

## 2024 Digital Education Survey for Higher Education in the UK Appendix



# 2024 Survey of Digital Education for higher education in the UK - Appendix

By Melanie Barrand, Vicky Brown, Martin Jenkins, Fiona Handley, Jane Mooney,  
Elaine Swift, Julie Voce, Richard Walker and Annette Webb



## Contents

Section 1: Factors encouraging development and transformation of Digital Education .....	1
Section 2: Technology Enhanced Learning Tools Currently in Use .....	19
Section 3: Course Delivery and Evaluation of Digital Education .....	78
Section 4: Enabling Digital Capable Students and Staff .....	132
Section 5: Accessibility and Inclusion .....	153
Section 6: Support for Digital Education Development .....	174
Section 7: Looking to the Future .....	184

# Section 1: Factors encouraging development and transformation of Digital Education

**Question 1.1: Possible factors for driving digital education (TEL and Digital Capability) and the processes that promote it. How important, if at all, have each of these been in your institution to date?**

**Table A1.1a Factors driving digital education (TEL and Digital Capability) and the processes that promote it ranked by importance for total. By institution type.**

Driving factors (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
	(57)		(30)		(24)		(3)	
Enhancing the quality of learning and teaching in general	3.82	1	3.77	1	3.88	=1	4	=1
Assisting and improving the success, continuation and progression of students	3.79	2	3.7	2	3.88	=1	4	=1
Improving student satisfaction (e.g. NSS, PTES, PRES)	3.68	3	3.63	4	3.75	3	3.67	=8
Improving accessibility to learning for all students	3.63	4	3.67	3	3.54	=5	4	=1
Improving widening participation and inclusive learning and teaching	3.53	5	3.5	=5	3.54	=5	3.67	=8
Meeting student expectations in the use of technology	3.51	6	3.4	=7	3.58	4	4	=1
Technology developments	3.40	7	3.5	=5	3.29	11	3.33	=16
Expansion in course offerings	3.33	=8	3.23	11	3.42	=8	3.67	=8
Attracting new markets	3.33	=8	3.17	14	3.46	7	4	=1
Improving administrative processes	3.30	10	3.4	=7	3.17	=14	3.33	=16
Supporting flexible/blended curriculum development	3.28	11	3.2	=12	3.33	10	3.67	=8
Achieving efficiency savings	3.26	=12	3.33	=9	3.13	18	3.67	=8
Meeting requirements of external awarding bodies/PSRBs	3.26	=12	3.33	=9	3.21	=12	3	=21
Supporting the development of digital capabilities for students and staff	3.23	14	3.07	=17	3.42	=8	3.33	=16
Attracting international (including EU) students	3.18	15	3.1	=15	3.17	=14	4	=1
Addressing sustainability/green agenda	3.16	16	3.2	=12	3.08	=19	3.33	=16
Improving institutional reputation	3.14	17	3.07	=17	3.17	=14	3.67	=8
Addressing work-based learning – the employer / workforce development agenda and student employability skills	3.12	=18	3.1	=15	3.17	=14	3	=21
Attracting home students	3.12	=18	2.97	20	3.21	=12	4	=1

Table A1.1a (continued).

Driving factors (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
	(57)		(30)		(24)		(3)	
Responding to the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF)	2.96	20	3.03	19	2.79	25	3.67	=8
Developing networking and community building provision for students	2.95	=21	2.8	=23	3.08	=19	3.33	=16
Developing a wider regional, national or international role for your institution	2.95	=21	2.83	22	3	22	3.67	=8
Support of research practices	2.86	23	2.87	21	2.88	23	2.67	=25
Addressing lifelong learning and continual professional development	2.77	24	2.8	=23	2.75	26	2.67	=25
Advance HE Professional Standards Framework	2.74	25	2.63	25	2.83	24	3	=21
Addressing learning for degree apprenticeships	2.53	26	2.17	27	3.08	=19	1.67	31
Attracting new staff to institution	2.46	27	2.47	26	2.38	27	3	=21
Improving access to learning through the provision of open education resources	2.07	28	2.03	28	2.04	28	2.67	=25
Improving access to learning through the provision of open education courses	2	29	2	29	1.96	29	2.33	28
Meeting the requirements of the Public Sector Bodies (Websites and Mobile Applications) (No. 2) Accessibility Regulations 2018	1.39	30	1.33	=30	1.38	30	2	=29
Meeting the requirements of the Equality Act (2010)	1.26	31	1.33	30	1.08	31	2	=29

**Table A1.1b Factors driving digital education (TEL and Digital Capability) and the processes that promote it ranked by importance for total. By country.**

Driving factors (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
	(57)		(48)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Enhancing the quality of learning and teaching in general	3.82	1	3.79	1	4	=1	4	=1	4	=1
Assisting and improving the success, continuation and progression of students	3.79	2	3.77	2	3.75	=3	4	=1	4	=1
Improving student satisfaction (e.g. NSS, PTES, PRES)	3.68	3	3.65	3	3.75	=3	4	=1	4	=1
Improving accessibility to learning for all students	3.63	4	3.58	4	4	=1	4	=1	3.5	=7
Improving widening participation and inclusive learning and teaching	3.53	5	3.5	5	3.5	=6	4	=1	3.5	=7
Meeting student expectations in the use of technology	3.51	6	3.44	6	3.75	=3	4	=1	4	=1
Technology developments	3.4	7	3.4	7	3.5	=6	3.67	=11	3	=17
Expansion in course offerings	3.33	=8	3.29	=11	3.25	=12	3.67	=11	4	=1
Attracting new markets	3.33	=8	3.35	8	3.25	=12	3.33	=19	3	=17
Improving administrative processes	3.3	10	3.33	9	3	=17	3.33	=19	3	=17
Supporting flexible/blended curriculum development	3.28	11	3.25	13	3	=17	4	=1	3.5	=7
Achieving efficiency savings	3.26	=12	3.31	10	2.5	=23	3.67	=11	3	=17
Meeting requirements of external awarding bodies/PSRBs	3.26	=12	3.19	15	3.5	=6	4	=1	3.5	=7
Supporting the development of digital capabilities for students and staff	3.23	14	3.21	14	3	=17	4	=1	3	=17
Attracting international (including EU) students	3.18	15	3.13	18	3.25	=12	3.67	=11	3.5	=7
Addressing sustainability/green agenda	3.16	16	3.15	=16	2.75	=21	3.67	=11	3.5	=7
Improving institutional reputation	3.14	17	3.06	=19	3.5	=6	3.33	=19	4	=1
Addressing work-based learning – the employer / workforce development agenda and student employability skills	3.12	=18	3.06	=19	3	=17	4	=1	3.5	=7
Attracting home students	3.12	=18	3.15	=16	3.25	=12	2.67	=26	3	=17
Responding to the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF)	2.96	20	3.29	=11	1.5	29	0	31	2.5	=23

Table A1.1b (continued).

Driving factors (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
	(57)		(48)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Developing networking and community building provision for students	2.95	=21	2.85	22	3.5	=6	3.33	=19	3.5	=7
Developing a wider regional, national or international role for your institution	2.95	=21	2.92	21	2.75	=21	3.33	=19	3.5	=7
Support of research practices	2.86	23	2.77	23	3.5	=6	3.67	=11	2.5	=23
Addressing lifelong learning and continual professional development	2.77	24	2.71	=24	3.25	=12	3.33	=19	2.5	=23
Advance HE Professional Standards Framework	2.74	25	2.71	=24	2.25	=25	3.33	=19	3.5	=7
Addressing learning for degree apprenticeships	2.53	26	2.63	26	1	31	3.67	=11	1.5	29
Attracting new staff to institution	2.46	27	2.38	27	2.5	=23	3.67	=11	2.5	=23
Improving access to learning through the provision of open education resources	2.07	28	2.02	28	2.25	=25	2.33	28	2.5	=23
Improving access to learning through the provision of open education courses	2	29	2	29	1.25	30	2.67	=26	2.5	=23
Meeting the requirements of the Public Sector Bodies (Websites and Mobile Applications) (No. 2) Accessibility Regulations 2018	1.39	30	1.38	30	1.75	=27	2	29	0	=30
Meeting the requirements of the Equality Act (2010)	1.26	31	1.29	31	1.75	=27	1	30	0	=30

**Table A1.1c Factors driving digital education (TEL and Digital Capability) and the processes that promote it ranked by importance for total. By size.**

Driving factors (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
	(57)		(12)		(22)		(23)	
Enhancing the quality of learning and teaching in general	3.82	1	3.92	=1	3.68	=1	3.91	1
Assisting and improving the success, continuation and progression of students	3.79	2	3.92	=1	3.68	=1	3.83	2
Improving student satisfaction (e.g. NSS, PTES, PRES)	3.68	3	3.58	=7	3.64	3	3.78	3
Improving accessibility to learning for all students	3.63	4	3.83	=3	3.5	=4	3.65	4
Improving widening participation and inclusive learning and teaching	3.53	5	3.83	=3	3.5	=4	3.39	=6
Meeting student expectations in the use of technology	3.51	6	3.75	5	3.45	6	3.43	5
Technology developments	3.4	7	3.5	=11	3.41	7	3.35	=9
Expansion in course offerings	3.33	=8	3.33	=13	3.32	=8	3.35	=9
Attracting new markets	3.33	=8	3.58	=7	3.14	=14	3.39	=6
Improving administrative processes	3.3	10	3.33	=13	3.23	=11	3.35	=9
Supporting flexible/blended curriculum development	3.28	11	3.5	=11	3.23	=11	3.22	=15
Achieving efficiency savings	3.26	=12	3.17	=16	3.27	10	3.3	12
Meeting requirements of external awarding bodies/PSRBs	3.26	=12	3.17	=16	3.32	=8	3.26	=13
Supporting the development of digital capabilities for students and staff	3.23	14	3.58	=7	3.14	=14	3.13	17
Attracting international (including EU) students	3.18	15	3.58	=7	3.05	17	3.09	18
Addressing sustainability/green agenda	3.16	16	3	=21	3.18	13	3.22	=15
Improving institutional reputation	3.14	17	3.17	=16	3	=18	3.26	=13
Addressing work-based learning – the employer / workforce development agenda and student employability skills	3.12	=18	3	=21	2.91	20	3.39	=6
Attracting home students	3.12	=18	3.67	6	3	=18	2.96	21
Responding to the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF)	2.96	20	2.75	25	3.14	=14	2.91	22
Developing networking and community building provision for students	2.95	=21	3.25	15	2.86	=21	2.87	23
Developing a wider regional, national or international role for your institution	2.95	=21	3.08	20	2.77	24	3.04	19
Support of research practices	2.86	23	3.17	=16	2.86	=21	2.7	=24





Table A1.1c (continued).

Driving factors (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
	(57)		(12)		(22)		(23)	
Addressing lifelong learning and continual professional development	2.77	24	2.83	24	2.5	26	3	20
Advance HE Professional Standards Framework	2.74	25	3	=21	2.82	23	2.52	26
Addressing learning for degree apprenticeships	2.53	26	1.92	29	2.68	25	2.7	=24
Attracting new staff to institution	2.46	27	2.67	26	2.32	27	2.48	27
Improving access to learning through the provision of open education resources	2.07	28	2.33	27	2.05	28	1.96	29
Improving access to learning through the provision of open education courses	2	29	2	28	1.82	29	2.17	28
Meeting the requirements of the Public Sector Bodies (Websites and Mobile Applications) (No. 2) Accessibility Regulations 2018	1.39	30	1.75	30	1.27	30	1.3	30
Meeting the requirements of the Equality Act (2010)	1.26	31	1.33	31	1.23	31	1.26	31

**Question 1.2: Are there any other driving factors, for example, subject specific drivers, that are not in the above list?**

Table A1.2a Other possible factors and processes driving digital education. By institution type.

Other Driving Factors (Base: All respondents providing details of other factors)	Total		Type			
			Pre-92		Post-92	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(8)		(4)		(4)	
Medical/Allied Health subject related drivers	4	50%	1	25%	3	75%
Education related subject related drivers	1	13%	0	0%	1	25%
Preparing students for employment	1	13%	1	25%	0	0%
Meeting OfS B Conditions	1	13%	0	0%	1	25%
Utilising secondments	1	13%	1	25%	0	0%
Subject specific physical environment requirements	1	13%	1	25%	0	0%
Technology expectations of students	1	13%	1	25%	0	0%

**Table A1.2b Other possible factors and processes driving digital education. By country.**

Other Driving Factors (Base: All respondents providing details of other factors)	Total		Country					
			England		Wales		Scotland	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(8)		(6)		(1)		(1)	
Medical/Allied Health subject related drivers	4	50%	2	33%	1	100%	1	100%
Education related subject related drivers	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Preparing students for employment	1	13%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%
Meeting OfS B Conditions	1	13%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%
Utilising secondments	1	13%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%
Subject specific physical environment requirements	1	13%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%
Technology expectations of students	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%

**Table A1.2c Other possible factors and processes driving digital education. By size.**

Other Driving Factors (Base: All respondents providing details of other factors)	Total		Size of institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(8)		(1)		(5)		(2)	
Medical/Allied Health subject related drivers	4	50%	1	100%	3	60%	0	0%
Education related subject related drivers	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Preparing students for employment	1	13%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
Meeting OfS B Conditions	1	13%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
Utilising secondments	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
Subject specific physical environment requirements	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
Technology expectations of students	1	13%	1	100%	1	20%	0	0%

**Question 1.3: Possible factors that encourage the development of digital education and processes that promote it. How important, if at all, have each of these been in your institution over the past two years?**

**Table A1.3a Factors encouraging the development of digital education. By institution type.**

Encouraging factors (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
	(57)		(30)		(24)		(3)	
Central university senior management support	3.65	1	3.63	=1	3.67	1	3.67	=2
Feedback from students	3.60	2	3.63	=1	3.58	=2	3.33	=8
Internal support and training to staff on use of TEL or development of their digital capabilities	3.58	3	3.63	=1	3.5	=4	3.67	=2
Availability of relevant support staff	3.56	4	3.63	=1	3.46	=6	3.67	=2
A senior institutional champion/leader	3.54	=5	3.5	8	3.58	=2	3.67	=2
Availability and access to tools across the institution	3.54	=5	3.63	=1	3.42	8	3.67	=2
Adherence to external policies (e.g. cyber essentials, GDPR)	3.53	7	3.57	7	3.5	=4	3.33	=8
University committees and steering groups which guide development and policy	3.46	8	3.63	=1	3.33	=11	2.67	=22
Technological changes/developments	3.39	9	3.47	9	3.29	14	3.33	=8
Feedback from staff	3.35	=10	3.33	12	3.38	=9	3.33	=8
IT policy/infrastructure enabling of innovation, e.g. a software upgrade	3.35	=10	3.43	10	3.17	17	4.00	1
Creation of a common user experience	3.35	=10	3.37	11	3.33	=11	3.33	=8
Embedding of digital education within curriculum	3.33	13	3.20	17	3.46	=6	3.67	=2
Having committed local champions	3.30	14	3.23	=14	3.38	=9	3.33	=8
Having action plans (centrally) based on feedback	3.28	15	3.23	=14	3.33	=11	3.33	=8
School /departmental senior management support	3.25	16	3.23	=14	3.25	=15	3.33	=8
Threshold/minimum/baseline standards e.g. VLE standards	3.21	17	3.30	13	3.13	=18	3.00	=19
Creating action plans (locally) based on feedback	3.19	18	3.13	=18	3.25	=15	3.33	=8
Events and activities e.g. Digital Education focused conferences, Communities of Practice	2.89	=19	3.07	20	2.75	=24	2.33	=26
Student focused employability or extra-curricular projects	2.89	=19	2.67	23	3.13	=18	3.33	=8
Availability of internal project funding	2.82	21	3.13	=18	2.54	27	2.00	=31

Table A1.3a (continued)

Encouraging factors (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
	(57)		(30)		(24)		(3)	
Partnership with students on TEL and digital capability projects (students as co-creators, staff-student partnerships)	2.77	22	2.70	22	2.92	20	2.33	=26
Institutional scoping, benchmarking or audit projects	2.75	23	2.80	21	2.75	=24	2.33	=26
Graduate frameworks and attribute descriptors	2.74	24	2.60	24	2.83	=21	3.33	=8
Induction processes for staff or students that support development of relevant digital capabilities	2.67	25	2.57	25	2.79	23	2.67	=22
Availability of employability / progression data to inform priority areas for development	2.54	26	2.30	=28	2.83	=21	2.67	=22
Policies for use of personal devices or software	2.47	=27	2.33	=26	2.67	26	2.33	=26
Availability of external project funding	2.47	=27	2.53	=26	2.33	30	3.00	=19
Student digital champions or similar	2.33	29	2.30	=28	2.38	29	2.33	=26
External support and training on use of TEL or development of their digital capabilities	2.30	30	2.13	30	2.42	28	3.00	=19
Staff recruitment including reference to digital education in job descriptions	2.16	31	2.00	32	2.29	31	2.67	=22
Recognition and reward mechanisms for staff on adoption of digital education	2.12	32	2.07	31	2.25	32	1.67	=33
Partnership opportunities with suppliers e.g. Adobe Creative Campus	1.91	33	1.77	33	2.13	34	1.67	=33
Setting targets for digital education adoption for staff as part of annual review / appraisal process	1.84	34	1.57	34	2.17	33	2.00	=31

