for moderating marks are clearly articulated and consistently operated by those involved in the assessment process.
179. To understand whether students are provided with opportunities to develop an understanding of, and the necessary skills to demonstrate, good academic practice, the assessment team reviewed the institute's 'Academic integrity policy', relevant sections of the student handbook, and sampled module handbook and assessment briefs. The assessment team found that students are provided with these opportunities. For example, the team found that the student handbook contains clear notice that academic honesty is expected and guides students on the extent of help they can accept, such as proofreading they are permitted to receive from others in preparing work for submission.
180. The institute's 'Academic integrity policy' describes how the institute and its staff foster good academic practices as well as describing what it considers to be academic dishonesty. For example, the policy distinguishes clearly between poor academic practice and academic misconduct. Overall, the team found that the policy is thorough, relevant and fit-for-purpose. For example, it covers and controls the use of artificial intelligence content generation and clearly sets out the process and potential consequences to students should academic misconduct be identified. The team observed that, during a year-two, QAA monitoring assessment, students reported that they were aware of the need to study in accordance with good academic practice, and that one of the compulsory online learning units supported their understanding of what this is. The team also considered how the personal tutor role description further supports this practice by including responsibility for guiding students on good academic practice in respect of both study skills and academic honesty.
181. In addition, the team considered that the variety of assessments adopted by the institute, and the use of 'managed challenge' as a learning and teaching strategy, support students' confidence and differing learning styles. These enable students to study and learn in a

manner that suits them. Furthermore, the institute has developed a new student peer mentoring scheme, which is intended to enable students to share good academic practice, achieve their learning goals and develop skills in interpersonal communication. The team considered that these approaches encourage good academic practice and discourage poor academic practice. It found that the evidence reviewed demonstrated that students are provided with opportunities to develop an understanding of, and the necessary skills to demonstrate, good academic practice and the processes for preventing unacceptable academic practice are effective.

182. The assessment team considered whether the institute operates effective processes for identifying, investigating and responding to unacceptable academic practice, and has concluded that it does. As discussed previously in this section, advice and guidance regarding the importance of academic honesty and integrity is clearly brought to students' attention through handbooks and briefs. When submitting assessments, where possible, students submit through an online platform with plagiarism detection software to support the identification and investigation of academic misconduct and plagiarism. The institute's 'Academic integrity policy' sets out how investigations into academic integrity cases take place and the possible outcomes of such investigations. The team considered this policy to be effective and appropriately implemented, resulting in cases being upheld or dismissed. The evidence considered demonstrated that the institute operates appropriate processes for preventing, identifying, investigating and responding to unacceptable academic practice.
183. The assessment team is satisfied that the institute's processes for marking assessments and for moderating marks are clearly articulated and consistently operated by those involved in the assessment process. Following consideration of the evidence set out above, the assessment team's view is that processes for marking are appropriate, clear, thorough and evidence shows that they are consistently used. The evidence reviewed demonstrated to the team that it is clear that staff appropriately uphold the responsibility of assessing accurately and fairly and ensure that assessment and its associated feedback are an integrated and valuable part of student's learning. For example, the evidence reviewed by the team shows that staff are engaged in detailed consideration of how marks should be awarded through moderation, feedback to students is constructive and actionable, and external examiner feedback and queries are addressed.
184. The team also noted that the external examiner has been closely engaged in executing their responsibilities since the start of their tenure and the institute's opening provision and they confirm that the assessment processes undertaken are secure and appropriate. This evidence is further corroborated by an observation of an assessment board in 2022, undertaken by a previous QAA monitoring assessment team. The observation record confirmed that the assessment board adhered to the institute's assessment procedure and academic regulations in practice.
185. Overall, the assessment team is satisfied that the institute's processes for assessment are valid, reliable, inclusive and rigorously applied.

External examining

186. The institute has in place an 'External examining policy', which sets out the procedures and responsibilities for how the institute engages with external examiners. It sets out the procedures for nominating, appointing and inducting external examiners, to ensure they are

appropriately experienced and trained to undertake the role effectively. The policy also sets out the role, responsibilities and expectations of the appointed external examiners, including their role in reviewing briefs as well as producing annual reports. The team, based on its experience across the sector, considered the policy to be appropriate and sufficient.

187. The institute's 'External examining policy' sets out how external examiner reports are to be considered by programme leaders and the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee. The team considered that there is clear evidence that the institute makes scrupulous use of its external examiner, including in the moderation of assessment tasks and students' assessed work. The assessment team found that evidence clearly shows that the institute makes consistent and effective use of its external examiner in terms of sector best practice and compliance with its own regulations. The external examiner verifies the proposed assessment instruments and assessment feedback rubric. They have full access to marks and clear sight of the full assessment process, ensuring that there is very little prospect of corruption or error. In the view of the team, the external examiner induction document is clear and thorough, and includes all necessary information about the role, process, regulations, and notice of how to raise a serious concern directly with the Executive Dean, if necessary.
188. The assessment team is satisfied that the institute gives full and serious consideration to the comments and recommendations contained in external examiners' feedback and reports. The team saw evidence of the external examiner's feedback being considered at assessment boards in Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees and at monitoring and review panels. The team also considered that the institute provides external examiners with a considered and timely response to their comments and recommendations, as evidenced through a review of the institute's response to the 2022-23 external examiner report. For example, the external examiner recommended that student's 'Portfolio' module submissions are moved earlier on in the academic year to allow for consideration of feedback and the institute agreed to implement this recommendation. Therefore, the assessment team found that the institute considers the comments and advice of the external examiner, acts on that advice and responds in a timely manner to the external examiner's in-person comments and reports, confirming its actions in response.
189. Overall, the assessment team considers that the institute makes effective use of its external examiner, for the assurance of marking standards and to contribute to the quality assurance of its provision.

