

Quality Indicators & Reporting Definitions

Definitions and safeguards for evidence-led programme-level monitoring and future public reporting.

1. Reporting method

This guide defines metrics for future publication when an authorised and reliable data source exists. Each reported figure requires a known numerator, denominator, measurement period, population, source system, verifier and caveat. The examples here are definitions, not IEU performance results.

Indicator	Method / numerator and denominator
New entrants	Count of verified new entrants in the defined intake and pathway.
Enrolment	Active learners meeting the programme enrolment definition on the census date.
Continuation / retention	Eligible learners continuing at the next specified checkpoint divided by eligible learners in the cohort.
Course completion	Learners meeting the course completion definition divided by eligible active learners.
Programme completion	Learners awarded the identified qualification divided by the defined eligible cohort, with time window disclosed.
Assessment performance	Assessment outcomes grouped by consistent grading definitions; show distribution, not just average.
Student satisfaction	Favourable valid survey responses divided by valid responses, alongside response rate and question wording.
Survey response rate	Valid respondents divided by persons invited to respond.
Complaints handling	Cases acknowledged and resolved within documented targets, separated by type and severity.
Graduate outcomes	Verified respondents in a defined employment or further-study outcome, with sample size and date disclosed.

2. Mandatory metadata with every public number

- Time period: exact start and end, term, intake or graduation cohort.
- Population: who is included or excluded, for instance programme and study mode.
- Source and owner: system of record and a named functional data steward.
- Method: calculation formula and survey instrument as relevant.

- Assurance: last verification date, review sign-off and known limitations.
- Privacy: use aggregation and suppression thresholds where small populations might identify individuals.

3. Data quality checks

Check	Rule
Reconciliation	Ensure counts agree with source records and that duplication rules are defined.
Consistency	Keep the same cohort definitions across periods; explain methodological changes.
Independence	Separate student satisfaction from formal quality accreditation or programme authorisation.
Interpretation	Use comparative charts only for comparable populations and periods.
Missing data	Say information is not available for the reporting period; do not display zero as a substitute for no observation.
Sensitive groups	Avoid any disaggregation that makes students identifiable.

4. Suggested academic dashboard structure

- Programme overview: programme name, level, current offer status and documented issuing entity.
- Learner activity: new entrants, cohort size, continuation and completion where evidence exists.
- Education quality: outcome achievement, teaching feedback and learning-support experience.
- Student protection: feedback handling, complaint resolution and action tracking.
- Annual improvement: number of closed verified improvement actions, with narratives and evidence references.

No synthetic statistics

Do not publish invented pass rates, employment outcomes, satisfaction percentages or numbers of graduates. Use a methodology description until there are actual verified observations.