**Table A1.3b Factors encouraging the development of digital education. By country.**

Encouraging factors (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
	(57)		(48)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Central university senior management support	3.65	1	3.60	1	3.75	=7	4.00	=1	4.00	=1
Feedback from students	3.6	2	3.54	=2	4.00	=1	4.00	=1	3.50	=13
Internal support and training to staff on use of TEL or development of their digital capabilities	3.58	3	3.54	=2	3.75	=7	4.00	=1	3.50	=13
Availability of relevant support staff	3.56	4	3.50	4	4.00	=1	4.00	=1	3.50	=13
A senior institutional champion/leader	3.54	=5	3.48	5	3.75	=7	4.00	=1	4.00	=1
Availability and access to tools across the institution	3.54	=5	3.46	=6	4.00	=1	4.00	=1	4.00	=1
Adherence to external policies (e.g. cyber essentials, GDPR)	3.53	7	3.46	=6	4.00	=1	4.00	=1	3.50	=13
University committees and steering groups which guide development and policy	3.46	8	3.40	8	3.75	=7	3.67	=15	4.00	=1
Technological changes/developments	3.39	9	3.29	=10	3.75	=7	4.00	=1	4.00	=1
Feedback from staff	3.35	=10	3.27	13	4.00	=1	3.67	=15	3.50	=13
IT policy/infrastructure enabling of innovation, e.g. a software upgrade	3.35	=10	3.31	9	3.50	=15	4.00	=1	3.00	=24
Creation of a common user experience	3.35	=10	3.29	=10	3.75	=7	3.33	=21	4.00	=1
Embedding of digital education within curriculum	3.33	13	3.29	=10	3.25	=19	3.67	=15	4.00	=1
Having committed local champions	3.30	14	3.25	14	3.25	=19	4.00	=1	3.50	=13
Having action plans (centrally) based on feedback	3.28	15	3.19	15	4.00	=1	4.00	=1	3.00	=24
School/departmental senior management support	3.25	16	3.17	16	3.50	=15	3.67	=15	4.00	=1
Threshold/minimum/baseline standards e.g. VLE standards	3.21	17	3.10	17	3.75	=7	4.00	=1	3.50	=13
Creating action plans (locally) based on feedback	3.19	18	3.08	18	3.75	=7	4.00	=1	3.50	=13
Events and activities e.g. Digital Education focused conferences, Communities of Practice	2.89	=19	2.81	19	3.50	=15	3.33	=21	3.00	=24

Student focused employability or extra-curricular projects	2.89	=19	2.79	=20	3.00	=23	3.67	=15	4.00	=1
--	------	-----	------	-----	------	-----	------	-----	------	----

**Table A1.3b (continued).**

Encouraging factors (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
	(57)		(48)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Availability of internal project funding	2.82	21	2.79	=20	2.25	=29	3.33	=21	4.00	=1
Partnership with students on TEL and digital capability projects (students as co-creators, staff-student partnerships)	2.77	22	2.71	22	2.75	=25	3.33	=21	3.50	=13
Institutional scoping, benchmarking or audit projects	2.75	23	2.65	23	3.25	=19	3.33	=21	3.50	=13
Graduate frameworks and attribute descriptors	2.74	24	2.63	24	3.25	=19	3.00	=27	4.00	=1
Induction processes for staff or students that support development of relevant digital capabilities	2.67	25	2.56	25	2.75	=25	3.67	=15	3.50	=13
Availability of employability / progression data to inform priority areas for development	2.54	26	2.50	26	3.00	=23	3.00	=27	2.00	=33
Policies for use of personal devices or software	2.47	=27	2.38	27	2.75	=25	4.00	=1	2.00	=33
Availability of external project funding	2.47	=27	2.31	29	3.50	=15	3.33	=21	3.00	=24
Student digital champions or similar	2.33	29	2.35	28	1.50	=32	2.67	=31	3.00	=24
External support and training on use of TEL or development of their digital capabilities	2.30	30	2.21	30	2.50	28	3.00	=27	3.00	=24
Staff recruitment including reference to digital education in job descriptions	2.16	31	2.08	31	2.25	=29	3.00	=27	2.50	=31
Recognition and reward mechanisms for staff on adoption of digital education	2.12	32	2.04	32	1.75	31	2.67	=31	4.00	=1
Partnership opportunities with suppliers e.g. Adobe Creative Campus	1.91	33	1.90	33	1.25	34	2.33	34	3.00	=24
Setting targets for digital education adoption for staff as part of annual review / appraisal process	1.84	34	1.79	34	1.50	=32	2.67	=31	2.50	=31





**Table A1.3c Factors encouraging the development of digital education. By size.**

Encouraging factors (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
	(57)		(12)		(22)		(23)	
Central university senior management support	3.65	1	3.75	=2	3.59	=1	3.65	2
Feedback from students	3.60	2	3.58	=7	3.45	=7	3.74	1
Internal support and training to staff on use of TEL or development of their digital capabilities	3.58	3	3.75	=2	3.59	=1	3.48	=5
Availability of relevant support staff	3.56	4	3.67	=4	3.59	=1	3.48	=5
A senior institutional champion/leader	3.54	=5	3.58	=7	3.59	=1	3.48	=5
Availability and access to tools across the institution	3.54	=5	3.58	=7	3.55	5	3.52	4
Adherence to external policies (e.g. cyber essentials, GDPR)	3.53	7	3.67	=4	3.50	6	3.48	=5
University committees and steering groups which guide development and policy	3.46	8	3.17	=17	3.45	=7	3.61	3
Technological changes/developments	3.39	9	3.33	15	3.41	9	3.39	10
Feedback from staff	3.35	=10	3.50	=10	3.27	=10	3.35	=11
IT policy/infrastructure enabling of innovation, e.g. a software upgrade	3.35	=10	3.83	1	3.18	=16	3.26	=14
Creation of a common user experience	3.35	=10	3.67	=4	3.27	=10	3.26	=14
Embedding of digital education within curriculum	3.33	13	3.50	=10	3.23	=14	3.35	=11
Having committed local champions	3.30	14	3.50	=10	3.05	19	3.43	9
Having action plans (centrally) based on feedback	3.28	15	3.50	=10	3.23	=14	3.22	16
School /departmental senior management support	3.25	16	3.25	16	3.18	=16	3.30	13
Threshold/minimum/baseline standards e.g. VLE standards	3.21	17	3.50	=10	3.27	=10	3.00	19
Creating action plans (locally) based on feedback	3.19	18	3.17	=17	3.27	=10	3.13	=17
Events and activities e.g. Digital Education focused conferences, Communities of Practice	2.89	=19	2.92	=21	2.95	20	2.83	21
Student focused employability or extra-curricular projects	2.89	=19	2.92	=21	2.82	=21	2.96	20
Availability of internal project funding	2.82	21	1.67	=33	3.14	18	3.13	=17
Partnership with students on TEL and digital capability projects (students as co-creators, staff-student partnerships)	2.77	22	2.75	25	2.82	=21	2.74	22

Institutional scoping, benchmarking or audit projects	2.75	23	3.08	20	2.82	=21	2.52	=25
---	------	----	------	----	------	-----	------	-----

**Table A1.3c (continued).**

Encouraging factors (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
	(57)		(12)		(22)		(23)	
Graduate frameworks and attribute descriptors	2.74	24	2.83	=23	2.73	25	2.70	=23
Induction processes for staff or students that support development of relevant digital capabilities	2.67	25	3.17	=17	2.36	=27	2.70	=23
Availability of employability / progression data to inform priority areas for development	2.54	26	2.58	=27	2.77	24	2.30	28
Policies for use of personal devices or software	2.47	=27	2.58	=27	2.36	=27	2.52	=25
Availability of external project funding	2.47	=27	2.83	=23	2.50	26	2.26	=29
Student digital champions or similar	2.33	29	2.42	30	2.27	30	2.35	27
External support and training on use of TEL or development of their digital capabilities	2.30	30	2.67	26	2.36	=27	2.04	33
Staff recruitment including reference to digital education in job descriptions	2.16	31	2.50	29	2.00	32	2.13	31
Recognition and reward mechanisms for staff on adoption of digital education	2.12	32	2.25	=31	2.09	31	2.09	32
Partnership opportunities with suppliers e.g. Adobe Creative Campus	1.91	33	1.67	=33	1.68	34	2.26	=29
Setting targets for digital education adoption for staff as part of annual review / appraisal process	1.84	34	2.25	=31	1.77	33	1.70	34

**Question 1.4: In what ways, if any, have you sought to raise awareness amongst staff of the benefits of adopting digital education, in their teaching and assessment practices?**

**Table A1.4a Approaches taken to raise awareness amongst staff of the benefits of adopting digital education. By institution type.**

Approaches used to raise awareness (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(57)		(30)		(24)		(3)	
Staff development programme(s)	52	91%	26	87%	23	96%	3	100%
Online training resources and guidance	51	89%	29	97%	21	88%	1	33%
Embedded within PGCert Teaching & Learning / Academic Practice programme for academic staff	50	88%	28	93%	21	88%	1	33%
Staff networks	50	88%	26	87%	23	96%	1	33%
Show and tell sessions	49	86%	24	80%	23	96%	2	67%
Internal conferences	45	79%	25	83%	20	83%	0	0%
Case studies	44	77%	25	83%	17	71%	2	67%
Professional recognition schemes (Advance HE PSF/CMALT)	44	77%	24	80%	19	79%	1	33%
Strategy development groups	38	67%	20	67%	17	71%	1	33%
Newsletters	36	63%	21	70%	14	58%	1	33%
School and/or discipline champions	31	54%	19	63%	12	50%	0	0%
Use Benchmarking and Maturity Models e.g. Jisc Digital Discovery Tool	26	46%	11	37%	15	63%	0	0%
Engagement in short online Continual Professional Development (e.g. MOOCS)	24	42%	15	50%	8	33%	1	33%
Prizes and awards	19	33%	11	37%	8	33%	0	0%
Digital scholarship and research	18	32%	13	43%	5	21%	0	0%
Other	10	18%	5	17%	5	21%	0	0%
Digital Badges	9	16%	6	20%	3	13%	0	0%

**Table A1.4b Approaches taken to raise awareness amongst staff of the benefits of adopting digital education. By country.**

Approaches used to raise awareness (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(57)		(48)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Staff development programme(s)	52	91%	45	94%	4	100%	2	67%	1	50%
Online training resources and guidance	51	89%	42	88%	4	100%	3	100%	2	100%
Embedded within PGCert Teaching & Learning/Academic Practice programme for academic staff	50	88%	41	85%	4	100%	3	100%	2	100%
Staff networks	50	88%	42	88%	3	75%	3	100%	2	100%

Table A1.4b (continued).

Approaches used to raise awareness (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(57)		(48)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Show and tell sessions	49	86%	42	88%	3	75%	2	67%	2	100%
Internal conferences	45	79%	39	81%	4	100%	0	0%	2	100%
Case studies	44	77%	37	77%	3	75%	2	67%	2	100%
Professional recognition schemes (Advance HE PSF/CMALT)	44	77%	37	77%	4	100%	1	33%	2	100%
Strategy development groups	38	67%	31	65%	2	50%	3	100%	2	100%
Newsletters	36	63%	30	63%	4	100%	1	33%	1	50%
School and/or discipline champions	31	54%	26	54%	1	25%	3	100%	1	50%
Use Benchmarking and Maturity Models e.g. Jisc Digital Discovery Tool	26	46%	21	44%	2	50%	1	33%	2	100%
Engagement in short online Continual Professional Development (e.g. MOOCs)	24	42%	19	40%	2	50%	2	67%	1	50%
Prizes and awards	19	33%	15	31%	2	50%	0	0%	2	100%
Digital scholarship and research	18	32%	16	33%	0	0%	1	33%	1	50%
Other	10	18%	8	17%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%
Digital Badges	9	16%	9	19%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Table A1.4c Approaches taken to raise awareness amongst staff of the benefits of adopting digital education. By size.

Approaches used to raise awareness (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(57)		(12)		(22)		(23)	
Staff development programme(s)	52	91%	11	92%	20	91%	21	91%
Online training resources and guidance	51	89%	8	67%	21	95%	22	96%
Embedded within PGCert Teaching & Learning / Academic Practice programme for academic staff	50	88%	9	75%	20	91%	21	91%
Staff networks	50	88%	8	67%	22	100%	20	87%
Show and tell sessions	49	86%	10	83%	20	91%	19	83%
Internal conferences	45	79%	6	50%	20	91%	19	83%
Case studies	44	77%	7	58%	19	86%	18	78%
Professional recognition schemes (Advance HE PSF/CMALT)	44	77%	8	67%	19	86%	17	74%
Strategy development groups	38	67%	5	42%	18	82%	15	65%
Newsletters	36	63%	7	58%	14	64%	15	65%
School and/or discipline champions	31	54%	4	33%	12	55%	15	65%

Table A1.4c (continued).

Approaches used to raise awareness (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(57)		(12)		(22)		(23)	
Use Benchmarking and Maturity Models e.g. Jisc Digital Discovery Tool	26	46%	3	25%	8	36%	15	65%
Engagement in short online Continual Professional Development (e.g. MOOCS)	24	42%	4	33%	7	32%	13	57%
Prizes and awards	19	33%	2	17%	9	41%	8	35%
Digital scholarship and research	18	32%	0	0%	8	36%	10	43%
Other	10	18%	2	17%	5	23%	3	13%
Digital Badges	9	16%	1	8%	3	14%	5	22%
Use Benchmarking and Maturity Models e.g. Jisc Digital Discovery Tool	26	46%	3	25%	8	36%	15	65%

## Section 2: Technology Enhanced Learning Tools Currently in Use

### Question 2.1 Which centrally-supported TEL tools are used by students in your institution?

Table A2.1a Centrally-supported TEL tools are used by students. By institution type.

Centrally-supported TEL tools used by students (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(30)		(24)		(3)	
Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) (e.g. Blackboard, Brightspace, Canvas, Moodle)	57	100%	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1
Content management systems (e.g. Google Docs, Microsoft 365, SharePoint)	57	100%	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1
Document sharing tool (e.g. Google Docs, Microsoft 365, SharePoint)	57	100%	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1
Webinar/virtual classroom (e.g. Class Collaborate, Microsoft Teams meetings, Zoom)	57	100%	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1
Formative eAssessment tools (e.g. VLE, QuestionMark)	56	98%	100%	=1	96%	=8	100%	=1
Summative eAssessment tools (e.g. VLE)	56	98%	100%	=1	96%	=8	100%	=1
Collaborative tools (e.g. Discord, Microsoft Teams, Slack, Padlet, Miro)	55	96%	93%	=11	100%	=1	100%	=1
Media streaming system (e.g. Kaltura, Medial, Microsoft Stream, Panopto)	55	96%	97%	=8	96%	=8	100%	=1
Text matching tools (e.g. SafeAssign, Turnitin)	54	95%	97%	=8	100%	=1	33%	=20
Personal response systems (including handsets or web-based apps) (e.g. Mentimeter, Poll Everywhere, TurningPoint/PointSolutions, Vevox)	52	91%	87%	=15	100%	=1	67%	=11
Lecture capture technology (system to record teaching in a lecture theatre/classroom, e.g. Echo360, Panopto)	51	89%	100%	=1	79%	=16	67%	=11
Reading list management software (e.g. Leganto, Talis)	51	89%	93%	=11	88%	12	67%	=11
Asynchronous communication tools (e.g. discussion forums, Teams, Slack)	50	88%	97%	=8	79%	=16	67%	=11
Accessibility tools (e.g. Anthology Ally, Yuja Panorama)	49	86%	90%	=13	83%	=13	67%	=11
Hybrid delivery technologies (e.g. Teams, Class Collaborate, physical systems)	48	84%	77%	=18	92%	11	100%	=1
Mobile apps (e.g. CampusM, VLE)	47	82%	90%	=13	83%	=13	0%	=25

Table A2.1a (continued).