Academic appeals and student complaints

190. To understand whether the institute has effective procedures for handling academic appeals and student complaints about the quality of the academic experience, and whether these procedures are fair, accessible and timely and enable enhancement, the assessment team reviewed the institute's 'Complaints policy' and 'Academic appeals policy' (as set out in its 'Academic regulatory framework'). The assessment team's view is that the institute's complaints and appeals policies and processes are clear, appropriate and straightforward, explained in student-facing language. While the institute has not yet applied its complaints process, the team found that the institute would follow its procedures should this be required. However, as the assessment team has not been able to review the policy in practice, it recommends that this is reassessed, should the institute be considered for indefinite DAPs.

191. The institute has considered one formal appeal during its New DAPs probationary period, which has been resolved. The assessment team considered that the institute's policy was applied effectively and noted that the appeal was considered at a suitably senior level with appropriate academic advice. Based on its experience across the sector, the team considered that the appeal was resolved with a fair and appropriate outcome.
192. Overall, the assessment team's view is that the institute has effective policies and procedures in place to manage student academic appeals and complaints.

Conclusions

193. The assessment team concluded that the institute meets criterion B3.1 as the evidence demonstrated that the institute designs and delivers courses and qualifications that provide a high quality academic experience to all students from all backgrounds, irrespective of circumstances.
194. The team further concluded that there is evidence to show that learning opportunities are rigorously and consistently quality assured.
195. The team considers that the OfS should reassess the risk to student experience and the institute's complaints policy due to the institute's current low cohort numbers, when the institute is considered for indefinite DAPs. The team also considers that the institute's plans for growth by expanding its programmes and potential physical resources should be reassessed when these are finalised by the institute in November 2024. However, the team noted that based on its current size and higher education provision, its view is that these issues do not prevent the institute meeting criterion B3 at this time.

Assessment of DAPs Criterion C: Scholarship and the pedagogical effectiveness of staff

Criterion C1: The role of academic and professional staff

Advice to the OfS

196. The assessment team's view is that the institute meets the requirements of criterion C1: The role of academic and professional staff.
197. The assessment team's view is based on its review of evidence, which shows in summary that the institute has demonstrated it has sufficient staff who are appropriately qualified to deliver its programmes.
198. This view is based on specific consideration of the evidence requirements for this criterion collated throughout the institute's probationary period, and for the purposes of this New DAPs end assessment, alongside any other relevant information.

Criterion C1

C1.1 An organisation granted powers to award degrees assures itself that it has appropriate numbers of staff to teach its students. Everyone involved in teaching or supporting student learning, and in the assessment of student work, is appropriately qualified, supported and developed to the level(s) and subject(s) of the qualifications being awarded.

Advice to the OfS

199. The assessment team's view is that the institute meets criterion C1.1 because it has demonstrated that it has appropriate numbers of staff to teach its students and that all staff involved in teaching or supporting learning are appropriately qualified, and given appropriate support and development opportunities.
200. The assessment team's view is based on its review of evidence, which shows that the institute has met the evidence requirements for C1.

Reasoning

201. To inform the team's consideration of the institute's scholarship, and confirm that teaching practices are informed by reflection, evaluation of professional practice, and subject-specific educational scholarship, the team reviewed documentation on learning, teaching and assessment practices at the institute level, the programme level and the module level. This documentation included the institute's 'Quality manual', which describes how programme development and monitoring is expected to take place within the institute. The team finds that these standards for development and monitoring are based on relevant learning, teaching and assessment practices.
202. The provider's engagement with its external examiner demonstrates that assessment practices are informed by reflection and evaluation of professional practice. An example of this

was when assessment in a year three module was updated, based on feedback from the external examiner, to ensure the module learning outcomes could be demonstrated by all students.