	Total	Type
--	-------	------

Centrally-supported TEL tools used by students (Base: All respondents)			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(30)		(24)		(3)	
Screen casting (e.g. Panopto, Camtasia, ScreenPal)	44	77%	77%	=18	79%	=16	67%	=11
Content Creation Technologies (e.g. H5P, Xerte, Articulate360)	42	74%	87%	=15	58%	=25	67%	=11
e-Portfolio (e.g. Mahara, PebblePad)	42	74%	63%	=23	83%	=13	100%	=1
Multimedia resource (e.g. Box of Broadcasts)	42	74%	80%	17	75%	19	0%	=25
Blog (e.g. Campus Press, WordPress)	40	70%	73%	=20	67%	=21	67%	=11
Electronic Management of Assignments (EMA)	40	70%	73%	=20	71%	20	33%	=20
Digital Skills tools (e.g. LinkedIn Learning)	37	65%	70%	22	63%	=23	33%	=20
Podcasting (e.g. Kaltura, Panopto, SoundCloud)	36	63%	63%	=23	67%	=21	33%	=20
Learning analytics tools (e.g. Jisc Data Explorer, SolutionPath, VLE)	31	54%	57%	26	58%	=25	0%	=25
Virtual Reality or Augmented Reality technologies	30	53%	60%	25	50%	=27	0%	=25
Generative AI to support teaching (e.g. Chat GPT 4.0, image generation tools, Microsoft CoPilot)	28	49%	43%	=27	63%	=23	0%	=25
Generative AI used by students (e.g. Chat GPT 4.0, image generation tools, Microsoft CoPilot)	25	44%	40%	=29	50%	=27	33%	=20
Digital Skills assessment (e.g. Jisc Discovery tool, in-house skills assessment)	23	40%	37%	=31	50%	=27	0%	=25
Digital/learning object repository (e.g. ePrints, Equella)	22	39%	40%	=29	42%	=30	0%	=25
Social networking (e.g. LinkedIn, Twitter (X), Tik Tok, Instagram, Mastodon)	21	37%	33%	=33	38%	=32	67%	=11
Academic skills / writing (e.g. Grammarly)	20	35%	33%	=33	42%	=30	0%	=25
Wiki (e.g. CampusPack, Confluence)	20	35%	37%	=31	38%	=32	0%	=25
Digital exams system (e.g. Inspira, Wiseflow)	16	28%	43%	=27	13%	=36	0%	=25
Chatbots	15	26%	33%	=33	21%	=34	0%	=25
Other centrally supported TEL tool	12	21%	23%	37	21%	=34	0%	=25
Social annotation tools (e.g. Talis Elevate)	11	19%	27%	36	13%	=36	0%	=25
Proctoring software (e.g. Examity, Proctorio, ProctorFree)	8	14%	17%	38	13%	=36	0%	=25
Intelligent agents (e.g. Siri, Google Assistant)	1	2%	0%	39	4%	39	0%	=25

**Table A2.1b Centrally-supported TEL tools are used by students. By country.**

	Total	Country
--	-------	---------

Centrally-supported TEL tools used by students <i>(Base: All respondents)</i>			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(48)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) (e.g. Blackboard, Brightspace, Canvas, Moodle)	57	100%	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1
Content management systems (e.g. Google Docs, Microsoft 365, SharePoint)	57	100%	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1
Document sharing tool (e.g. Google Docs, Microsoft 365, SharePoint)	57	100%	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1
Webinar/virtual classroom (e.g. Class Collaborate, Microsoft Teams meetings, Zoom)	57	100%	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1
Formative eAssessment tools (e.g. VLE, QuestionMark)	56	98%	98%	=5	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1
Summative eAssessment tools (e.g. VLE)	56	98%	98%	=5	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1
Collaborative tools (e.g. Discord, Microsoft Teams, Slack, Padlet, Miro)	55	96%	96%	=7	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1
Media streaming system (e.g. Kaltura, Medial, Microsoft Stream, Panopto)	55	96%	96%	=7	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1
Text matching tools (e.g. SafeAssign, Turnitin)	54	95%	94%	9	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1
Personal response systems (including handsets or web-based apps) (e.g. Mentimeter, Poll Everywhere, TurningPoint/PointSolutions, Vevox)	52	91%	92%	10	75%	=14	100%	=1	100%	=1
Lecture capture technology (system to record teaching in a lecture theatre/classroom, e.g. Echo360, Panopto)	51	89%	90%	=11	100%	=1	67%	=17	100%	=1
Reading list management software (e.g. Leganto, Talis)	51	89%	90%	=11	75%	=14	100%	=1	100%	=1
Asynchronous communication tools (e.g. discussion forums, Teams, Slack)	50	88%	85%	14	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1
Accessibility tools (e.g. Anthology Ally, Yuja Panorama)	49	86%	88%	13	75%	=14	67%	=17	100%	=1
Hybrid delivery technologies (e.g. Teams, Class Collaborate, physical systems)	48	84%	83%	15	75%	=14	100%	=1	100%	=1
Mobile apps (e.g. CampusM, VLE)	47	82%	81%	16	75%	=14	100%	=1	100%	=1
Screen casting (e.g. Panopto, Camtasia, ScreenPal)	44	77%	77%	18	75%	=14	67%	=17	100%	=1
Content Creation Technologies (e.g. H5P, Xerte, Articulate360)	42	74%	75%	=19	100%	=1	0%	=34	100%	=1



Table A2.1b (continued).

Centrally-supported TEL tools used by students (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(48)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
e-Portfolio (e.g. Mahara, PebblePad)	42	74%	79%	17	50%	=23	67%	=17	0%	=35
Multimedia resource (e.g. Box of Broadcasts)	42	74%	75%	=19	75%	=14	33%	=26	100%	=1
Blog (e.g. Campus Press, WordPress)	40	70%	69%	21	75%	=14	67%	=17	100%	=1
Electronic Management of Assignments (EMA)	40	70%	67%	=22	100%	=1	100%	=1	50%	=25
Digital Skills tools (e.g. LinkedIn Learning)	37	65%	67%	=22	50%	=23	33%	=26	100%	=1
Podcasting (e.g. Kaltura, Panopto, SoundCloud)	36	63%	67%	=22	25%	=29	67%	=17	50%	=25
Learning analytics tools (e.g. Jisc Data Explorer, SolutionPath, VLE)	31	54%	50%	=26	75%	=14	67%	=17	100%	=1
Virtual Reality or Augmented Reality technologies	30	53%	54%	25	50%	=23	33%	=26	50%	=25
Generative AI to support teaching (e.g. Chat GPT 4.0, image generation tools, Microsoft CoPilot)	28	49%	50%	=26	25%	=29	67%	=17	50%	=25
Generative AI used by students (e.g. Chat GPT 4.0, image generation tools, Microsoft CoPilot)	25	44%	48%	28	0%	=34	33%	=26	50%	=25
Digital Skills assessment (e.g. Jisc Discovery tool, in-house skills assessment)	23	40%	38%	30	50%	=23	67%	=17	50%	=25
Digital/learning object repository (e.g. ePrints, Equella)	22	39%	42%	29	0%	=34	33%	=26	50%	=25
Social networking (e.g. LinkedIn, Twitter (X), Tik Tok, Instagram, Mastodon)	21	37%	35%	31	25%	=29	33%	=26	100%	=1
Academic skills / writing (e.g. Grammarly)	20	35%	33%	=32	0%	=34	100%	=1	50%	=25
Wiki (e.g. CampusPack, Confluence)	20	35%	33%	=32	50%	=23	33%	=26	50%	=25
Digital exams system (e.g. Inspira, Wiseflow)	16	28%	31%	34	0%	=34	33%	=26	0%	=35
Chatbots	15	26%	23%	36	50%	=23	0%	=34	100%	=1
Social annotation tools (e.g. Talis Elevate)	11	19%	21%	37	25%	=29	0%	=34	0%	=35
Proctoring software (e.g. Examity, Proctorio, ProctorFree)	8	14%	13%	38	25%	=29	0%	=34	50%	=25

Intelligent agents (e.g. Siri, Google Assistant)	1	2%	2%	39	0%	=34	0%	=34	0%	=35
Other centrally supported TEL tool	12	21%	25%	35	0%	=34	0%	=34	0%	=35

**Table A2.1c Centrally-supported TEL tools are used by students. By size.**

Centrally-supported TEL tools used by students (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(12)		(23)		(22)	
Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) (e.g. Blackboard, Brightspace, Canvas, Moodle)	57	100%	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1
Content management systems (e.g. Google Docs, Microsoft 365, SharePoint)	57	100%	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1
Document sharing tool (e.g. Google Docs, Microsoft 365, SharePoint)	57	100%	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1
Webinar/virtual classroom (e.g. Class Collaborate, Microsoft Teams meetings, Zoom)	57	100%	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1
Formative eAssessment tools (e.g. VLE, QuestionMark)	56	98%	92%	=7	100%	=1	100%	=1
Summative eAssessment tools (e.g. VLE)	56	98%	92%	=7	100%	=1	100%	=1
Collaborative tools (e.g. Discord, Microsoft Teams, Slack, Padlet, Miro)	55	96%	100%	=1	96%	=7	95%	=8
Media streaming system (e.g. Kaltura, Medial, Microsoft Stream, Panopto)	55	96%	100%	=1	96%	=7	95%	=8
Text matching tools (e.g. SafeAssign, Turnitin)	54	95%	83%	=12	96%	=7	100%	=1
Personal response systems (including handsets or web-based apps) (e.g. Mentimeter, Poll Everywhere, TurningPoint/PointSolutions, Vevox)	52	91%	92%	=7	96%	=7	86%	=15
Lecture capture technology (system to record teaching in a lecture theatre/classroom, e.g. Echo360, Panopto)	51	89%	75%	=16	91%	=12	95%	=8
Reading list management software (e.g. Leganto, Talis)	51	89%	67%	18	96%	=7	95%	=8
Asynchronous communication tools (e.g. discussion forums, Teams, Slack)	50	88%	83%	=12	91%	=12	86%	=15
Accessibility tools (e.g. Anthology Ally, Yuja Panorama)	49	86%	92%	=7	87%	=14	82%	=17
Hybrid delivery technologies (e.g. Teams, Class Collaborate, physical systems)	48	84%	83%	=12	78%	=18	91%	=13
Mobile apps (e.g. CampusM, VLE)	47	82%	58%	=19	83%	=16	95%	=8

Screen casting (e.g. Panopto, Camtasia, ScreenPal)	44	77%	83%	=12	78%	=18	73%	=22
Content Creation Technologies (e.g. H5P, Xerte, Articulate360)	42	74%	75%	=16	65%	=21	82%	=17

**Table A2.1c (continued).**

Centrally-supported TEL tools used by students (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(12)		(23)		(22)	
e-Portfolio (e.g. Mahara, PebblePad)	42	74%	92%	=7	65%	=21	73%	=22
Multimedia resource (e.g. Box of Broadcasts)	42	74%	33%	=26	87%	=14	82%	=17
Blog (e.g. Campus Press, WordPress)	40	70%	58%	=19	70%	20	77%	=20
Electronic Management of Assignments (EMA)	40	70%	50%	=21	61%	24	91%	=13
Digital Skills tools (e.g. LinkedIn Learning)	37	65%	50%	=21	65%	=21	73%	=22
Podcasting (e.g. Kaltura, Panopto, SoundCloud)	36	63%	50%	=21	83%	=16	50%	28
Learning analytics tools (e.g. Jisc Data Explorer, SolutionPath, VLE)	31	54%	33%	=26	43%	28	77%	=20
Virtual Reality or Augmented Reality technologies	30	53%	25%	=32	48%	=26	73%	=22
Generative AI to support teaching (e.g. Chat GPT 4.0, image generation tools, Microsoft CoPilot)	28	49%	42%	25	57%	25	45%	=29
Generative AI used by students (e.g. Chat GPT 4.0, image generation tools, Microsoft CoPilot)	25	44%	33%	=26	48%	=26	45%	=29
Digital Skills assessment (e.g. Jisc Discovery tool, in-house skills assessment)	23	40%	25%	=32	35%	=30	55%	=26
Digital/learning object repository (e.g. ePrints, Equella)	22	39%	25%	=32	30%	=32	55%	=26
Social networking (e.g. LinkedIn, Twitter (X), Tik Tok, Instagram, Mastodon)	21	37%	50%	=21	39%	29	27%	=35
Academic skills / writing (e.g. Grammarly)	20	35%	33%	=26	35%	=30	36%	34
Wiki (e.g. CampusPack, Confluence)	20	35%	33%	=26	30%	=32	41%	33
Digital exams system (e.g. Inspira, Wiseflow)	16	28%	0%	=38	26%	34	45%	=29
Chatbots	15	26%	8%	=35	17%	36	45%	=29
Social annotation tools (e.g. Talis Elevate)	11	19%	33%	=26	9%	38	23%	37

Proctoring software (e.g. Examity, Proctorio, ProctorFree)	8	14%	8%	=35	13%	37	18%	38
Intelligent agents (e.g. Siri, Google Assistant)	1	2%	0%	=38	4%	39	0%	39
Other centrally supported TEL tool	12	21%	8%	=35	22%	35	27%	=35

**Question 2.2: Does your institution currently outsource its provision of any services? Provision refers to an institutional service being hosted by another organisation.**

**Table A2.2a Institutional outsourcing of services. By institution type.**

Whether institution currently outsources its provision of any services (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(57)		(30)		(24)		(3)	
Yes	41	72%	22	73%	18	75%	1	33%
No	16	28%	8	27%	6	25%	2	67%

**Table A2.2b Institutional outsourcing of services. By country.**

Whether institution currently outsources its provision of any services (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(57)		(48)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	41	72%	34	71%	3	75%	2	67%	2	100%
No	16	28%	14	29%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%

**Table A2.2c Institutional outsourcing of services. By size.**

Whether institution currently outsources its provision of any services (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(57)		(12)		(23)		(22)	
Yes	41	72%	8	67%	18	78%	15	68%
No	16	28%	4	33%	5	22%	7	32%

### Question 2.3 The provision of which services are currently outsourced?

Table A2.3a Institutional services that are currently outsourced. By institution type.

Outsourced services <i>(Base: All respondents that outsource some provision)</i>	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(41)		(22)		(18)		(1)	
Lecture capture platform	34	83%	19	86%	15	83%	0	0%
Digital repositories (e.g. Google Drive, Google Docs, Microsoft Office 365)	34	83%	19	86%	15	83%	0	0%
VLE platform supporting the delivery of blended learning courses	33	80%	17	77%	15	83%	1	100%
VLE platform supporting the delivery of fully online courses	33	80%	17	77%	15	83%	1	100%
Media streaming	33	80%	18	82%	15	83%	0	0%
Digital Assessment tools	30	73%	17	77%	13	72%	0	0%
Delivery platform supporting short courses for CPD	29	71%	13	59%	15	83%	1	100%
Virtual classroom	23	56%	12	55%	11	61%	0	0%
e-Portfolio	22	54%	8	36%	14	78%	0	0%
VLE platform supporting the delivery of open online courses	21	51%	11	50%	9	50%	1	100%
Digital Skills development	18	44%	7	32%	11	61%	0	0%
Learning analytics	17	41%	8	36%	9	50%	0	0%
Other outsourced service	5	12%	4	18%	1	6%	0	0%

Table A2.3b Institutional services that are currently outsourced. By country.

Outsourced services <i>(Base: All respondents that outsource some provision)</i>	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(41)		(34)		(3)		(2)		(2)	
Lecture capture platform	34	83%	28	82%	3	100%	1	50%	2	100%
Digital repositories (eg. Google Drive, Google Docs, Microsoft Office 365)	34	83%	28	82%	2	67%	2	100%	2	100%
VLE platform supporting the delivery of blended learning courses	33	80%	27	79%	3	100%	1	50%	2	100%
VLE platform supporting the delivery of fully online courses	33	80%	28	82%	2	67%	1	50%	2	100%
Media streaming	33	80%	27	79%	3	100%	1	50%	2	100%
Digital Assessment tools	30	73%	24	71%	3	100%	1	50%	2	100%

Delivery platform supporting short courses for CPD	29	71%	25	74%	3	100%	1	50%	0	0%
--	----	-----	----	-----	---	------	---	-----	---	----

**Table A2.3b (continued).**

Outsourced services <i>(Base: All respondents that outsource some provision)</i>	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(41)		(34)		(3)		(2)		(2)	
Virtual classroom	23	56%	17	50%	3	100%	1	50%	2	100%
e-Portfolio	22	54%	20	59%	1	33%	1	50%	0	0%
VLE platform supporting the delivery of open online courses	21	51%	18	53%	1	33%	1	50%	1	50%
Digital Skills development	18	44%	15	44%	2	67%	0	0%	1	50%
Learning analytics	17	41%	14	41%	1	33%	0	0%	2	100%
Other outsourced service	5	12%	4	12%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%

**Table A2.3c Institutional services that are currently outsourced. By size.**

Outsourced services <i>(Base: All respondents that outsource some provision)</i>	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(41)		(8)		(18)		(15)	
Lecture capture platform	34	83%	7	88%	16	89%	11	73%
Digital repositories (eg. Google Drive, Google Docs, Microsoft Office 365)	34	83%	6	75%	17	94%	11	73%
VLE platform supporting the delivery of blended learning courses	33	80%	8	100%	15	83%	10	67%
VLE platform supporting the delivery of fully online courses	33	80%	8	100%	13	72%	12	80%
Media streaming	33	80%	7	88%	16	89%	10	67%
Digital Assessment tools	30	73%	6	75%	15	83%	9	60%
Delivery platform supporting short courses for CPD	29	71%	7	88%	15	83%	7	47%
Virtual classroom	23	56%	6	75%	9	50%	8	53%
e-Portfolio	22	54%	5	63%	11	61%	6	40%
VLE platform supporting the delivery of open online courses	21	51%	3	38%	9	50%	9	60%
Digital Skills development	18	44%	3	38%	11	61%	4	27%
Learning analytics	17	41%	2	25%	10	56%	5	33%

Other outsourced service	5	12%	1	13%	2	11%	2	13%
--------------------------	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----



## Question 2.4 How is the provision of these services currently outsourced?

**Table A2.4a** How services are currently outsourced.

How services are outsourced (Row percentages shown, based on numbers in brackets)	Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party		Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service		Don't know	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Lecture capture platform (34)	5	15%	28	82%	1	3%
Digital repositories (e.g. Google Drive, Google Docs, Microsoft Office 365) (34)	5	15%	29	85%	0	0%
VLE platform – supporting the delivery of blended learning courses (33)	10	30%	23	70%	0	0%
VLE platform – supporting the delivery of fully online courses (33)	9	27%	24	73%	0	0%
Media streaming (33)	6	18%	27	82%	0	0%
Digital Assessment tools (30)	7	23%	23	77%	0	0%
Delivery platform – supporting short courses for CPD (29)	11	38%	17	59%	1	3%
Virtual classroom (23)	2	9%	21	91%	0	0%
e-Portfolio (22)	7	32%	15	68%	0	0%
VLE platform – supporting the delivery of open online courses (21)	10	48%	10	48%	1	5%
Digital Skills development (18)	1	6%	14	78%	3	17%
Learning analytics (17)	3	18%	14	82%	0	0%
Other outsourced service (5)	0	0%	4	80%	1	20%

**Table A2.4aa** Type of outsourcing for Lecture capture platform. By institution type.

Outsourced services: Lecture Capture (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(34)		(19)		(15)		(0)	
Institutionally managed but hosted by a third party	5	15%	3	16%	2	13%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	28	82%	16	84%	12	80%	0	0%
Don't know	1	3%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%