203. The institute offers both formal and informal structures for staff to develop their learning, teaching, and assessment practices. These are discussed below. In the team's view, 'Programme development guidance' aimed at all staff is sector-appropriate, clear, and references external standards. These include QAA guidance and PSRB standards. Staff training needs are assessed as part of a quarterly review cycle, with an associated budget per individual. Staff activities show evidence of reflection, evaluation of professional practice, and subject-specific and educational scholarship. For example, staff can attend and contribute to seminars and webinars focused on contemporary topics in higher education, including those relevant to the institute's subject specialisms (e.g. problem-based learning and artificial intelligence).
204. The assessment team reviewed fifteen job descriptions and CVs of staff in post and found that current staff have broad and appropriate academic and professional expertise. This is true for teaching staff as well as for management, technical and professional service staff. This expertise is evidenced in CVs through, for example, academic qualifications, industrial experience, board memberships, advisory roles, publications, external examining and professional registration. The team finds that the institute has recruited high quality academic staff.
205. Job descriptions, used when advertising for new staff, set out clearly that academic staff are expected to have relevant expertise of learning, teaching and assessment practices, informed by reflection, evaluation of professional practice, and educational scholarship.
206. The list of staff expertise shows that existing staff within the institute have a wide range of qualifications, and based on its experience, the team considers that this range is appropriate for the sector and for the specific disciplines taught at the institute. Nearly all teaching staff are qualified to PhD level, and all have some level of professional registration. There is evidence that staff have engaged with their discipline through external examiner roles, as reviewers for academic journals, in roles with professional bodies, and in work they have completed (for example, in curriculum design or course management) at previous institutions.
207. The assessment team found clear evidence that the institute supports academic staff to actively engage with the pedagogic development of their discipline knowledge. The institute maintains a log of staff external activities, which shows evidence of staff participation in PSRB-led events focused on teaching and learning, in accreditation panels at external providers, and in workshops and advisory groups on engineering education. The assessment team found that the institute's staff are not only participating in events, but in many cases they are involved in the events' leadership. For example, staff members from the institute are co-authors on a recent multidisciplinary QAA report, 'When Quality Assurance Meets Innovation in Higher Education'.
208. The institute's 'Maximising performance policy' and 'Academic promotion policy' both show evidence that staff are incentivised by the institute to engage with pedagogic developments, discipline-specific research, and advanced scholarship. Staff are supported, both financially and with an allowance of one day a month, to engage in personal learning and development

opportunities. Staff are supported financially in their membership of an appropriate professional body. Staff promotion is dependent on the delivery of high quality education at the institute and this is evidenced, for example, through AdvanceHE fellowship. AdvanceHE activities have been coordinated by an eminent National Teaching Fellow and Principal Fellow which ensures that staff receive bespoke advice and robust guidance. The team's view is that there is an appropriate balance of support and incentives for staff to engage with personal and professional development.

209. The team reviewed CVs of academic staff members and found evidence of academic publication, engagement with research and advanced scholarship. The team found that this knowledge and understanding would directly inform and enhance their teaching. This academic scholarship is included as a requirement in job specifications and supported through the institute's academic promotions process. The assessment team found that the institute's engagement with current research and advanced scholarship is appropriate to the level and subject of the qualifications being offered.
210. As well as these external opportunities to share and develop understanding, staff meet internally and share reflections and evaluations of their learning, teaching and assessment practice. The Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee and Student Experience Committee offer formalised opportunities for this internal sharing. The assessment team found that in both committees the student voice is recognised and reflected upon to shape future learning and teaching. There is evidence that programme amendments are made in response to reflection, evaluation and student feedback. For example, in Applied Professional Skills and Portfolio (ENG1302) and Ecological Design (ENG2202), the assessment structure has been adapted to clarify learning outcomes and align with PSRB standards. The assessment team considered that these opportunities to engage in reflection and evaluation of practice are appropriate to the level of qualifications being awarded.
211. A QAA monitoring assessment team conducted an observation of teaching in 2022, which demonstrated that reflection and evaluation were strong themes in the development and framing of taught sessions. The QAA considered that individual classes exhibited staff reflections on previous taught sessions and how those reflections would inform the delivery of teaching going forward.
212. Development opportunities, personal learning, continuing professional development and external representation are written into the staff-facing 'Maximising performance policy'. Staff are allocated one development day a month, and costs of professional membership are covered by the institute. The assessment team considers that the institute's log of staff members' external activities shows that this set of policies feeds through into practice and shows strong evidence of staff participation in development activities. The team found that these opportunities to enhance practice and scholarship are comparable to opportunities across the sector.
213. Logs of external activity undertaken by institute staff show a range of activities which provide opportunities to gain experience in curriculum development and assessment design, as well as engage with the other higher education providers. Examples of these activities include review work undertaken for the Institution of Civil Engineers and Institution of Mechanical Engineers; external examining roles within UK higher education; and advisory roles within apprenticeship trailblazers and the Engineering Professors' Council. The eight listed members

of academic staff engaged, collectively in the academic year 2022-23, with ten external providers. This was done as external examiners, visiting professors, members of accreditation panels, and guest staff. The assessment team found that this level of engagement is appropriate to a higher education provider of the institute's current size.