**Table A2.4ab Type of outsourcing for Lecture capture platform. By country.**

Outsourced services: Lecture Capture (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(34)		(28)		(3)		(1)		(2)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	5	15%	5	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	28	82%	22	79%	3	100%	1	100%	2	100%
Don't know	1	3%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4acType of outsourcing for Lecture capture platform. By size.**

Outsourced services: Lecture Capture (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(34)		(7)		(16)		(11)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	5	15%	1	14%	4	25%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	28	82%	6	86%	11	69%	11	100%
Don't know	1	3%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%

**Table A2.4ba Type of outsourcing for Digital repositories. By institutional type**

Outsourced services: Digital Repositories (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(34)		(19)		(15)		(0)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	5	15%	3	16%	2	13%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	29	85%	16	84%	13	87%	0	0%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4bb Type of outsourcing for Digital repositories. By country.**

Outsourced services: Digital repositories (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(34)		(28)		(2)		(2)		(2)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	5	15%	5	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	29	85%	23	82%	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4bc Type of outsourcing for Digital repositories. By size.**

Outsourced services: Digital repositories (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(34)		(6)		(17)		(11)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	5	15%	1	17%	4	24%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	29	85%	5	83%	13	76%	11	100%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4ca Type of outsourcing for VLE platform – supporting the delivery of blended learning courses. By institution type.**

Outsourced services: VLE platform supporting the delivery of blended learning courses (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(33)		(17)		(15)		(1)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	10	30%	6	35%	4	27%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	23	70%	11	65%	11	73%	1	100%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4cb Type of outsourcing for VLE platform – supporting the delivery of blended learning courses. By country.**

Outsourced services: VLE platform supporting the delivery of blended learning courses (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(33)		(27)		(3)		(1)		(2)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	10	30%	9	33%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	23	70%	18	67%	2	67%	1	100%	2	100%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4cc Type of outsourcing for VLE platform - supporting the delivery of blended learning courses. By size.**

Outsourced services: VLE platform supporting the delivery of blended learning courses (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(33)		(8)		(15)		(10)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	10	30%	3	38%	3	20%	4	40%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	23	70%	5	63%	12	80%	6	60%

Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
------------	---	----	---	----	---	----	---	----

**Table A2.4da Type of outsourcing for VLE platform - supporting the delivery of fully online courses. By institution type.**

Outsourced services: VLE platform supporting the delivery of fully online courses (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(33)		(17)		(15)		(1)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	9	27%	7	41%	2	13%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	24	73%	10	59%	13	87%	1	100%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4db Type of outsourcing for VLE platform - supporting the delivery of fully online courses. By country.**

Outsourced services: VLE platform supporting the delivery of fully online courses (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(33)		(28)		(2)		(1)		(2)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	9	27%	9	32%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	24	73%	19	68%	2	100%	1	100%	2	100%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4dc Type of outsourcing for VLE platform - supporting the delivery of fully online courses. By size.**

Outsourced services: VLE platform supporting the delivery of fully online courses (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(33)		(8)		(13)		(12)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	9	27%	1	13%	3	23%	5	42%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	24	73%	7	88%	10	77%	7	58%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4ea Type of outsourcing for Media Streaming. By institution type.**

Outsourced services: Media Streaming (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(33)		(18)		(15)		(0)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	6	18%	4	22%	2	13%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	27	82%	14	78%	13	87%	0	0%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%



Table A2.4eb Type of outsourcing for Media Streaming. By country.

Outsourced services: Media Streaming (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(33)		(27)		(3)		(1)		(2)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	6	18%	6	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	27	82%	21	78%	3	100%	1	100%	2	100%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Table A2.4ec Type of outsourcing for Media Streaming. By size.

Outsourced services: Media Streaming (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(33)		(7)		(16)		(10)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	6	18%	1	14%	3	19%	2	20%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	27	82%	6	86%	13	81%	8	80%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Table A2.4fa Type of outsourcing for Digital Assessment tools. By institutional type.

Outsourced services: Digital Assessment tools (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(30)		(17)		(13)		(0)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	7	23%	4	24%	3	23%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	23	77%	13	76%	10	77%	0	0%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Table A2.4fb Type of outsourcing for Digital Assessment tools. By country.

Outsourced services: Digital Assessment tools (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(30)		(24)		(3)		(1)		(2)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	7	23%	6	25%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	23	77%	18	75%	2	67%	1	100%	2	100%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4fc Type of outsourcing for Digital Assessment tools. By size.**

Outsourced services: Digital Assessment tools (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(30)		(6)		(15)		(9)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	7	23%	2	33%	3	20%	2	22%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	23	77%	4	67%	12	80%	7	78%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4ga Type of outsourcing for Delivery platform - supporting short courses for CPD. By institution type.**

Outsourced services: Delivery platform supporting short courses for CPD (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(29)		(13)		(15)		(1)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	11	38%	6	46%	5	33%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	17	59%	7	54%	9	60%	1	100%
Don't know	1	3%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%

**Table A2.4gb Type of outsourcing for Delivery platform - supporting short courses for CPD. By country.**

Outsourced services: Delivery platform supporting short courses for CPD (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(29)		(25)		(3)		(1)		(0)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	11	38%	11	44%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	17	59%	13	52%	3	100%	1	100%	0	0%
Don't know	1	3%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4gc Type of outsourcing for Delivery platform - supporting short courses for CPD. By size.**

Outsourced services: Delivery platform supporting short courses for CPD (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(29)		(7)		(15)		(7)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	11	38%	2	29%	5	33%	4	57%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	17	59%	4	57%	10	67%	3	43%



Don't know

1

3%

1

14%

0

0%

0

0%

**Table A2.4ha Type of outsourcing for Virtual classroom. By institution type.**

Outsourced services: Virtual classroom (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(23)		(12)		(11)		(0)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	2	9%	0	0%	2	18%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	21	91%	12	100%	9	82%	0	0%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4hb Type of outsourcing for Virtual classroom. By country.**

Outsourced services: Virtual classroom (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(23)		(17)		(3)		(1)		(2)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	2	9%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	21	91%	15	88%	3	100%	1	100%	2	100%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4hc Virtual classroom. By size.**

Outsourced services: Virtual classroom (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(23)		(6)		(9)		(8)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	2	9%	1	17%	1	11%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	21	91%	5	83%	8	89%	8	100%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4ia Type of outsourcing for e-Portfolio. By institution type.**

Outsourced services: e-Portfolio (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(22)		(8)		(14)		(0)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	7	32%	2	25%	5	36%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	15	68%	6	75%	9	64%	0	0%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4ib Type of outsourcing for e-Portfolio. By country.**

Outsourced services: e-Portfolio <i>(Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)</i>	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(22)		(20)		(1)		(1)		(0)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	7	32%	6	30%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	15	68%	14	70%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4ic Type of outsourcing for e-Portfolio. By size.**

Outsourced services: e-Portfolio <i>(Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)</i>	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(22)		(5)		(11)		(6)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	7	32%	1	20%	4	36%	2	33%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	15	68%	4	80%	7	64%	4	67%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4ja Type of outsourcing of VLE platform - supporting the delivery of open online courses. By institution type.**

Outsourced services: VLE platform - supporting the delivery of open online courses <i>(Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)</i>	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(21)		(11)		(9)		(1)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	10	48%	6	55%	4	44%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	10	48%	5	45%	4	44%	1	100%
Don't know	1	5%	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%

**Table A2.4jb Type of outsourcing of VLE platform - supporting the delivery of open online courses. By country.**

Outsourced services: VLE platform - supporting the delivery of open online courses <i>(Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)</i>	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(21)		(18)		(1)		(1)		(1)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	10	48%	8	44%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%

Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	10	48%	9	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%
Don't know	1	5%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4jc Type of outsourcing for VLE platform – supporting the delivery of open online courses. By size.**

Outsourced services: VLE platform - supporting the delivery of open online courses (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(21)		(3)		(9)		(9)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	10	48%	1	33%	4	44%	5	56%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	10	48%	1	33%	5	56%	4	44%
Don't know	1	5%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4ka Type of outsourcing for Digital Skills development. By institution type.**

Outsourced services: Digital Skills development (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(18)		(7)		(11)		(0)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	1	6%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	14	78%	6	86%	8	73%	0	0%
Don't know	3	17%	1	14%	2	18%	0	0%

**Table A2.4kb Type of outsourcing for Digital Skills development. By country.**

Outsourced services: Digital Skills development (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(18)		(15)		(2)		(0)		(1)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	1	6%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	14	78%	11	73%	2	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Don't know	3	17%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4kc Type of outsourcing for Digital Skills development. By size.**

Outsourced services: Digital Skills development (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(18)		(3)		(11)		(4)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	1	6%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	14	78%	3	100%	7	64%	4	100%
Don't know	3	17%	0	0%	3	27%	0	0%



**Table A2.4Ia Type of outsourcing for Learning analytics. By institution type.**

Outsourced services: Learning analytics (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(17)		(8)		(9)		(0)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	3	18%	2	25%	1	11%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	14	82%	6	75%	8	89%	0	0%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4Ib Type of outsourcing for Learning analytics. By country.**

Outsourced services: Learning analytics (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(17)		(14)		(1)		(0)		(2)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	3	18%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	14	82%	11	79%	1	100%	0	0%	2	100%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4Ic Type of outsourcing for Learning analytics. By size.**

Outsourced services: Learning analytics (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(17)		(2)		(10)		(5)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	3	18%	1	50%	1	10%	1	20%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	14	82%	1	50%	9	90%	4	80%
Don't know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4ma Type of outsourcing for Other outsourced service. By institution type.**

Outsourced services: Other outsourced service (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(5)		(4)		(1)		(0)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	4	80%	3	75%	1	100%	0	0%
Don't know	1	20%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%





**Table A2.4mb Type of outsourcing of Other outsourced service. By country.**

Outsourced services: Other outsourced service (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(5)		(4)		(0)		(1)		(0)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	4	80%	3	75%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Don't know	1	20%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A2.4mc Type of outsourcing of Other outsourced service. By size.**

Outsourced services: Other outsourced service (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(5)		(1)		(2)		(2)	
Institutionally-managed but hosted by a third party	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) multi-tenant service	4	80%	1	100%	1	50%	2	100%
Don't know	1	20%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%

**Question 2.5 Which, if any, of the services that are currently outsourced are you considering bringing back in to be institutionally managed?**

**Table A2.5a Services being considered to bring back in to be institutionally managed. By institution type.**

Services being considered to bring back in to be institutionally managed (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(41)		(22)		(18)		(1)	
None being considered for bringing back in-house	36	88%	86%	1	89%	1	100%	1
VLE platform supporting the delivery of fully online courses	2	5%	5%	=3	6%	=2	0%	=2
Delivery platform supporting short courses for CPD	2	5%	9%	2	0%	=5	0%	=2
VLE platform supporting the delivery of blended learning courses	1	2%	0%	=5	6%	=2	0%	=2
VLE platform supporting the delivery of open online courses	1	2%	5%	=3	0%	=5	0%	=2
Learning analytics	1	2%	0%	=5	6%	=2	0%	=2

**Table A2.5b Services being considered to bring back in to be institutionally managed. By country.**

Services being considered to bring back in to be institutionally managed  (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(41)		(34)		(3)		(2)		(2)	
None being considered for bringing back in-house	36	88%	85%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1
VLE platform supporting the delivery of fully online courses	2	5%	6%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2
Delivery platform supporting short courses for CPD	2	5%	6%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2
VLE platform supporting the delivery of blended learning courses	1	2%	3%	=4	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2
VLE platform supporting the delivery of open online courses	1	2%	3%	=4	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2
Learning analytics	1	2%	3%	=4	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2

**Table A2.5c Services being considered to bring back in to be institutionally managed. By size.**

Services being considered to bring back in to be institutionally managed  (Base: All respondents with outsourced provision)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(41)		(8)		(18)		(15)	
None being considered for bringing back in-house	36	88%	100%	1	89%	1	80%	1
VLE platform supporting the delivery of fully online courses	2	5%	0%	=2	0%	=4	13%	2
Delivery platform supporting short courses for CPD	2	5%	0%	=2	6%	=2	7%	=3
VLE platform supporting the delivery of blended learning courses	1	2%	0%	=2	0%	=4	7%	=3
VLE platform supporting the delivery of open online courses	1	2%	0%	=2	0%	=4	7%	=3
Learning analytics	1	2%	0%	=2	6%	=2	0%	6

**Question 2.6 Has your institution formally considered collaboration with commercial partners (e.g. Online Programme Management Services) on the design and delivery of courses or resources for professional development/CPD?**

**Table A2.6a Considered collaboration with commercial partners. By institution type.**

Considered collaboration with commercial partners (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(30)		(24)		(3)	
Yes, and do collaborate	24	42%	47%	1	42%	1	0%	=2
Yes, under consideration	7	12%	13%	4	13%	=3	0%	=2
Yes, but decided not to	12	21%	20%	2	25%	2	0%	=2
No, have not considered	10	18%	17%	3	8%	5	100%	1
Don't know	4	7%	3%	5	13%	=3	0%	=2

**Table A2.6b Considered collaboration with commercial partners. By country.**

Considered collaboration with commercial partners (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(48)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes, and do collaborate	24	42%	42%	1	50%	=1	33%	=1	50%	=1
Yes, under consideration	7	12%	10%	4	50%	=1	0%	=4	0%	=3
Yes, but decided not to	12	21%	23%	2	0%	=3	33%	=1	0%	=3
No, have not considered	10	18%	17%	3	0%	=3	33%	=1	50%	=1
Don't know	4	7%	8%	5	0%	=3	0%	=4	0%	=3

**Table A2.6c Considered collaboration with commercial partners. By size.**

Considered collaboration with commercial partners (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(12)		(23)		(22)	
Yes, and do collaborate	24	42%	42%	=1	39%	1	45%	1
Yes, under consideration	7	12%	8%	=3	17%	3	9%	4
Yes, but decided not to	12	21%	0%	5	26%	2	27%	2
No, have not considered	10	18%	42%	=1	9%	=4	14%	3
Don't know	4	7%	8%	=3	9%	=4	5%	5

## Question 2.7 What do you collaborate/are you considering collaborating/did you consider collaborating on?

**Table A2.7a What do you collaborate/are you considering collaborating/did you consider collaborating on? By institution type.**

What do you collaborate/are you considering collaborating/did you consider collaborating on? <i>(Base: All respondents that have considered collaborating with commercial partners)</i>	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(43)		(24)		(19)		(0)	
Fully online/distance learning programmes	40	93%	88%	1	100%	1	0	0%
Short courses (e.g. LLE modules or CPD)	16	37%	46%	2	26%	2	0	0%
Design and delivery of open learning	9	21%	29%	3	11%	3	0	0%
Degree apprenticeships	4	9%	13%	4	5%	4	0	0%
Other	2	5%	8%	5	0%	5	0	0%

**Table A2.7b What do you collaborate/are you considering collaborating/did you consider collaborating on? By country.**

What do you collaborate/are you considering collaborating/did you consider collaborating on? <i>(Base: All respondents that have considered collaborating with commercial partners)</i>	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(43)		(36)		(4)		(2)		(1)	
Fully online/distance learning programmes	40	93%	92%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1
Short courses (e.g. LLE modules or CPD)	16	37%	36%	2	75%	2	0%	=2	0%	=2
Design and delivery of open learning	9	21%	19%	3	50%	3	0%	=2	0%	=2
Degree apprenticeships	4	9%	11%	4	0%	=4	0%	=2	0%	=2
Other	2	5%	6%	5	0%	=4	0%	=2	0%	=2

**Table A2.7c What do you collaborate/are you considering collaborating/did you consider collaborating on? By size.**

What do you collaborate/are you considering collaborating/did you consider collaborating on? <i>(Base: All respondents that have considered collaborating with commercial partners)</i>	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(43)		(6)		(19)		(18)	
Fully online/distance learning programmes	40	93%	83%	1	95%	1	94%	1
Short courses (e.g. LLE modules or CPD)	16	37%	50%	2	32%	2	39%	2
Design and delivery of open learning	9	21%	17%	3	16%	=3	28%	3
Degree apprenticeships	4	9%	0%	=4	16%	=3	6%	=4
Other	2	5%	0%	=4	5%	5	6%	=4



## Question 2.8 Whether undertaken a review in the last two years?

Table A2.8a Whether a review has been undertaken in the last two years. By institution type.

Whether undertaken a review in the last two years (Base: All respondents)	Total		Pre-92		Type Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(57)		(30)		(24)		(3)	
Yes	46	81%	27	90%	18	75%	1	33%
No	11	19%	3	10%	6	25%	2	67%

Table A2.8b Whether a review has been undertaken in the last two years. By country

Whether undertaken a review in the last two years (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(57)		(48)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	46	81%	39	81%	4	100%	2	67%	1	50%
No	11	19%	9	19%	0	0%	1	33%	1	50%

Table A2.8c Whether a review has been undertaken in the last two years. By size.

Whether undertaken a review in the last two years (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(57)		(12)		(23)		(22)	
Yes	46	81%	8	67%	19	83%	19	86%
No	11	19%	4	33%	4	17%	3	14%

## Question 2.9 Services or systems reviewed?

Table A2.9a Services or systems reviewed. By institution type.