214. The assessment team reviewed all supplied staff CVs and finds that these show experience of assessment design. Development and implementation of new ideas in assessment is considered in the criteria for staff promotion, and assessment is considered within the required competencies for all academic grades. As referenced in criterion B3, the assessment team finds that assessment briefs show evidence of high quality assessment design, appropriate to the institute's academic disciplines. Assessment is internally scrutinised through moderation and double marking, as evidenced by module review forms for Reverse Engineering for Design (ENG1102), Designing for Smart Cities 1 (ENG1301), Design for Manufacture (ENG2101) and User Centred Product Design (ENG2102) modules and Assessment Review Panel minutes.
215. The team found evidence that students are given explicit information about the dates when feedback will be given to them, and this demonstrated to the assessment team that staff have experience in giving timely feedback and recognise its importance. Internal moderation processes (shared moderation forms and moderation meetings) allow staff to discuss assessment and feedback as part of the day-to-day operation of the institute. A review of all feedback provided for the modules Prototyping (ENG1201), Ecological Design (ENG2202) and Professional and Personal Portfolio (ENG 3302) shows evidence of expertise in providing feedback on assessment that is constructive and developmental. Outcomes and grade profiles show that the assessment allows a range of outcomes.
216. The assessment team reviewed a set of answers to frequently asked questions (FAQs), made available to students, which shows evidence that assessment is considered from the students' perspectives. Students are given a similar set of FAQs specifically related to results, and the assessment team finds that this constitutes effective support around outcomes and feedback. Students are invited to give feedback regarding the relevance of assessments, and the usefulness and timeliness of feedback, for each module. This student feedback shows a response which is largely positive or neutral. The student feedback allows for good practice and areas for enhancement to be compared across modules, which in turn contributes to staff expertise.
217. Staff CVs demonstrate experience of curriculum development, and curriculum development is considered within the criteria for staff promotions. The team saw evidence that senior staff have previous roles focused on curriculum development in higher education, and staff have published on curriculum design. Staff also have relevant experience of assessment design, which includes:
- reviewing and changing assessment policy at a previous employer
 - using the TESTA (Transforming the Experience of Students Through Assessment) and LEAF (Laboratory Efficiency Assessment Framework) methodologies
 - management of institutional assessment and feedback policies
 - publishing on portfolio-based assessment

- membership of a PSRB academic assessment committee
- practice-based experience in assessment and feedback from student-facing roles in other institutions.

218. External examiner feedback provides evidence that current assessment practice at the institute is appropriate to the sector and supportive to students.

219. Students are invited to give feedback on the content of each module, and this student feedback is largely positive. Annual programme monitoring shows evidence that curriculum development is undertaken on a continuous basis within the institute, and responsibility for this development is distributed appropriately across leadership, academic and professional services staff.

220. Staff recruitment plans target a student-to-staff ratio of 16 to 1 initially, moving to 26 to 1 as the institute matures. In the view of the team, these ratios are appropriate for the requirements of the institute, given the technical nature of the courses. Staff lists and organograms show evidence that these targets are appropriately resourced. Staff CVs also demonstrate a rigorous assessment of the skills and expertise required to teach the institute's students. The institute's strategy for programme monitoring includes periodic review of details of the shape and size of the provision, staff and student groups. In light of these expectations around staffing ratios, and systematic procedures for recruitment and monitoring of staffing, the team believe that the institute will be able to create appropriate staffing arrangements for the new courses it is developing.

221. The assessment team found that the institute's staff recruitment practices are appropriate for higher education. Job advertisements are appropriate to the roles being advertised and promotion criteria are aligned with those of other higher education providers. The institute uses an applicant tracking system to solicit feedback from successful and unsuccessful candidates for roles. Selection processes include scenario-led activities and questions, alongside observations of interactions with students.

222. The team concluded that the institute meets criterion C1.1 as the evidence demonstrates that the institute has appropriate numbers of staff to teach the students, the staff are appropriately qualified and staff development is embedded and supportive. This allows the institute to teach and support the students for the subjects and at the levels of the qualifications being awarded.

Conclusions

223. The assessment team concluded that the institute has appropriate staffing to deliver high quality teaching.

224. Staff have appropriate academic qualifications and are supported and encouraged to extend their expertise through external engagements, internal support, training and reflection. Staff engage with pedagogic developments, and their expertise is evident in their curriculum development and assessment design.

225. Staff work with other higher education providers, regulatory bodies, professional and learned societies, and in specific research areas, ensuring that they maintain awareness of developments within their academic disciplines.

226. The institute has appropriate processes in place to ensure that staffing is sufficient for student numbers, and staff recruitment practices are well aligned with standard practice in higher education. Therefore, the team concluded that the institute meets criterion C1.

Assessment of DAPs Criterion D: Environment for supporting students

Criterion D1: Enabling student development and achievement

Advice to the OfS

227. The assessment team's view is that the institute meets the requirements for criterion D1: Enabling student development and achievement.

228. The assessment team's view is based on its review of evidence, which shows that the institute enables students to develop their academic, personal and professional potentials. The systems for supporting this development are monitored and evaluated appropriately.

229. This view is based on specific consideration of the evidence requirements for this criterion collated throughout the institute's probationary period, and for the purposes of this New DAPs end assessment, alongside any other relevant information.

Criterion D1

D1.1 Higher education providers have in place, monitor and evaluate arrangements and resources which enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential.

Advice to the OfS

230. The assessment team's view is that the institute meets criterion D1.1 because it has demonstrated that its students are fully enabled to develop their academic, personal and professional potential. The student journey through the institute is clear and well supported. Student experience and progress are closely monitored. All students are given the opportunity to develop and flourish. The institute's commitment to equity is built into its procedures and operations.

231. The assessment team's view is based on its review of evidence which shows that the institute has met the evidence requirements for D1.

Reasoning

232. The assessment team's view on criterion D1.1 is informed by policies and exemplars provided by the institute, alongside records of student experience and progression, and reports from observations conducted by the QAA monitoring assessment team.

233. The institute's 'Quality manual' provides an overview of the strategic and operational approach to student development. The listed quality criteria cover

- programme aims and learning outcomes
- curriculum content and design
- learning and teaching

- assessment
- student progression
- student support and guidance
- learning resources
- quality management and enhancement.