Services or systems reviewed (Base: All respondents that have undertaken a review)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(46)		(27)		(18)		(1)	
VLE	35	76%	20	74%	14	78%	1	100%
Polling tools	27	59%	14	52%	12	67%	1	100%
e-Portfolio	26	57%	15	56%	10	56%	1	100%
Lecture capture	23	50%	13	48%	9	50%	1	100%
Generative Artificial Intelligence tools	23	50%	13	48%	10	56%	0	0%
Learning analytics	19	41%	8	30%	10	56%	1	100%
Digital Assessment (e.g. quizzes)	17	37%	10	37%	7	39%	0	0%
Digital Skills assessment	16	35%	12	44%	4	22%	0	0%
Digital exams system	14	30%	9	33%	5	28%	0	0%
Digital accessibility tools	14	30%	9	33%	5	28%	0	0%

Electronic Management of Assignments (EMA)	12	26%	9	33%	3	17%	0	0%
--	----	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	----

**Table A2.9a (continued).**

Services or systems reviewed <i>(Base: All respondents that have undertaken a review)</i>	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(46)		(27)		(18)		(1)	
Media streaming	12	26%	8	30%	4	22%	0	0%
Webinar platform	12	26%	6	22%	5	28%	1	100%
Collaborative tools	12	26%	7	26%	5	28%	0	0%
Digital Skills tools	10	22%	8	30%	2	11%	0	0%
Proctoring software	9	20%	5	19%	4	22%	0	0%
Podcasting	7	15%	4	15%	3	17%	0	0%
Other service or system	7	15%	5	19%	2	11%	0	0%

**Table A2.9b Services or systems reviewed. By country.**

Services or systems reviewed <i>(Base: All respondents that have undertaken a review)</i>	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(46)		(39)		(4)		(2)		(1)	
VLE	35	76%	30	77%	3	75%	1	50%	1	100%
Polling tools	27	59%	22	56%	3	75%	1	50%	1	100%
e-Portfolio	26	57%	21	54%	3	75%	1	50%	1	100%
Lecture capture	23	50%	19	49%	1	25%	2	100%	1	100%
Generative Artificial Intelligence tools	23	50%	18	46%	3	75%	1	50%	1	100%
Learning analytics	19	41%	16	41%	1	25%	1	50%	1	100%
Digital Assessment (e.g. quizzes)	17	37%	14	36%	0	0%	2	100%	1	100%
Digital Skills assessment	16	35%	13	33%	1	25%	1	50%	1	100%
Digital exams system	14	30%	11	28%	0	0%	2	100%	1	100%
Digital accessibility tools	14	30%	11	28%	1	25%	1	50%	1	100%
Electronic Management of Assignments (EMA)	12	26%	9	23%	1	25%	1	50%	1	100%
Media streaming	12	26%	9	23%	0	0%	2	100%	1	100%
Webinar platform	12	26%	9	23%	1	25%	1	50%	1	100%
Collaborative tools	12	26%	10	26%	0	0%	1	50%	1	100%
Digital Skills tools	10	22%	7	18%	1	25%	1	50%	1	100%
Proctoring software	9	20%	7	18%	0	0%	1	50%	1	100%
Podcasting	7	15%	4	10%	0	0%	2	100%	1	100%
Other service or system	7	15%	5	13%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%





**Table A2.9c Services or systems reviewed. By size.**

Services or systems reviewed (Base: All respondents that have undertaken a review)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(46)		(8)		(19)		(19)	
VLE	35	76%	8	100%	13	68%	14	74%
Polling tools	27	59%	7	88%	9	47%	11	58%
e-Portfolio	26	57%	6	75%	8	42%	12	63%
Lecture capture	23	50%	4	50%	10	53%	9	47%
Generative Artificial Intelligence tools	23	50%	4	50%	8	42%	11	58%
Learning analytics	19	41%	6	75%	6	32%	7	37%
Digital Assessment (e.g. quizzes)	17	37%	4	50%	4	21%	9	47%
Digital Skills assessment	16	35%	3	38%	4	21%	9	47%
Digital exams system	14	30%	1	13%	4	21%	9	47%
Digital accessibility tools	14	30%	4	50%	3	16%	7	37%
Electronic Management of Assignments (EMA)	12	26%	2	25%	2	11%	8	42%
Media streaming	12	26%	3	38%	3	16%	6	32%
Webinar platform	12	26%	4	50%	3	16%	5	26%
Collaborative tools	12	26%	5	63%	1	5%	6	32%
Digital Skills tools	10	22%	3	38%	0	0%	7	37%
Proctoring software	9	20%	1	13%	2	11%	6	32%
Podcasting	7	15%	2	25%	1	5%	4	21%
Other service or system	7	15%	1	13%	3	16%	3	16%

**Question 2.10 What was the outcome of the review on these services or systems?**

**Table A2.10aa Outcomes of VLE reviews. By institution type.**

Outcome of review: VLE (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(35)		(20)		(14)		(1)	
Review still in progress	4	11%	15%	=3	7%	=3	0%	=2
Continue with current system	8	23%	25%	2	14%	2	100%	1
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	9%	15%	=3	0%	5	0%	=2
Upgrade current system	18	51%	40%	1	71%	1	0%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	2	6%	5%	5	7%	=3	0%	=2
Other	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0	0%	=2

Table A2.10ab Outcomes of VLE reviews. By country.

Outcome of review: VLE (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(35)		(30)		(3)		(1)		(1)	
Review still in progress	4	11%	10%	3	33%	=1	0%	=2	0%	=2
Continue with current system	8	23%	20%	2	0%	=4	100%	1	100%	1
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	9%	7%	=4	33%	=1	0%	=2	0%	=2
Upgrade current system	18	51%	57%	1	33%	=1	0%	=2	0%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	2	6%	7%	=4	0%	=4	0%	=2	0%	=2
Other	0	0%	0%	6	0%	=4	0%	=2	0%	=2

Table A2.10ac Outcomes of VLE reviews. By size.

Outcome of review: VLE (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(35)		(8)		(13)		(14)	
Review still in progress	4	11%	38%	=1	0%	=4	7%	=4
Continue with current system	8	23%	25%	3	23%	2	21%	=2
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	9%	0%	=4	0%	=4	21%	=2
Upgrade current system	18	51%	38%	=1	69%	1	43%	1
Move to external hosting for current system	2	6%	0%	=4	8%	3	7%	=4
Other	0	0%	0%	=4	0%	=4	0%	6

Table A2.10ba Outcomes of polling tools reviews. By institution type.

Outcome of review: Polling tools (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(27)		(14)		(12)		(1)	
Review still in progress	6	22%	14%	3	33%	2	0%	=2
Continue with current system	5	19%	21%	2	17%	3	0%	=2
Implementation/pilot of new system	13	48%	50%	1	50%	1	0%	=2
Upgrade current system	1	4%	7%	=4	0%	=4	0%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	6	0%	=4	0%	=2
Other	2	7%	7%	=4	0%	=4	100%	1

**Table A2.10bb Outcomes of polling tools reviews. By country.**

Outcome of review: Polling tools (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(27)		(22)		(3)		(1)		(1)	
Review still in progress	6	22%	18%	=2	33%	=1	100%	1	0%	=2
Continue with current system	5	19%	18%	=2	0%	=4	0%	=2	100%	1
Implementation/pilot of new system	13	48%	55%	1	33%	=1	0%	=2	0%	=2
Upgrade current system	1	4%	5%	=4	0%	=4	0%	=2	0%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	6	0%	=4	0%	=2	0%	=2
Other	2	7%	5%	=4	33%	=1	0%	=2	0%	=2

**Table A2.10bc Outcomes of polling tools reviews. By size.**

Outcome of review: Polling tools (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(27)		(7)		(9)		(11)	
Review still in progress	6	22%	43%	1	33%	2	0%	=3
Continue with current system	5	19%	14%	=2	11%	=3	27%	2
Implementation/pilot of new system	13	48%	14%	=2	44%	1	73%	1
Upgrade current system	1	4%	14%	=2	0%	=5	0%	=3
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	6	0%	=5	0%	=3
Other	2	7%	14%	=2	11%	=3	0%	=3

**Table A2.10ca Outcomes of the e-Portfolio reviews. By institution type.**

Outcome of review: e-Portfolio (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(24)		(13)		(10)		(1)	
Review still in progress	8	33%	31%	1	40%	=1	0%	=2
Continue with current system	6	25%	15%	=3	40%	=1	0%	=2
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	13%	15%	=3	0%	=4	100%	1
Upgrade current system	3	13%	23%	2	0%	=4	0%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	1	4%	8%	=5	0%	=4	0%	=2
Other	3	13%	8%	=5	20%	3	0%	=2

**Table A2.10cb Outcome of the e-Portfolio reviews. By country.**

Outcome of review: e-Portfolio <i>(Base: All respondents that reviewed)</i>	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(24)		(20)		(3)		(1)		(0)	
Review still in progress	8	33%	30%	1	67%	1	0%	=2	0%	-
Continue with current system	6	25%	25%	2	0%	=3	100%	1	0%	-
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	13%	15%	=3	0%	=3	0%	=2	0%	-
Upgrade current system	3	13%	15%	=3	0%	=3	0%	=2	0%	-
Move to external hosting for current system	1	4%	5%	6	0%	=3	0%	=2	0%	-
Other	3	13%	10%	5	33%	2	0%	=2	0%	-

**Table A2.10cc Outcomes of the e-Portfolio reviews. By size.**

Outcome of review: e-Portfolio <i>(Base: All respondents that reviewed)</i>	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(24)		(6)		(8)		(10)	
Review still in progress	8	33%	17%	=3	38%	=1	40%	1
Continue with current system	6	25%	33%	=1	38%	=1	10%	=3
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	13%	33%	=1	0%	=5	10%	=3
Upgrade current system	3	13%	0%	=5	13%	=3	20%	2
Move to external hosting for current system	1	4%	0%	=5	0%	=5	10%	=3
Other	3	13%	17%	=3	13%	=3	10%	=3

**Table A2.10da Outcomes of the lecture capture reviews. By institution type.**

Outcome of review: Lecture capture <i>(Base: All respondents that reviewed)</i>	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(23)		(13)		(9)		(1)	
Review still in progress	6	26%	38%	1	11%	=2	0%	=2
Continue with current system	10	43%	23%	=2	78%	1	0%	=2
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	13%	23%	=2	0%	=4	0%	=2
Upgrade current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=4	0%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	4	17%	15%	4	11%	=2	100%	1
Other	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=4	0%	=2

**Table A2.10db Outcome of the lecture capture reviews. By country.**

Outcome of review: Lecture capture <i>(Base: All respondents that reviewed)</i>	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(23)		(19)		(1)		(2)		(1)	
Review still in progress	6	26%	26%	2	100%	1	0%	=3	0%	=2
Continue with current system	10	43%	53%	1	0%	=2	0%	=3	0%	=2
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	13%	5%	4	0%	=2	50%	=1	100%	1
Upgrade current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=2	0%	=3	0%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	4	17%	16%	3	0%	=2	50%	=1	0%	=2
Other	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=2	0%	=3	0%	=2

**Table A2.10dc Outcomes of the lecture capture reviews. By size.**

Outcome of review: Lecture capture <i>(Base: All respondents that reviewed)</i>	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(23)		(4)		(10)		(9)	
Review still in progress	6	26%	0%	=3	20%	=2	44%	1
Continue with current system	10	43%	50%	=1	60%	1	22%	=2
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	13%	0%	=3	20%	=2	11%	4
Upgrade current system	0	0%	0%	=3	0%	=4	0%	=5
Move to external hosting for current system	4	17%	50%	=1	0%	=4	22%	=2
Other	0	0%	0%	=3	0%	=4	0%	=5

**Table A2.10ea Outcomes of Generative AI tools reviews. By institution type.**

Outcome of review: Generative AI tools <i>(Base: All respondents that reviewed)</i>	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(22)		(12)		(10)		(0)	
Review still in progress	10	45%	33%	2	60%	1	0%	-
Continue with current system	2	9%	8%	=3	10%	3	0%	-
Implementation/pilot of new system	9	41%	50%	1	30%	2	0%	-
Upgrade current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=4	0%	-
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=4	0%	-
Other	1	5%	8%	=3	0%	=4	0%	-

Table A2.10eb Outcome of Generative AI tools reviews. By country.

Outcome of review: Generative AI tools (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(22)		(17)		(3)		(1)		(1)	
Review still in progress	10	45%	41%	2	67%	1	100%	1	0%	=2
Continue with current system	2	9%	6%	=3	33%	2	0%	=2	0%	=2
Implementation/pilot of new system	9	41%	47%	1	0%	=3	0%	=2	100%	1
Upgrade current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=3	0%	=2	0%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=3	0%	=2	0%	=2
Other	1	5%	6%	=3	0%	=3	0%	=2	0%	=2

Table A2.10ec Outcomes of Generative AI tools reviews. By size.

Outcome of review: Generative AI tools (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(22)		(4)		(8)		(10)	
Review still in progress	10	45%	75%	1	63%	1	20%	2
Continue with current system	2	9%	0%	=3	13%	3	10%	=3
Implementation/pilot of new system	9	41%	25%	2	25%	2	60%	1
Upgrade current system	0	0%	0%	3	0%	=4	0%	=5
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=3	0%	=4	0%	=5
Other	1	5%	0%	=3	0%	=4	10%	=3

Table A2.10fa Outcomes of Learning analytics reviews. By institution type.

Outcome of review: Learning analytics (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(18)		(7)		(10)		(1)	
Review still in progress	6	33%	43%	1	20%	=2	100%	1
Continue with current system	5	28%	14%	=3	40%	1	0%	=2
Implementation/pilot of new system	4	22%	29%	2	20%	=2	0%	=2
Upgrade current system	1	6%	0%	=5	10%	=4	0%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	6	0%	=2
Other	2	11%	14%	=3	10%	=4	0%	=2

**Table A2.10fb Outcome of Learning analytics reviews. By country.**

Outcome of review: Learning analytics (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(18)		(15)		(1)		(1)		(1)	
Review still in progress	6	33%	40%	1	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2
Continue with current system	5	28%	20%	3	0%	=2	100%	1	100%	1
Implementation/pilot of new system	4	22%	27%	2	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2
Upgrade current system	1	6%	7%	=4	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	6	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2
Other	2	11%	7%	=4	100%	1	0%	=2	0%	=2

**Table A2.10fc Outcomes of Learning analytics reviews. By size.**

Outcome of review: Learning analytics (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(18)		(6)		(6)		(6)	
Review still in progress	6	33%	33%	=1	33%	=1	33%	=1
Continue with current system	5	28%	17%	=3	33%	=1	33%	=1
Implementation/pilot of new system	4	22%	33%	=1	17%	=3	17%	=3
Upgrade current system	1	6%	0%	=5	17%	=3	0%	=5
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=5	0%	=5
Other	2	11%	17%	=3	0%	=5	17%	=3

**Table A2.10ga Outcomes of Digital Assessment (e.g. quizzes) reviews. By institution type.**

Outcome of review: Digital Assessment (e.g. quizzes) (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(16)		(9)		(7)		(0)	
Review still in progress	5	31%	33%	=1	29%	2	0%	-
Continue with current system	5	31%	22%	3	43%	1	0%	-
Implementation/pilot of new system	4	25%	33%	=1	14%	=3	0%	-
Upgrade current system	1	6%	0%	=5	14%	=3	0%	-
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=5	0%	-
Other	1	6%	11%	4	0%	=5	0%	-

**Table A2.10gb Outcome of Digital Assessment (e.g. quizzes) reviews. By country.**

Outcome of review: Digital Assessment (e.g. quizzes) (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(16)		(13)		(0)		(2)		(1)	
Review still in progress	5	31%	38%	1	0%	-	0%	=3	0%	=2
Continue with current system	5	31%	23%	=2	0%	-	50%	=1	100%	1
Implementation/pilot of new system	4	25%	23%	=2	0%	-	50%	=1	0%	=2
Upgrade current system	1	6%	8%	=4	0%	-	0%	=3	0%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	6	0%	-	0%	=3	0%	=2
Other	1	6%	8%	=4	0%	-	0%	=3	0%	=2

**Table A2.10gc Outcomes of Digital Assessment (e.g. quizzes) reviews. By size.**

Outcome of review: Digital Assessment (e.g. quizzes) (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(16)		(4)		(4)		(8)	
Review still in progress	5	31%	25%	=2	50%	1	25%	=2
Continue with current system	5	31%	50%	1	25%	=2	25%	=2
Implementation/pilot of new system	4	25%	0%	=4	25%	=2	38%	1
Upgrade current system	1	6%	25%	=2	0%	=4	0%	=5
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=4	0%	=4	0%	=5
Other	1	6%	0%	=4	0%	=4	13%	4

**Table A2.10ha Outcomes of Digital skills assessments reviews. By institution type.**

Outcome of review: Digital skills assessments (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(14)		(10)		(4)		(0)	
Review still in progress	4	29%	30%	2	25%	=2	0%	-
Continue with current system	3	21%	10%	4	50%	1	0%	-
Implementation/pilot of new system	5	36%	40%	1	25%	=2	0%	-
Upgrade current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=4	0%	-
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=4	0%	-
Other	2	14%	20%	3	0%	=4	0%	-



**Table A2.10hb Outcome of Digital skills assessments reviews. By country.**

Outcome of review: Digital skills assessments (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(14)		(11)		(1)		(1)		(1)	
Review still in progress	4	29%	27%	2	100%	1	0%	=2	0%	=2
Continue with current system	3	21%	9%	4	0%	=2	100%	1	100%	1
Implementation/pilot of new system	5	36%	45%	1	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2
Upgrade current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2
Other	2	14%	18%	3	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2

**Table A2.10hc Outcomes of Digital skills assessments reviews. By size.**

Outcome of review: Digital skills assessments (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(14)		(3)		(4)		(7)	
Review still in progress	4	29%	67%	1	25%	=2	14%	=3
Continue with current system	3	21%	33%	2	0%	=4	29%	2
Implementation/pilot of new system	5	36%	0%	=3	50%	1	43%	1
Upgrade current system	0	0%	0%	=3	0%	=4	0%	=5
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=3	0%	=4	0%	=5
Other	2	14%	0%	=3	25%	=2	14%	=3

**Table A2.10ia Outcomes of Digital exam systems reviews. By institution type.**

Outcome of review: Digital exam systems (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(12)		(7)		(5)		(0)	
Review still in progress	5	42%	43%	1	40%	=1	0%	-
Continue with current system	2	17%	14%	=3	20%	3	0%	-
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	25%	14%	=3	40%	=1	0%	-
Upgrade current system	2	17%	29%	2	0%	=4	0%	-
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=4	0%	-
Other	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=4	0%	-

**Table A2.10ib Outcome of Digital exam systems reviews. By country.**

Outcome of review: Digital exam systems (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(12)		(10)		(0)		(2)		(0)	
Review still in progress	5	42%	40%	1	0%	-	50%	=1	0%	-
Continue with current system	2	17%	20%	=2	0%	-	0%	=3	0%	-
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	25%	20%	=2	0%	-	50%	=1	0%	-
Upgrade current system	2	17%	20%	=2	0%	-	0%	=3	0%	-
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	-	0%	=3	0%	-
Other	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	-	0%	=3	0%	-

**Table A2.10ic Outcomes of Digital exam systems reviews. By size.**

Outcome of review: Digital exam systems (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(12)		(1)		(4)		(7)	
Review still in progress	5	42%	100%	1	25%	=2	43%	1
Continue with current system	2	17%	0%	=2	25%	=2	14%	=3
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	25%	0%	=2	50%	1	14%	=3
Upgrade current system	2	17%	0%	=2	0%	=4	29%	2
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=2	0%	=4	0%	=5
Other	0	0%	0%	=2	0%	=4	0%	=5

**Table A2.10ja Outcomes of Digital accessibility tools reviews. By institution type.**

Outcome of review: Digital accessibility tools (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(13)		(8)		(5)		(0)	
Review still in progress	3	23%	25%	=2	20%	2	0%	0
Continue with current system	5	38%	13%	4	80%	1	0%	0
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	23%	38%	1	0%	=3	0%	0
Upgrade current system	2	15%	25%	=2	0%	=3	0%	0
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=3	0%	0
Other	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=3	0%	0

**Table A2.10jb Outcome of Digital accessibility tools reviews. By country.**

Outcome of review: Digital accessibility tools (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(13)		(10)		(1)		(1)		(1)	
Review still in progress	3	23%	20%	=3	100%	1	0%	=2	0%	=2
Continue with current system	5	38%	30%	=1	0%	=2	100%	1	100%	1
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	23%	30%	=1	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2
Upgrade current system	2	15%	20%	=3	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2
Other	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2

**Table A2.10jc Outcomes of Digital accessibility tools reviews. By size.**

Outcome of review: Digital accessibility tools (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(13)		(4)		(3)		(6)	
Review still in progress	3	23%	25%	=2	67%	1	0%	=3
Continue with current system	5	38%	50%	1	0%	=3	50%	=1
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	23%	0%	=4	0%	=3	50%	=1
Upgrade current system	2	15%	25%	=2	33%	2	0%	=3
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=4	0%	=3	0%	=3
Other	0	0%	0%	=4	0%	=3	0%	=3

**Table A2.10ka Outcomes of Electronic Management of Assignments (EMA) reviews. By institution type.**

Outcome of review: Electronic Management of Assignments (EMA) (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(11)		(8)		(3)		(0)	
Review still in progress	5	46%	50%	1	33%	2	0%	-
Continue with current system	3	27%	13%	=3	67%	1	0%	-
Implementation/pilot of new system	2	18%	25%	2	0%	=3	0%	-
Upgrade current system	1	9%	13%	=3	0%	=3	0%	-
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=3	0%	-
Other	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=3	0%	-

**Table A2.10kb Outcome of Electronic Management of Assignments (EMA) reviews. By country.**

Outcome of review: Electronic Management of Assignments (EMA) <i>(Base: All respondents that reviewed)</i>	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(11)		(9)		(1)		(1)		(0)	
Review still in progress	5	45%	56%	1	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	-
Continue with current system	3	27%	22%	=2	0%	=2	100%	1	0%	-
Implementation/pilot of new system	2	18%	22%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	-
Upgrade current system	1	9%	0%	=4	100%	1	0%	=2	0%	-
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=4	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	-
Other	0	0%	0%	=4	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	-

**Table A2.10kc Outcomes of Electronic Management of Assignments (EMA) reviews. By size.**

Outcome of review: Electronic Management of Assignments (EMA) <i>(Base: All respondents that reviewed)</i>	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(11)		(2)		(2)		(7)	
Review still in progress	5	45%	50%	=1	50%	=1	43%	1
Continue with current system	3	27%	50%	=1	0%	=3	29%	=2
Implementation/pilot of new system	2	18%	0%	=3	0%	=3	29%	=2
Upgrade current system	1	9%	0%	=3	50%	=1	0%	=4
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=3	0%	=3	0%	=4
Other	0	0%	0%	=3	0%	=3	0%	=4

**Table A2.10la Outcomes of Media streaming reviews. By institution type.**

Outcome of review: Media streaming <i>(Base: All respondents that reviewed)</i>	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(12)		(8)		(4)		(0)	
Review still in progress	1	8%	13%	=3	0%	=4	0%	-
Continue with current system	2	17%	0%	=5	50%	1	0%	-
Implementation/pilot of new system	4	33%	38%	=1	25%	=2	0%	-
Upgrade current system	1	8%	13%	=3	0%	=4	0%	-
Move to external hosting for current system	4	33%	38%	=1	25%	=2	0%	-
Other	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=4	0%	-

**Table A2.10lb Outcome of Media streaming reviews. By country.**

Outcome of review: Media streaming (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(12)		(9)		(0)		(2)		(1)	
Review still in progress	1	8%	11%	=4	0%	-	0%	=3	0%	=2
Continue with current system	2	17%	22%	=2	0%	-	0%	=3	0%	=2
Implementation/pilot of new system	4	33%	22%	=2	0%	-	50%	=1	100%	1
Upgrade current system	1	8%	11%	=4	0%	-	0%	=3	0%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	4	33%	33%	1	0%	-	50%	=1	0%	=2
Other	0	0%	0%	6	0%	-	0%	=3	0%	=2

**Table A2.10lc Outcomes of Media streaming reviews. By size.**

Outcome of review: Media streaming (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(12)		(3)		(3)		(6)	
Review still in progress	1	8%	33%	=1	0%	=2	0%	=5
Continue with current system	2	17%	33%	=1	0%	=2	17%	=2
Implementation/pilot of new system	4	33%	0%	=4	100%	1	17%	=2
Upgrade current system	1	8%	0%	=4	0%	=2	17%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	4	33%	33%	=1	0%	=2	50%	1
Other	0	0%	0%	=4	0%	=2	0%	=5

**Table A2.10ma Outcomes of Webinar platform reviews. By institution type.**

Outcome of review: Webinar platform (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(10)		(5)		(4)		(1)	
Review still in progress	2	20%	40%	=1	0%	=4	0%	=2
Continue with current system	4	40%	40%	=1	50%	1	0%	=2
Implementation/pilot of new system	1	10%	0%	=4	25%	=2	0%	=2
Upgrade current system	1	10%	20%	3	0%	=4	0%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	1	10%	0%	=4	25%	=2	0%	=2
Other	1	10%	0%	=4	0%	=4	100%	1

**Table A2.10mb Outcome of Webinar platform reviews. By country.**

Outcome of review: Webinar platform <i>(Base: All respondents that reviewed)</i>	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(10)		(7)		(1)		(1)		(1)	
Review still in progress	2	20%	14%	=2	100%	1	0%	=2	0%	=2
Continue with current system	4	40%	43%	1	0%	=2	0%	=2	100%	1
Implementation/pilot of new system	1	10%	14%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2
Upgrade current system	1	10%	14%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	1	10%	0%	6	0%	=2	100%	1	0%	=2
Other	1	10%	14%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=2

**Table A2.10mc Outcomes of Webinar platform reviews. By size.**

Outcome of review: Webinar platform <i>(Base: All respondents that reviewed)</i>	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(10)		(4)		(2)		(4)	
Review still in progress	2	20%	0%	=5	50%	=1	25%	=2
Continue with current system	4	40%	25%	=1	50%	=1	50%	1
Implementation/pilot of new system	1	10%	0%	=5	0%	=3	25%	=2
Upgrade current system	1	10%	25%	=1	0%	=3	0%	=4
Move to external hosting for current system	1	10%	25%	=1	0%	=3	0%	=4
Other	1	10%	25%	=1	0%	=3	0%	=4

**Table A2.10na Outcomes of Collaborative tools reviews. By institution type.**

Outcome of review: Collaborative tools <i>(Base: All respondents that reviewed)</i>	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(11)		(6)		(5)		(0)	
Review still in progress	4	36%	33%	=1	40%	2	0%	-
Continue with current system	4	36%	17%	=3	60%	1	0%	-
Implementation/pilot of new system	2	18%	33%	=1	0%	=3	0%	-
Upgrade current system	1	9%	17%	=3	0%	=3	0%	-
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=3	0%	-
Other	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=3	0%	-

**Table A2.10nb Outcome of Collaborative tools reviews. By country.**

Outcome of review: Collaborative tools <i>(Base: All respondents that reviewed)</i>	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(11)		(9)		(0)		(1)		(1)	
Review still in progress	4	36%	44%	1	0%	-	0%	=2	0%	=2
Continue with current system	4	36%	22%	=2	0%	-	100%	1	100%	1
Implementation/pilot of new system	2	18%	22%	=2	0%	-	0%	=2	0%	=2
Upgrade current system	1	9%	11%	4	0%	-	0%	=2	0%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	-	0%	=2	0%	=2
Other	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	-	0%	=2	0%	=2

**Table A2.10nc Outcomes of Collaborative tools reviews. By size.**

Outcome of review: Collaborative tools <i>(Base: All respondents that reviewed)</i>	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(11)		(5)		(1)		(5)	
Review still in progress	4	36%	20%	=2	100%	1	40%	=1
Continue with current system	4	36%	40%	1	0%	=2	40%	=1
Implementation/pilot of new system	2	18%	20%	=2	0%	=2	20%	3
Upgrade current system	1	9%	20%	=2	0%	=2	0%	=4
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=2	0%	=4
Other	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=2	0%	=4

**Table A2.10oa Outcomes of Digital skills tools reviews. By institution type.**

Outcome of review: Digital skills tools <i>(Base: All respondents that reviewed)</i>	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(8)		(6)		(2)		(0)	
Review still in progress	3	38%	50%	=1	0%	=2	0%	-
Continue with current system	2	25%	0%	=3	100%	1	0%	-
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	38%	50%	=1	0%	=2	0%	-
Upgrade current system	0	0%	0%	=3	0%	=2	0%	-
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=3	0%	=2	0%	-
Other	0	0%	0%	=3	0%	=2	0%	-

**Table A2.10ob Outcome of Digital skills tools reviews. By country.**

Outcome of review: Digital skills tools (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(8)		(6)		(1)		(1)		(0)	
Review still in progress	3	38%	33%	2	100%	1	0%	=2	0%	-
Continue with current system	2	25%	17%	3	0%	=2	100%	1	0%	-
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	38%	50%	1	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	-
Upgrade current system	0	0%	0%	=4	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	-
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=4	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	-
Other	0	0%	0%	=4	0%	=2	0%	=2	0%	-

**Table A2.10oc Outcomes of Digital skills tools reviews. By size.**

Outcome of review: Digital skills tools (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(8)		(3)		(0)		(5)	
Review still in progress	3	38%	67%	1	0%	-	20%	=2
Continue with current system	2	25%	33%	2	0%	-	20%	=2
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	38%	0%	=3	0%	-	60%	1
Upgrade current system	0	0%	0%	=3	0%	-	0%	=4
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=3	0%	-	0%	=4
Other	0	0%	0%	=3	0%	-	0%	=4

**Table A2.10pa Outcomes of Proctoring software reviews. By institution type.**

Outcome of review: Proctoring software (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(8)		(4)		(4)		(0)	
Review still in progress	3	38%	25%	=1	50%	1	0%	-
Continue with current system	2	25%	25%	=1	25%	=2	0%	-
Implementation/pilot of new system	2	25%	25%	=1	25%	=2	0%	-
Upgrade current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=4	0%	-
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=4	0%	-
Other	1	13%	25%	=1	0%	=4	0%	-



**Table A2.10pb Outcome of Proctoring software reviews. By country.**

Outcome of review: Proctoring software (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(8)		(6)		(0)		(1)		(1)	
Review still in progress	3	38%	33%	=1	0%	-	100%	1	0%	=2
Continue with current system	2	25%	17%	=3	0%	-	0%	=2	100%	1
Implementation/pilot of new system	2	25%	33%	=1	0%	-	0%	=2	0%	=2
Upgrade current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	-	0%	=2	0%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	-	0%	=2	0%	=2
Other	1	13%	17%	=3	0%	-	0%	=2	0%	=2

**Table A2.10pc Outcomes of Proctoring software reviews. By size.**

Outcome of review: Proctoring software (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(8)		(1)		(2)		(5)	
Review still in progress	3	38%	100%	1	50%	=1	20%	=2
Continue with current system	2	25%	0%	=2	0%	=3	40%	1
Implementation/pilot of new system	2	25%	0%	=2	50%	=1	20%	=2
Upgrade current system	0	0%	0%	=2	0%	=3	0%	=5
Move to external hosting for current system	0	0%	0%	=2	0%	=3	0%	=5
Other	1	13%	0%	=2	0%	=3	20%	=2

**Table A2.10qa Outcomes of Podcasting reviews. By institution type.**

Outcome of review: Podcasting (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(6)		(3)		(3)		(0)	
Review still in progress	0	0%	0%	=2	0%	=3	0%	-
Continue with current system	2	33%	0%	=2	67%	1	0%	-
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	50%	100%	1	0%	=3	0%	-
Upgrade current system	0	0%	0%	=2	0%	=3	0%	-
Move to external hosting for current system	1	17%	0%	=2	33%	2	0%	-
Other	0	0%	0%	=2	0%	=3	0%	-

Table A2.10qb Outcome of Podcasting reviews. By country.

Outcome of review: Podcasting (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(6)		(3)		(0)		(2)		(1)	
Review still in progress	0	0%	0%	=3	0%	-	0%	=3	0%	=2
Continue with current system	2	33%	67%	1	0%	-	0%	=3	0%	=2
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	50%	33%	2	0%	-	50%	=1	100%	1
Upgrade current system	0	0%	0%	=3	0%	-	0%	=3	0%	=2
Move to external hosting for current system	1	17%	0%	=3	0%	-	50%	=1	0%	=2
Other	0	0%	0%	=3	0%	-	0%	=3	0%	=2

Table A2.10qc Outcomes of Podcasting reviews. By size.

Outcome of review: Podcasting (Base: All respondents that reviewed)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(6)		(2)		(1)		(3)	
Review still in progress	0	0%	0%	=3	0%	=2	0%	=3
Continue with current system	2	33%	50%	=1	0%	=2	33%	2
Implementation/pilot of new system	3	50%	0%	=3	100%	1	67%	1
Upgrade current system	0	0%	0%	=3	0%	=2	0%	=3
Move to external hosting for current system	1	17%	50%	=1	0%	=2	0%	=3
Other	0	0%	0%	=3	0%	=2	0%	=3

**Question 2.11 Which, if any, of the following digital education tools are you planning on implementing or piloting on a centrally-supported basis over the next two years to add to those already available?**

Table A2.11a Digital education tools institutions are planning on implementing or piloting over the next two years. By institution type.

Centrally-supported digital education tools to be implemented or piloted over next 2 years (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
			%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(30)		(24)		(3)	
Generative AI	28	49%	53%	1	46%	1	33%	=3
Digital Exams system	14	25%	30%	2	21%	3	0%	=14
e-Portfolio	12	21%	17%	=10	25%	2	33%	=3
Learning analytics tools	11	19%	17%	=10	17%	=4	67%	=1
Summative eAssessment tools	11	19%	23%	=3	13%	=11	33%	=3
Other centrally supported TEL tool	11	19%	23%	=3	17%	=4	0%	=14
Collaborative tools	10	18%	23%	=3	8%	=15	33%	=3

Table A2.11a (continued).