234. In the view of the assessment team, the 'Quality manual' supports the institute's strategic approach to student development.

235. The institute's student charter is publicly available through the institute's website. The charter is co-created by staff and students. It outlines what is expected of students and what they can expect from the institute. The charter explains the ethos of the institute, with sections on:

- how an excellent academic and learning experience can be fostered
- how students' health and wellbeing will be supported
- what opportunities students can expect for personal development and growth
- how communication and feedback underpin the alliance between students and the institute as a community of learning.

236. While the charter is marked as not being legally binding, the team considered that it sets out clear and public expectations about the institute's approach to student development and achievement. It also shows further evidence of the university's strategic approach to student development.

237. Programme specifications for the BEng and MEng (Hons) Global Design Engineering programme (full-time and part-time) are well aligned with the expectations of the 'Quality manual' and the 'Student charter'. Programme content is appropriate to titles, and the curriculum shown in the programme specifications will, in the view of the team, encourage achievement of the intended learning outcomes. The assessment processes are clearly defined within the module documentation and marking criteria are used effectively. Student support plans show academic support that is personalised to individual students through the personal tutoring scheme and demonstrates recognition of a diverse student body. The team's view was that the high-level expectations defined within the 'Quality manual' are implemented in an effective way in the detailed teaching and associated documentation, and that the strategic approach is aligned with the operational reality.

238. The institute's public-facing web pages are aligned with its internal documentation. The team reviewed the institute's website, which provided a clear understanding of the core pedagogy, with a strong focus on project-based learning. The website also gives potential students a sense of expectations including, for example, that the January start options allow more flexibility but require an intensive first semester, followed by a mandatory summer school. The institute's admissions policy is also publicly available on the website. This website is likely to be the first phase of induction into study for many students and the assessment team considered this to be an effective first phase of advice and induction.

239. The team found that upon enrolment, students are inducted through a Welcome Week and supported in this induction by a personal tutor. The team considered evidence related to the Welcome Week, including the timetable, information provided to students, and student feedback. The week offers students a variety of individual and group activities as evidenced in the Welcome Week timetable. Welcome Week feedback is collated and the Student Experience Team is responsible for analysing this feedback and implementing a process of continuous feedback. After reviewing the timetable, student-facing information and existing student feedback, the team found that Welcome Week forms an effective and appropriate first interaction with the institute for students.
240. Students are supported through their study programme by a personal tutor. Personal tutoring is currently logged and monitored through an app. Personal tutors are given guidance notes which structure early meetings and ensure that students are supported through the first year of their programme of study.
241. The team reviewed guidance for personal tutors and found it appropriate as a template for guiding students through their initial interactions with the institute, as well as later support once they are established within their study programmes. The institute states that the role descriptor for personal tutors is built around the 'Student support plan'. This plan ensures that personal tutor interactions are documented and actions are completed by the student or personal tutor as required. Case studies for personal tutors are useful illustrations and offer clear opportunities for reflection and discussion. The team reviewed anonymised examples of student support plans and found that they represent an appropriate understanding of individual students and give individual students a list of specific actions they can take to support their induction into their study programmes. In the view of the team, this system allows for different students' choices and support needs to be taken into account. Student feedback indicates that they have appreciated their interactions with their personal tutor.
242. The Student Support Team has a written procedure for students in crisis and students whose attendance or engagement falls below certain thresholds. These procedures show appropriate support for students who are currently unable to engage with their study programme. The team considered examples of attendance-related communications and found these to show appropriate guidance and clarity. Information provided by the institute explains that where attendance has been consistently low, students have been put on probation. From this probation, two students were successfully supported to increase their engagement, and one student was temporarily interrupted (with agreed assessment resubmission dates). The team reviewed examples of emails sent to students with poor attendance. These show evidence that non-engaging students are given an opportunity to meet staff and review attendance, following the 'Fitness to study policy' and the 'Attendance and engagement policy'.
243. The team reviewed information about non-academic support offered by the institute. Alongside personal tutoring support, the institute's Student Hub offers mental health and wellbeing, financial, study skills and accommodation support, and support related to learning differences and disability. Student feedback indicates that where students have engaged with these services, they have felt supported.
244. The team considered that students are provided with a variety of ways to access advisory, support and counselling services. The team reviewed personal tutoring training and guidance for staff and equivalent guidance for students. The team found that the guidance for staff is

focused on academic development, including preparation for assessment, and includes support for work experience and employability. The team also found that student-facing guidance gives clear expectations of the aims of personal tutoring. The personal tutoring model is regularly reviewed as part of the 'Your voice' annual survey and the latest review found that 83.4 per cent of students felt that their personal tutor had been helpful in supporting their personal experience. The assessment team considered the personal tutoring model, and opportunities for feedback, to be an appropriate system to help students understand the institute and develop their potential.