Centrally-supported digital education tools to be implemented or piloted over next 2 years (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
			%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(30)		(24)		(3)	
Electronic Management of Assignments (EMA)	10	18%	23%	=3	13%	=11	0%	=14
Webinar / virtual classroom	10	18%	17%	=10	17%	=4	33%	=3
Personal response systems (including handsets or web-based apps) (e.g. Mentimeter, Poll Everywhere, TurningPoint/PointSolutions, Vevox)	9	16%	20%	=7	13%	=11	0%	=14
Formative eAssessment tools	9	16%	20%	=7	8%	=15	33%	=3
Proctoring software	8	14%	13%	=13	17%	=4	0%	=14
Hybrid delivery technologies	8	14%	20%	=7	4%	=21	33%	=3
Academic skills / writing	7	12%	7%	=17	17%	=4	33%	=3
Digital Skills courses	6	11%	13%	=13	4%	=21	33%	=3
Lecture capture tools	6	11%	7%	=17	17%	=4	0%	=14
Digital Skills assessment	5	9%	10%	=15	8%	=15	0%	=14
Mobile apps	5	9%	3%	=25	17%	=4	0%	=14
Not planning on piloting or implementing any	5	9%	7%	=17	13%	=11	0%	=14
Accessibility tools	4	7%	7%	=17	8%	=15	0%	=14
Virtual Learning Environment (VLE)	4	7%	0%	=30	8%	=15	67%	=1
Asynchronous communication tools	3	5%	7%	=17	0%	=26	33%	=3
Document sharing tool	3	5%	7%	=17	0%	=26	33%	=3
Media streaming system	3	5%	3%	=25	8%	=15	0%	=14
Podcasting	3	5%	10%	=15	0%	=26	0%	=14
Content management systems	2	4%	7%	=17	0%	=26	0%	=14
Text matching tools	2	4%	7%	=17	0%	=26	0%	=14
Blog	1	2%	0%	=30	4%	=21	0%	=14
Digital / learning object repository	1	2%	3%	=25	0%	=26	0%	=14
Intelligent agents	1	2%	0%	=30	4%	=21	0%	=14
Reading list management software	1	2%	0%	=30	4%	=21	0%	=14
Screen casting	1	2%	3%	=25	0%	=26	0%	=14
Social annotation tools	1	2%	3%	=25	0%	=26	0%	=14

**Table A2.11b Digital education tools institutions are planning on implementing or piloting over the next two years. By country.**

Centrally-supported digital education tools to be implemented or piloted over next 2 years (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
			%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(48)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Generative AI	28	49%	44%	1	75%	=1	67%	=1	100%	1
Digital Exams system	14	25%	25%	=2	0%	=4	67%	=1	0%	=3
e-Portfolio	12	21%	25%	=2	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Learning analytics tools	11	19%	23%	4	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Summative eAssessment tools	11	19%	21%	=5	0%	=4	33%	=3	0%	=3
Other centrally supported TEL tool	11	19%	17%	=8	75%	=1	0%	=10	0%	=3
Collaborative tools	10	18%	21%	=5	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Electronic Management of Assignments (EMA)	10	18%	17%	=8	0%	=4	33%	=3	50%	2
Webinar / virtual classroom	10	18%	19%	7	0%	=4	33%	=3	0%	=3
Personal response systems (incl. handsets or web-based apps)	9	16%	17%	=8	25%	3	0%	=10	0%	=3
Formative eAssessment tools	9	16%	17%	=8	0%	=4	33%	=3	0%	=3
Proctoring software	8	14%	15%	=12	0%	=4	33%	=3	0%	=3
Hybrid delivery technologies	8	14%	15%	=12	0%	=4	33%	=3	0%	=3
Academic skills/writing	7	12%	15%	=12	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Digital Skills courses	6	11%	13%	=15	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Lecture capture tools	6	11%	13%	=15	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Digital Skills assessment	5	9%	10%	=17	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Mobile apps	5	9%	10%	=17	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Not planning on piloting or implementing any	5	9%	8%	=19	0%	=4	33%	=3	0%	=3
Accessibility tools	4	7%	8%	=19	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Virtual Learning Environment (VLE)	4	7%	8%	=19	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Asynchronous communication tools	3	5%	6%	=22	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Document sharing tool	3	5%	6%	=22	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Media streaming system	3	5%	6%	=22	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Podcasting	3	5%	6%	=22	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Content management systems	2	4%	4%	=26	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Text matching tools	2	4%	4%	=26	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Blog	1	2%	2%	=28	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Digital/learning object repository	1	2%	2%	=28	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Intelligent agents	1	2%	2%	=28	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Reading list management software	1	2%	2%	=28	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Screen casting	1	2%	2%	=28	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3
Social annotation tools	1	2%	2%	=28	0%	=4	0%	=10	0%	=3

**Table A2.11c Digital education tools institutions are planning on implementing or piloting over the next two years. By size.**

Centrally-supported digital education tools to be implemented or piloted over next 2 years (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(12)		(23)		(22)	
Generative AI	28	49%	58%	1	52%	1	41%	1
Digital Exams system	14	25%	17%	=5	30%	2	23%	=3
e-Portfolio	12	21%	25%	=2	22%	=3	18%	=7
Learning analytics tools	11	19%	25%	=2	22%	=3	14%	=10
Summative eAssessment tools	11	19%	8%	=12	17%	=8	27%	2
Other centrally supported TEL tool	11	19%	17%	=5	22%	=3	18%	=7
Collaborative tools	10	18%	17%	=5	13%	=12	23%	=3
Electronic Management of Assignments (EMA)	10	18%	8%	=12	17%	=8	23%	=3
Webinar / virtual classroom	10	18%	17%	=5	22%	=3	14%	=10
Personal response systems (including handsets or web-based apps)	9	16%	0%	=19	22%	=3	18%	=7
Formative eAssessment tools	9	16%	8%	=12	13%	=12	23%	=3
Proctoring software	8	14%	8%	=12	17%	=8	14%	=10
Hybrid delivery technologies	8	14%	25%	=2	13%	=12	9%	=18
Academic skills / writing	7	12%	17%	=5	17%	=8	5%	=23
Digital skills courses	6	11%	8%	=12	13%	=12	9%	=18
Lecture capture tools	6	11%	0%	=19	13%	=12	14%	=10
Digital Skills assessment	5	9%	0%	=19	9%	=18	14%	=10
Mobile apps	5	9%	0%	=19	13%	=12	9%	=18
Not planning on piloting or implementing any	5	9%	0%	=19	9%	=18	14%	=10
Accessibility tools	4	7%	0%	=19	4%	=22	14%	=10
Virtual Learning Environment (VLE)	4	7%	17%	=5	9%	=18	0%	=30
Asynchronous communication tools	3	5%	8%	=12	4%	=22	5%	=23
Document sharing tool	3	5%	17%	=5	0%	=26	5%	=23
Media streaming system	3	5%	0%	=19	9%	=18	5%	=23
Podcasting	3	5%	0%	=19	0%	=26	14%	=10
Content management systems	2	4%	0%	=19	0%	=26	9%	=18
Text matching tools	2	4%	0%	=19	0%	=26	9%	=18
Blog	1	2%	0%	=19	0%	=26	5%	=23
Digital / learning object repository	1	2%	0%	=19	0%	=26	5%	=23
Intelligent agents	1	2%	0%	=19	4%	=22	0%	=30
Reading list management software	1	2%	0%	=19	4%	=22	0%	=30
Screen casting	1	2%	8%	=12	0%	=26	0%	=30
Social annotation tools	1	2%	0%	=19	0%	=26	5%	=23



**Question 2.12 What steps, if any, is your institution taking to engage with generative Artificial Intelligence to support teaching and learning activities?**

**Table A2.12a Steps taken to engage with generative Artificial Intelligence to support teaching and learning activities. By institution type.**

Steps institutions are taking to engage with Gen AI (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
			%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(30)		(24)		(3)	
Developed/updated guidance on responsible use of AI	51	89%	90%	1	96%	1	33%	=3
Working group set up to look at this	47	82%	87%	2	83%	2	33%	=3
Developed/implemented training on Gen AI	40	70%	73%	3	71%	3	33%	=3
Developed/updated policy on responsible use of AI	37	65%	70%	4	58%	4	67%	=1
Are piloting AI tools with restricted access to some staff/students	28	49%	53%	5	50%	5	0%	=7
Surveying staff/students about use or experiences of Gen AI	26	46%	47%	6	42%	6	67%	=1
Licensed AI tools and offering as a centrally supported service	16	28%	30%	7	25%	7	33%	=3
Other	10	18%	20%	8	17%	8	0%	=7
No action taken	1	2%	3%	9	0%	9	0%	=7

**Table A2.12b Steps taken to engage with generative Artificial Intelligence to support teaching and learning activities. By country.**

Steps institutions are taking to engage with Gen AI (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
			%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(48)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Developed / updated guidance on responsible use of AI	51	89%	88%	1	100%	=1	100%	=1	100%	=1
Working group set up to look at this	47	82%	81%	2	75%	=3	100%	=1	100%	=1
Developed / implemented training on Gen AI	40	70%	67%	=3	100%	=1	67%	=3	100%	=1
Developed / updated policy on responsible use of AI	37	65%	67%	=3	25%	=5	67%	=3	100%	=1
Are piloting AI tools with restricted access to some staff / students	28	49%	54%	5	25%	=5	0%	=7	50%	=5
Surveying staff /students about use or experiences of Gen AI	26	46%	42%	6	75%	=3	67%	=3	50%	=5
Licensed AI tools and offering as a centrally supported service	16	28%	29%	7	25%	=5	0%	=7	50%	=5
Other	10	18%	17%	8	25%	=5	33%	6	0%	=8
No action taken	1	2%	2%	9	0%	9	0%	=7	0%	=8

**Table A2.12c Steps taken to engage with generative Artificial Intelligence to support teaching and learning activities. By size.**

Steps institutions are taking to engage with Gen AI (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
			%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(12)		(23)		(22)	
Developed / updated guidance on responsible use of AI	51	89%	67%	3	96%	1	95%	1
Working group set up to look at this	47	82%	75%	=1	83%	2	86%	2
Developed / implemented training on Gen AI	40	70%	50%	4	74%	4	77%	3
Developed / updated policy on responsible use of AI	37	65%	33%	=5	78%	3	68%	4
Are piloting AI tools with restricted access to some staff / students	28	49%	17%	7	57%	5	59%	5
Surveying staff /students about use or experiences of Gen AI	26	46%	75%	=1	39%	6	36%	6
Licensed AI tools and offering as a centrally supported service	16	28%	33%	=5	26%	7	27%	7
Other	10	18%	8%	8	22%	8	18%	8
No action taken	1	2%	0%	9	4%	9	0%	9



## Section 3: Course Delivery and Evaluation of Digital Education

### Question 3.1 Does your institution offer any of the following types of programmes or courses?

**Table A3.1aa Whether institutions offer Blended learning degree programmes. By institution type.**

Blended learning degree programmes (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	45	78%	73%	1	80%	1	100%	1
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	7	12%	17%	2	8%	=2	0%	=2
Yes, by some individual teachers	4	7%	7%	3	8%	=2	0%	=2
Not yet, but we are planning to	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=5	0%	=2
Not offered and no plans to do so	2	3%	3%	4	4%	4	0%	=2
Don't know/not applicable	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=5	0%	=2

**Table A3.1ab Whether institutions offer Blended learning degree programmes. By country.**

Blended learning degree programmes (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	45	78%	78%	1	50%	=1	100%	1	100%	1
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	7	12%	10%	2	50%	=1	0%	=2	0%	=2
Yes, by some individual teachers	4	7%	8%	3	0%	=3	0%	=2	0%	=2
Not yet, but we are planning to	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=3	0%	=2	0%	=2
Not offered and no plans to do so	2	3%	4%	4	0%	=3	0%	=2	0%	=2
Don't know/not applicable	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=3	0%	=2	0%	=2

**Table A3.1ac Whether institutions offer Blended learning degree programmes. By size.**

Blended learning degree programmes (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	45	78%	67%	1	74%	1	87%	1
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	7	12%	17%	2	13%	=2	9%	2
Yes, by some individual teachers	4	7%	8%	=3	13%	=2	0%	=4
Not yet, but we are planning to	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=4	0%	=4
Not offered and no plans to do so	2	3%	8%	=3	0%	=4	4%	3
Don't know/not applicable	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=4	0%	=4

**Table A3.1ba Whether institutions offer Active Blended learning degree programmes. By institution type.**

Active Blended learning degree programmes (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	17	29%	23%	3	36%	1	33%	=1
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	22	38%	47%	1	32%	2	0%	=4
Yes, by some individual teachers	16	28%	27%	2	28%	3	33%	=1
Not yet, but we are planning to	1	2%	0%	=5	0%	=5	33%	=1
Not offered and no plans to do so	2	3%	3%	4	4%	4	0%	=4
Don't know/not applicable	0	0%	0%	=5	0%	=5	0%	=4

**Table A3.1bb Whether institutions offer Active Blended learning degree programmes. By country.**

Active Blended learning degree programmes (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	17	29%	27%	=2	25%	=2	67%	1	50%	=1
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	22	38%	41%	1	25%	=2	33%	2	0%	=3
Yes, by some individual teachers	16	28%	27%	=2	50%	1	0%	=3	50%	=1
Not yet, but we are planning to	1	2%	2%	5	0%	=4	0%	=3	0%	=3
Not offered and no plans to do so	2	3%	4%	4	0%	=4	0%	=3	0%	=3
Don't know/not applicable	0	0%	0%	6	0%	=4	0%	=3	0%	=3

**Table A3.1bc Whether institutions offer Active Blended learning degree programmes. By size.**

Active Blended learning degree programmes (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	17	29%	42%	1	26%	=2	26%	3
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	22	38%	17%	3	48%	1	39%	1
Yes, by some individual teachers	16	28%	25%	2	26%	=2	30%	2
Not yet, but we are planning to	1	2%	8%	=4	0%	=4	0%	=5
Not offered and no plans to do so	2	3%	8%	=4	0%	=4	4%	4
Don't know/not applicable	0	0%	0%	6	0%	=4	0%	=5

**Table A3.1ca Whether institutions offer Hybrid/Hyflex degree programmes. By institution type.**

Hybrid/Hyflex degree programmes (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	2	3%	3%	5	0%	=5	33%	=1
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	5	9%	13%	3	4%	4	0%	=4
Yes, by some individual teachers	24	41%	37%	=1	52%	1	0%	=4
Not yet, but we are planning to	6	10%	10%	4	8%	3	33%	=1
Not offered and no plans to do so	21	36%	37%	=1	36%	2	33%	=1
Don't know/not applicable	0	0%	0%	6	0%	=5	0%	=4

**Table A3.1cb Whether institutions offer Hybrid/Hyflex degree programmes. By country.**

Hybrid/Hyflex degree programmes (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	2	3%	4%	5	0%	=3	0%	=3	0%	=2
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	5	9%	10%	=3	0%	=3	0%	=3	0%	=2
Yes, by some individual teachers	24	41%	35%	2	75%	1	67%	1	100%	1
Not yet, but we are planning to	6	10%	10%	=3	0%	=3	33%	2	0%	=2
Not offered and no plans to do so	21	36%	41%	1	25%	2	0%	=3	0%	=2
Don't know/not applicable	0	0%	0%	6	0%	=3	0%	=3	0%	=2

**Table A3.1cc Whether institutions offer Hybrid/Hyflex degree programmes. By size.**

Hybrid/Hyflex degree programmes (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	2	3%	17%	=3	0%	=5	0%	=5
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	5	9%	17%	=3	4%	4	9%	3
Yes, by some individual teachers	24	41%	25%	=1	35%	2	57%	1
Not yet, but we are planning to	6	10%	17%	=3	13%	3	4%	4
Not offered and no plans to do so	21	36%	25%	=1	48%	1	30%	2
Don't know/not applicable	0	0%	0%	6	0%	=5	0%	=5

**Table A3.1da Whether institutions offer Active blended credit bearing short courses. By institution type.**

Active blended credit bearing short courses (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	1	2%	0%	6	4%	6	0%	=3
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	5	9%	7%	5	12%	=4	0%	=3
Yes, by some individual teachers	14	24%	30%	=1	20%	2	0%	=3
Not yet, but we are planning to	12	21%	20%	3	16%	3	67%	1
Not offered and no plans to do so	19	33%	30%	=1	36%	1	33%	2
Don't know/not applicable	7	12%	13%	4	12%	=4	0%	=3

**Table A3.1db Whether institutions offer Active blended credit bearing short courses. By country.**

Active blended credit bearing short courses (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	1	2%	0%	6	0%	=3	33%	=1	0%	=3
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	5	9%	8%	5	25%	2	0%	=4	0%	=3
Yes, by some individual teachers	14	24%	20%	=2	75%	1	0%	=4	50%	=1
Not yet, but we are planning to	12	21%	20%	=2	0%	=3	33%	=1	50%	=1
Not offered and no plans to do so	19	33%	39%	1	0%	=3	0%	=4	0%	=3
Don't know/not applicable	7	12%	12%	4	0%	=3	33%	=1	0%	=3

**Table A3.1dc Whether institutions offer Active blended credit bearing short courses. By size.**

Active blended credit bearing short courses (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	1	2%	0%	6	0%	6	4%	=5
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	5	9%	25%	=1	4%	5	4%	=5
Yes, by some individual teachers	14	24%	17%	4	17%	3	35%	1
Not yet, but we are planning to	12	21%	25%	=1	26%	2	13%	=3
Not offered and no plans to do so	19	33%	25%	=1	39%	1	30%	2
Don't know/not applicable	7	12%	8%	5	13%	4	13%	=3

**Table A3.1ea Whether institutions offer Active blended non-credit bearing short courses. By institution type.**

Active blended non-credit bearing short courses (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(29)		(25)		(3)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	2	4%	3%	6	4%	=5	0%	=4
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	11	19%	21%	=2	20%	3	0%	=4
Yes, by some individual teachers	19	33%	34%	1	32%	=1	33%	=1
Not yet, but we are planning to	6	11%	10%	=4	8%	4	33%	=1
Not offered and no plans to do so	15	26%	21%	=2	32%	=1	33%	=1
Don't know/not applicable	4	7%	10%	=4	4%	=5	0%	=4