245. The team reviewed the institute's 'Student support report' which sets out how support is available to students through the student services team and specifically through the Student Hub. In the view of the team, information about the Hub is clearly conveyed to students, for example through the institute's website page for 'Student support' and support is appropriately balanced between continuing support for student life.²³ For example through accommodation support and study skills, and more urgent student support through safeguarding and wellbeing support. Student evaluations of student services are collected through the Your voice survey, and the team observed that the results of this survey feed into action plans. For example, feedback around project outcomes was documented and an associated action was assigned to the Academic Director. As a result of this action, training sessions were provided for academics on assessment briefs.
246. A new peer mentor scheme has recently been introduced, and the team found this to be a useful and appropriate additional source of student support and student development. However, it noted that this programme has only just begun, and no formal analysis or feedback was available yet at the time of this assessment.
247. Students also can provide feedback at the module level and the course level throughout their degrees. Additional parts of the programme, such as Welcome Week and the study abroad opportunities, have feedback mechanisms built into them. The team found that the institute has a strong ethos of collecting feedback and acting on it. Alongside this student feedback, the institute also monitors recruitment and progression data, access and participation data and evidence from external examiners. In the future the periodic review process will also consider classifications and graduate destinations, once this data becomes available for the first graduating cohorts. All of these mechanisms point to the effectiveness of the monitoring of student and staff advisory support and counselling services and that any resource needs arising are considered.
248. The team has found that marks, attendance, credit accumulation and progression are securely recorded in the student record system. These records are then available to personal tutors through the personal tutor app. Year leads and the Academic Director can also see data for individual students and are able to monitor student progression and performance accurately. Support teams have access to additional personal information, which is withheld from personal tutors. Available screenshots confirm that data is recorded and visualised and the team's view is that the assessment board outcomes are presented in a clear manner and students are appropriately informed of their results. As such, the team found that the systems

²³ See [Support for students at TEDI-London.](#)

provide timely, secure and accurate information to satisfy academic and non-academic management information needs.

249. The assessment team observed a range of evidence that demonstrated the institute's commitment to providing opportunities for students to develop skills to enable their academic, personal and professional progression. This included academic, employment and future career management skills. For example, the team considered briefings for students who wish to study abroad, interactions with external speakers and industrial advisers through the winter school, and careers guidance and support through a sector-standard careers platform. Many of these opportunities are appropriate to a wide range of subjects and as such will continue to support career progression in the institute's planned programme expansion. The ongoing effectiveness of employability programmes is assessed through student feedback, which is mostly neutral or positive.
250. The institute's ethos is towards design, manufacture and live projects, and this means students need to use specialist physical and digital facilities. Makerspaces (student-accessible collaborative workshops) allow students to gain hands-on experience in prototyping and manufacturing, with orientations held regularly to enable students' early access to the workshops. The institute's 'Makerspace briefing' gives students a clear overview of the induction requirements for the Makerspaces and the team considers that these requirements are appropriate for engineering and design in higher education. In the team's view, the Makerspace induction is rigorous and the physical tools available to students are tools that are also used in professional environments.
251. Module evaluations and teaching block surveys assess whether students have felt supported to use appropriate resources. The teaching facilities can support education across a broad portfolio of design and engineering subjects, including the programmes the institute is considering in the future. The team found that the institute provides opportunities for all students to develop skills to make effective use of the learning resources provided, including the safe and effective use of the specialist facilities and the use of digital and virtual environments.
252. The team considered that there is a clear commitment to equity that is evident throughout the student journey. Operational changes (for example, the introduction of standalone Cert HE and Dip HE Global Design Engineering programmes in 2022) and changes made through the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee are assessed through formal equality impact assessments. As such, changes need to be considered in relation to protected characteristics (as set out in the Equality Act 2010), key operational considerations (data protection, health and safety, academic freedom or freedom of speech and safeguarding) and how they support the institute's key performance indicators (KPIs). The KPIs listed in the 'Annual programme monitoring document' show a commitment to student diversity, which includes increasing the number of female engineering students and mature students, as well as indicators around the number of both international and local students. The institute's access and participation plan defines the institute's approach to equal opportunities to access and success in higher education.
253. The team concluded that the institute meets criterion D1.1 as the evidence demonstrates that the institute has resources in place that enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potentials.

Conclusions

254. The team concluded that students are supported through their academic journey in a manner which is appropriate to a higher education provider. The strategy for student induction, academic progression, and support into employment is clearly set out. The team finds broad evidence that the strategy is implemented effectively.
255. Students at the institute are given regular opportunities to feedback, through module reviews, teaching block surveys, and ad hoc surveys. Where these feedback mechanisms show evidence of student concerns, action is taken to adapt and mitigate these concerns.
256. The institute provides a wide range of opportunities for its students, and these opportunities are clearly linked to professional expectations of engineers and designers. Design and manufacturing are significant parts of the learning experience for students, and the Makerspace environment supports students to flourish in these areas.
257. The institute shows a commitment to equity throughout its documentation, and many of the institutional KPIs are intended to support equitable outcomes for the design and engineering professions nationally. Therefore, the team concluded that the institute meets criterion D1.

Assessment of DAPs Criterion E: Evaluation of performance

Criterion E1: Evaluation of performance

Advice to the OfS

258. The assessment team's view is that the institute meets the requirements for criterion E1: Evaluation of performance.

259. The team's view is based on its review of evidence, which shows that the institute critically reviews its own performance and has in place robust mechanisms for internally disseminating good practice. The institute can identify weaknesses and take timely and effective remedial action in response. Additionally, it can identify and develop further its strengths.

260. This view is based on specific consideration of the evidence requirements for this criterion collated throughout the institute's probationary period, and for the purposes of this New DAPs end assessment, alongside any other relevant information.

Criterion E1

E1 An organisation granted degree awarding powers takes effective action to assess its own performance, respond to identified weaknesses and develop further its strengths.

Advice to the OfS

261. The assessment team's view is that the institute meets criterion E1 because it takes effective action to assess its own performance. The institute identifies weaknesses and strengths and responds to these to develop further.

262. The team's view is based on its review of evidence, which shows that the institute has met the evidence requirements for E1.

Reasoning

263. To evaluate whether critical self-assessment is integral to the institute's operation and that action is taken in response to matters raised through internal or external monitoring and review, the team reviewed a range of evidence. This included:

- a. the institute's 'Programme monitoring and review policy'
- b. an annual programme monitoring review report for MEng/BEng Global Design Engineering for 2022-23
- c. an external examiner's report for 2022-23 and the institute's response to this
- d. a sample of minutes from the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee and the terms of reference

e. a sample of minutes from the Strategic Industry Advisory Board.

264. The team considered the institute's annual programme review process to be a systematic and robust method for reviewing performance and enhancing programmes. This process applies to all programmes and the outcomes are considered by the Academic Board. The team also observed that external feedback was taken into account through this process, by consideration of external examiner reports and input from the Strategic Industry Advisory Board. Through its review of an annual programme monitoring review report and minutes of relevant committees, the team identified examples of action being taken in response to internal and external feedback. For example, each external examiner report has an individual response from the institute that sets out what action has been taken in response to any issues raised by the examiner. The team considered that issues raised by external examiners were fully and appropriately responded to in a timely way. For example, in the example report reviewed by the team an issue was raised about alignment with PSRB learning requirements and the relevant team responded by making changes to the module learning outcomes to ensure these were all explicitly aligned to the PSRB requirements.
265. The institute has a number of committees that have oversight of teaching and learning, curriculum and awards, including the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee. The team's review of minutes from this committee provided clear evidence of internal scrutiny and monitoring of the institute's academic provision, as well as action resulting from this. For example, in 2021 following a validation event, the findings from this event were used to propose programme changes, which were subsequently reviewed and approved by the committee. The institute also establishes 'Task and Finish Groups' to address particular areas of development that require further collaborative and internal review outside of formal committees. For example, a 'Programme Task and Finish Group' was established in 2021 to discuss proposed programme amendments with colleagues across the institute in attendance. In addition, as discussed under criterion A1, the institute's Student Experience Committee is the formal space for students to input and provide feedback to the institute's governing mechanisms. This evidence demonstrated to the team how the institute operates self-assessment and review and takes action in response to matters raised through internal and external monitoring and review. The evidence also demonstrated that ideas and expertise from within the institute are drawn into its arrangements for programme design, approval, delivery and review.
266. The team found that the institute's annual programme monitoring review process and subsequent report demonstrated that the institute proactively seeks, analyses and responds to student feedback. For example, feedback on student experience is sought through module evaluation surveys and teaching block surveys, the latter of which were run for the first time in 2022-23. Actions in response to this feedback are monitored through the annual programme review process and by the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee, which includes student membership. In addition, Task and Finish Group minutes reviewed by the team included examples of how students' views are responded to and resulting improvements in the student experience. The team noted that the institute's proposals to increase overall student numbers demonstrated that the institute has reflected on the potential for this to improve the student experience and not only to ensure institutional viability. The 'Annual programme monitoring report' also demonstrated to the team that the institute reflects on its strengths, as it includes reflection on good practice alongside areas for enhancement. It also showed that it is

considering its student outcomes in relation to the wider sector through its discussion of progression in relation to the sector benchmark.

267. Additionally, the team found evidence that the institute reviews progress against the KPIs set out in its strategic plan. The strategic plan details when each KPI should be reviewed and to what extent it should be achieved by 2025. The team noted that, while the institute cannot yet be expected to have met all the KPIs set out in the strategic plan (for example, because a cohort of students has not yet graduated), it is clear that it is monitoring progress against them.
268. The team concluded that from a teaching perspective self-reflection is well established and well grounded. It found that the institute is open to feedback from its stakeholders and responds to this constructively, taking action to strengthen its provision. It also observed that the institute regularly reviews its policies and has undertaken a number of reflective reviews during the probationary period. As noted under criterion A1.1 in this report, the institute conducted an academic governance review in November 2022, and recommendations from the review were approved by the Academic Board and subsequently implemented. The institute also advised in its New DAPs self-assessment its intention to undertake a further governance review in 2024, further assuring the team of the institute's self-reflective approach and commitment to ongoing improvement. The team's view was therefore that critical self-assessment is integral to the institute's operation and that action is taken in response to matters raised through internal or external monitoring and review.
269. From its review of the available evidence set out above, the assessment team concluded that clear mechanisms exist for assigning and discharging action in relation to the scrutiny and monitoring of the institute's academic provision. For example, the 'Programme monitoring and review policy' sets out clearly the respective responsibilities of the Academic Board, the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee and others involved in the process. The team also considered that evidence such as meeting minutes provided assurance that these responsibilities are carried out in line with the policy. At an operational level, the action plan included within the 'Annual programme monitoring review report' requires that responsibility for carrying out each action is assigned appropriately.
270. The team found that ideas and expertise from both within and external to the institute are drawn into its arrangements for programme design, approval, delivery and review. For example, expertise is used on curriculum design and development, teaching, learning and assessment, and employability. As discussed under criterion B2, the institute's 'Programme development guidance' sets out that the views and needs of relevant employers, external stakeholders and professional organisations should be actively sought to inform programme development and that external advisers form part of the programme approval process. Further, the policy also sets out the requirement that students must be engaged in the design and development of the programmes and curriculum. The assessment team observed that input is sought from the external examiner on all course changes and developments, as well as from the Strategic Industry Advisory Group and Industry Curriculum Working Group. In addition, the team considered how the institute engaged with its founding institutions (ASU, the UNSW and King's College London) to seek advice and input related to the design of curriculum and the setting of its academic standards. Furthermore, students were considered to have contributed to programme design and review through the Student Experience

Committee and their participation in the institute's other committees, as well as student voice surveys.

271. The team considered that the institute is self-reflective in relation to the performance of its programmes. It implements measures to improve its delivery, to ensure a good student experience and to support and maintain the quality and relevance of its programmes and curriculum. The team found evidence of reflective practice utilising senior expertise available within the institute. For example, both 'major' and 'minor' amendments to programmes and modules need to be approved by the Academic Director, Registrar and external examiner.
272. The team also found that the institute is outward-looking when seeking to develop its strengths. It was the team's view that the external examiner and Strategic Industry Advisers act as critical friends, providing valuable input which the institute welcomes and addresses through their operations. Such input is responded to formally and in an auditable manner through the Programme Task and Finish Group, external examiner report and minutes from the Strategic Industry Advisory Group. This evidence also demonstrated how these external inputs have informed programme design changes, such as amendments to the way in which assessment is carried out. The team found this reflection and action on external feedback to be an important indicator of how the institute acts as a genuinely self-reflective and self-critical organisation, accepting and addressing issues brought to its attention.
273. The team concluded that the institute meets criterion E1 as the evidence demonstrates that the institute takes effective action to assess its own performance, using internal and external expertise, identifying both weaknesses and strengths and responding to these in an effective manner.

Conclusions

274. The team has concluded that the institute has a self-reflective and self-critical approach to assessing its performance. The team is confident that the student voice is present throughout the governance structures and that actions are taken to address issues arising to improve student experience and outcomes. Input from individuals and organisations external to the institute is extensive and acted upon.
275. The academic team have demonstrated that the institute has a consistent reflective practice through the process of programme and module evaluation. Amendments to teaching and learning structures and practice and curriculum and assessment are evidence-based and rigorously quality assured. Therefore, the team concluded that the institute meets criterion E1.

Degree awarding powers overarching criterion

Full DAPs: A self-critical, cohesive academic community with a proven commitment to the assurance of standards supported by effective quality systems.

Advice to the OfS

276. The assessment team's view is that the institute meets the DAPs overarching criterion because it meets all the underpinning criteria.
277. The assessment team's view is based on its review of the evidence, which shows in summary that the institute is a cohesive, self-critical academic community with effective quality systems that effectively and reliably assure the standards of its provision.
278. This view is based on consideration of the evidence requirements for the DAPs criteria collated throughout the institute's probationary period, and for the purposes of this New DAPs end assessment, alongside any other relevant information.

Reasoning

279. The team has concluded that there is extensive evidence of genuine, effective and impactful self-reflection and self-criticality at the institute. The institute actively seeks the feedback and input of its students, external partners and members of its own academic community. It monitors its performance with a data-driven focus and has the expertise and processes to design, implement and monitor its resulting actions effectively.
280. The team is satisfied that the institute's standards are secure and accurately and consistently benchmarked against FHEQs and sector-recognised standards. Its use of the external examiner and its industry advisers is thorough, leading to confidence that the institute's programmes and resulting graduate knowledge, skills and attributes are relevant to the contemporary employment environment for the sector.
281. The team's view is that the institute has the physical and staffing resources that are required to deliver a high quality experience for its students and current portfolio of programmes.
282. The team's view is that the proposed programme portfolio developments outlined in the Board Strategy document of 26 June 2024 are within the institute's capacity to deliver to a high standard, provided that appropriate resources are in place. The team has no reason to consider this will not be the case.
283. The team has concluded that students in the institute are given broad opportunities to develop their academic, personal and professional potential.
284. The team has found that the institute's governance, management, policies, systems and procedures are well constructed, transparent, effective, regularly reviewed and applied in practice. This assures that the institute is capable of ongoing self-management of its higher education provision and the standards that apply.

Conclusions

285. The assessment team has therefore concluded that the institute meets the overarching DAPs criterion as the evidence reviewed demonstrates that the institute has a self-critical, cohesive academic community with a proven commitment to the assurance of standards supported by effective quality systems.

Annex A: Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Meaning
DAPs	degree awarding powers
DQB	designated quality body
EDI	equality, diversity and inclusion
FHEQ	Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications
HERA	Higher Education and Research Act 2017
OfS	Office for Students
QAA	Quality Assurance Agency
QAC	[OfS's] Quality Assessment Committee



© The Office for Students copyright 2025

This publication is available under the Open Government Licence 3.0 except where it indicates that the copyright for images or text is owned elsewhere.

www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/