**Table A3.1eb Whether institutions offer Active blended non-credit bearing short courses. By country.**

Active blended non-credit bearing short courses (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(48)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	2	4%	2%	6	0%	=3	33%	=1	0%	=3
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	11	19%	23%	3	0%	=3	0%	=4	0%	=3
Yes, by some individual teachers	19	33%	31%	1	75%	1	0%	=4	50%	=1
Not yet, but we are planning to	6	11%	8%	4	0%	=3	33%	=1	50%	=1
Not offered and no plans to do so	15	26%	29%	2	25%	2	0%	=4	0%	=3
Don't know/not applicable	4	7%	6%	5	0%	=3	33%	=1	0%	=3

**Table A3.1ec Whether institutions offer Active blended non-credit bearing short courses. By size.**

Active blended non-credit bearing short courses (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(12)		(23)		(22)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	2	4%	0%	6	0%	6	9%	=3
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	11	19%	33%	=1	22%	3	9%	=3
Yes, by some individual teachers	19	33%	17%	3	35%	1	41%	1
Not yet, but we are planning to	6	11%	8%	=4	13%	4	9%	=3
Not offered and no plans to do so	15	26%	33%	=1	26%	2	23%	2
Don't know/not applicable	4	7%	8%	=4	4%	5	9%	=3

**Table A3.1fa Whether institutions offer Fully online degree programmes. By institution type.**

Fully online degree programmes (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(29)		(25)		(3)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	6	11%	7%	=4	16%	3	0%	=3
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	23	40%	52%	1	32%	2	0%	=3
Yes, by some individual teachers	17	30%	24%	2	36%	1	33%	2
Not yet, but we are planning to	5	9%	7%	=4	4%	=5	67%	1
Not offered and no plans to do so	5	9%	10%	3	8%	4	0%	=3
Don't know/not applicable	1	2%	0%	6	4%	=5	0%	=3

**Table A3.1fb Whether institutions offer Fully online degree programmes. By country.**

Fully online degree programmes (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(48)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	6	11%	6%	5	0%	=5	67%	1	50%	=1
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	23	40%	44%	1	25%	=1	33%	2	0%	=3
Yes, by some individual teachers	17	30%	31%	2	25%	=1	0%	=3	50%	=1
Not yet, but we are planning to	5	9%	8%	=3	25%	=1	0%	=3	0%	=3
Not offered and no plans to do so	5	9%	8%	=3	25%	=1	0%	=3	0%	=3
Don't know/not applicable	1	2%	2%	6	0%	=5	0%	=3	0%	=3

**Table A3.1fc Whether institutions offer Fully online degree programmes. By size.**

Fully online degree programmes (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(12)		(22)		(23)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	6	11%	8%	4	5%	=5	17%	3
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	23	40%	42%	1	36%	1	43%	1
Yes, by some individual teachers	17	30%	25%	=2	32%	2	30%	2
Not yet, but we are planning to	5	9%	25%	=2	9%	4	0%	=5
Not offered and no plans to do so	5	9%	0%	=5	14%	3	9%	4
Don't know/not applicable	1	2%	0%	=5	5%	=5	0%	=5

**Table A3.1ga Whether institutions offer Fully online credit bearing short courses. By institution type.**

Fully online credit bearing short courses (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	2	3%	3%	6	4%	6	0%	=3
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	7	12%	10%	=4	16%	3	0%	=3
Yes, by some individual teachers	15	26%	30%	=1	24%	2	0%	=3
Not yet, but we are planning to	10	17%	17%	3	12%	=4	67%	1
Not offered and no plans to do so	18	31%	30%	=1	32%	1	33%	2
Don't know/not applicable	6	10%	10%	=4	12%	=4	0%	=3

**Table A3.1gb Whether institutions offer Fully online credit bearing short courses. By country.**

Fully online credit bearing short courses (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	2	3%	2%	6	0%	=3	33%	=1	0%	=3
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	7	12%	12%	4	0%	=3	0%	=4	50%	=1
Yes, by some individual teachers	15	26%	22%	2	75%	1	0%	=4	50%	=1
Not yet, but we are planning to	10	17%	18%	3	0%	=3	33%	=1	0%	=3
Not offered and no plans to do so	18	31%	35%	1	25%	2	0%	=4	0%	=3
Don't know/not applicable	6	10%	10%	5	0%	=3	33%	=1	0%	=3

**Table A3.1gc Whether institutions offer Fully online credit bearing short courses. By size.**

Fully online credit bearing short courses (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	2	3%	0%	6	0%	6	9%	=4
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	7	12%	8%	5	13%	=4	13%	3
Yes, by some individual teachers	15	26%	25%	=1	17%	3	35%	1
Not yet, but we are planning to	10	17%	25%	=1	22%	2	9%	=4
Not offered and no plans to do so	18	31%	25%	=1	35%	1	30%	2
Don't know/not applicable	6	10%	17%	4	13%	=4	4%	6

**Table A3.1ha Whether institutions offer Fully online non-credit bearing short courses. By institution type.**

Fully online non-credit bearing short courses (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	4	7%	3%	=4	12%	4	0%	=3
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	16	28%	37%	2	20%	2	0%	=3
Yes, by some individual teachers	24	41%	47%	1	40%	1	0%	=3
Not yet, but we are planning to	5	9%	3%	=4	8%	5	67%	1
Not offered and no plans to do so	7	12%	7%	3	16%	3	33%	2
Don't know/not applicable	2	3%	3%	=4	4%	6	0%	=3

**Table A3.1hb Whether institutions offer Fully online non-credit bearing short courses. By country.**

Fully online non-credit bearing short courses (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	4	7%	6%	5	0%	=3	33%	2	0%	=3
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	16	28%	31%	2	0%	=3	0%	=3	50%	=1
Yes, by some individual teachers	24	41%	37%	1	75%	1	67%	1	50%	=1
Not yet, but we are planning to	5	9%	10%	4	0%	=3	0%	=3	0%	=3
Not offered and no plans to do so	7	12%	12%	3	25%	2	0%	=3	0%	=3
Don't know/not applicable	2	3%	4%	6	0%	=3	0%	=3	0%	=3

**Table A3.1hc Whether institutions offer Fully online non-credit bearing short courses. By size.**

Fully online non-credit bearing short courses (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	4	7%	0%	6	0%	6	17%	3
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	16	28%	25%	=1	22%	2	35%	2
Yes, by some individual teachers	24	41%	25%	=1	48%	1	43%	1
Not yet, but we are planning to	5	9%	17%	4	9%	4	4%	4
Not offered and no plans to do so	7	12%	25%	=1	17%	3	0%	=5
Don't know/not applicable	2	3%	8%	5	4%	5	0%	=5



**Table A3.1ia Whether institutions offer Fully online pre-induction courses. By institution type.**

Fully online pre-induction courses (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	9	16%	17%	=3	16%	4	0%	=3
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	10	17%	27%	=1	8%	5	0%	=3
Yes, by some individual teachers	14	24%	27%	=1	24%	2	0%	=3
Not yet, but we are planning to	11	19%	3%	6	32%	1	67%	1
Not offered and no plans to do so	11	19%	17%	=3	20%	3	33%	2
Don't know/not applicable	3	5%	10%	5	0%	6	0%	=3

**Table A3.1ib Whether institutions offer Fully online pre-induction courses. By country.**

Fully online pre-induction courses (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	9	16%	16%	5	0%	=4	33%	2	0%	=3
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	10	17%	18%	=3	0%	=4	0%	=3	50%	=1
Yes, by some individual teachers	14	24%	22%	1	25%	=2	67%	1	0%	=3
Not yet, but we are planning to	11	19%	18%	=3	50%	1	0%	=3	0%	=3
Not offered and no plans to do so	11	19%	20%	2	0%	=4	0%	=3	50%	=1
Don't know/not applicable	3	5%	4%	6	25%	=2	0%	=3	0%	=3

**Table A3.1ic Whether institutions offer Fully online pre-induction courses. By size.**

Fully online pre-induction courses (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	9	16%	0%	=5	9%	5	30%	1
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	10	17%	17%	3	13%	4	22%	=2
Yes, by some individual teachers	14	24%	42%	1	17%	3	22%	=2
Not yet, but we are planning to	11	19%	33%	2	22%	2	9%	=4
Not offered and no plans to do so	11	19%	8%	4	35%	1	9%	=4
Don't know/not applicable	3	5%	0%	=5	4%	6	9%	=4

**Table A3.1ja Whether institutions offer Open online learning courses for all students at your institution (internal access). By institution type.**

Open online learning courses for all students at your institution (internal access) (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	14	24%	30%	2	20%	2	0%	=3
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	3	5%	3%	5	8%	5	0%	=3
Yes, by some individual teachers	12	21%	27%	3	16%	=3	0%	=3
Not yet, but we are planning to	8	14%	7%	4	16%	=3	67%	1
Not offered and no plans to do so	20	34%	33%	1	36%	1	33%	2
Don't know/not applicable	1	2%	0%	6	4%	6	0%	=3

**Table A3.1jb Whether institutions offer Open online learning courses for all students at your institution (internal access). By country.**

Open online learning courses for all students at your institution (internal access) (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	14	24%	22%	2	50%	1	33%	=1	0%	=3
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	3	5%	6%	5	0%	=4	0%	=4	0%	=3
Yes, by some individual teachers	12	21%	20%	3	25%	=2	0%	=4	50%	=1
Not yet, but we are planning to	8	14%	14%	4	0%	=4	33%	=1	0%	=3
Not offered and no plans to do so	20	34%	37%	1	25%	=2	0%	=4	50%	=1
Don't know/not applicable	1	2%	0%	6	0%	=4	33%	=1	0%	=3

**Table A3.1jc Whether institutions offer Open online learning courses for all students at your institution (internal access). By size.**

Open online learning courses for all students at your institution (internal access) (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	14	24%	25%	2	22%	2	26%	=2
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	3	5%	0%	6	9%	=4	4%	5
Yes, by some individual teachers	12	21%	33%	1	9%	=4	26%	=2
Not yet, but we are planning to	8	14%	17%	=3	17%	3	9%	4
Not offered and no plans to do so	20	34%	17%	=3	43%	1	35%	1
Don't know/not applicable	1	2%	8%	5	0%	6	0%	6

**Table A3.1ka Whether institutions offer Open online learning boundary courses. By institution type.**

Open online learning boundary courses (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	0	0%	0%	6	0%	=5	0%	=3
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	2	3%	7%	5	0%	=5	0%	=3
Yes, by some individual teachers	9	16%	17%	2	16%	2	0%	=3
Not yet, but we are planning to	7	12%	13%	3	8%	=3	33%	2
Not offered and no plans to do so	35	60%	53%	1	68%	1	67%	1
Don't know/not applicable	5	9%	10%	4	8%	=3	0%	=3

**Table A3.1kb Whether institutions offer Open online learning boundary courses. By country.**

Open online learning boundary courses (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	0	0%	0%	6	0%	=2	0%	=3	0%	=2
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	2	3%	4%	5	0%	=2	0%	=3	0%	=2
Yes, by some individual teachers	9	16%	18%	2	0%	=2	0%	=3	0%	=2
Not yet, but we are planning to	7	12%	14%	3	0%	=2	0%	=3	0%	=2
Not offered and no plans to do so	35	60%	55%	1	100%	1	67%	1	100%	1
Don't know/not applicable	5	9%	8%	4	0%	=2	33%	2	0%	=2

**Table A3.1kc Whether institutions offer Open online learning boundary courses. By size.**

Open online learning boundary courses (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	0	0%	0%	6	0%	=5	0%	6
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	2	3%	8%	=4	0%	=5	4%	5
Yes, by some individual teachers	9	16%	17%	3	13%	2	17%	2
Not yet, but we are planning to	7	12%	25%	2	9%	3	9%	4
Not offered and no plans to do so	35	60%	42%	1	74%	1	57%	1
Don't know/not applicable	5	9%	8%	=4	4%	4	13%	3

**Table A3.1la Whether institutions offer Open online learning courses for public (free external access). By institution type.**

Open online learning courses for public (free external access) (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(29)		(25)		(3)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	6	11%	14%	=3	8%	=3	0%	=3
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	6	11%	14%	=3	8%	=3	0%	=3
Yes, by some individual teachers	9	16%	28%	2	4%	6	0%	=3
Not yet, but we are planning to	7	12%	7%	5	16%	2	33%	2
Not offered and no plans to do so	27	47%	38%	1	56%	1	67%	1
Don't know/not applicable	2	4%	0%	6	8%	=3	0%	=3

**Table A3.1lb Whether institutions offer Open online learning courses for public (free external access). By country.**

Open online learning courses for public (free external access) (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(48)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	6	11%	10%	5	0%	=3	33%	=1	0%	=2
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	6	11%	13%	4	0%	=3	0%	=4	0%	=2
Yes, by some individual teachers	9	16%	17%	2	25%	2	0%	=4	0%	=2
Not yet, but we are planning to	7	12%	15%	3	0%	=3	0%	=4	0%	=2
Not offered and no plans to do so	27	47%	44%	1	75%	1	33%	=1	100%	1
Don't know/not applicable	2	4%	2%	6	0%	=3	33%	=1	0%	=2

**Table A3.1lc Whether institutions offer Open online learning courses for public (free external access). By size.**

Open online learning courses for public (free external access) (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(57)		(12)		(23)		(22)	
Yes, extensively across the institution	6	11%	0%	=5	9%	=4	18%	3
Yes, across some Schools/Departments	6	11%	8%	=3	9%	=4	14%	4
Yes, by some individual teachers	9	16%	0%	=5	17%	=2	23%	2
Not yet, but we are planning to	7	12%	17%	2	17%	=2	5%	=5
Not offered and no plans to do so	27	47%	67%	1	48%	1	36%	1
Don't know/not applicable	2	4%	8%	=3	0%	6	5%	=5

**Question 3.2 How, if at all, is your institution using technology to offer greater flexibility through hybrid/hyflex in learning and teaching activities? e.g. supporting remote and physically ‘present’ students for campus-based programmes.**

**Table A3.2a Use of technology to offer flexibility through hybrid/hyflex in learning and teaching activities. By institution type.**

Use of technology to offer flexibility (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
No flexibility offered	24	41%	13	43%	9	36%	2	67%
Offering a combination of in-person and remote teaching sessions (hybrid learning)	21	36%	9	30%	11	44%	1	33%
Other	11	19%	8	27%	3	12%	0	0%
Student choice over physical (in person) or remote attendance in teaching sessions	5	9%	2	7%	3	12%	0	0%
Student choice over real-time or asynchronous participation in teaching sessions	5	9%	3	10%	2	8%	0	0%
Offering a personalised learning pathway	2	3%	0	0%	2	8%	0	0%

**Table A3.2b Use of technology to offer flexibility through hybrid/hyflex in learning and teaching activities. By country.**

Use of technology to offer flexibility (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
No flexibility offered	24	41%	22	45%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Offering a combination of in-person and remote teaching sessions (hybrid learning)	21	36%	18	37%	2	50%	1	33%	0	0%
Other	11	19%	9	18%	0	0%	1	33%	1	50%
Student choice over physical (in person) or remote attendance in teaching sessions	5	9%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Student choice over real-time or asynchronous participation in teaching sessions	5	9%	3	6%	1	25%	0	0%	1	50%

Offering a personalised learning pathway	2	3%	1	2%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%
--	---	----	---	----	---	----	---	-----	---	----

**Table A3.2c Use of technology to offer flexibility through hybrid/hyflex in learning and teaching activities. By size.**

Use of technology to offer flexibility (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
No flexibility offered	24	41%	4	33%	11	48%	9	39%
Offering a combination of in-person and remote teaching sessions (hybrid learning)	21	36%	7	58%	6	26%	8	35%
Other	11	19%	0	0%	5	22%	6	26%
Student choice over physical (in person) or remote attendance in teaching sessions	5	9%	1	8%	2	9%	2	9%
Student choice over real-time or asynchronous participation in teaching sessions	5	9%	1	8%	2	9%	2	9%
Offering a personalised learning pathway	2	3%	1	8%	1	4%	0	0%

**Question 3.3 Does the institution measure the use of TEL tools across the institution, looking for any variation in take-up by course type, subject or other relevant factors?**

**Table A3.3a Institutional measurement of the use of TEL tools. By institution type.**

Measurement of the use of TEL tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes	33	57%	19	63%	14	56%	0	0%
No	25	43%	11	37%	11	44%	3	100%

**Table A3.3b Institutional measurement of the use of TEL tools. By country.**

Measurement of the use of TEL tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	33	57%	30	61%	1	25%	1	33%	1	50%
No	25	43%	19	39%	3	75%	2	67%	1	50%

**Table A3.3c Institutional measurement of the use of TEL tools. By size.**

Measurement of the use of TEL tools	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	

(Base: All respondents)	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes	33	57%	6	50%	15	65%	12	52%
No	25	43%	6	50%	8	35%	11	48%

**Question 3.6a Does the institution measure the development of Digital Capability Skills among students?**

**Table A3.6aa Measurement of the development of Digital Capability Skills among students. By institution type.**

Measurement of the development of Digital Capability Skills among students (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
No	22	38%	13	43%	7	28%	2	67%
No, but working towards this	20	34%	6	20%	13	52%	1	33%
Yes	16	28%	11	37%	5	20%	0	0%

**Table A3.6ab Measurement of the development of Digital Capability Skills among students. By country.**

Measurement of the development of Digital Capability Skills among students (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
No	22	38%	18	37%	2	50%	2	67%	0	0%
No, but working towards this	20	34%	19	39%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
Yes	16	28%	12	24%	2	50%	1	33%	1	50%

**Table A3.6ac Measurement of the development of Digital Capability Skills among students. By size.**

Measurement of the development of Digital Capability Skills among students (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
No	22	38%	5	42%	12	52%	5	22%
No, but working towards this	20	34%	4	33%	6	26%	10	43%
Yes	16	28%	3	25%	5	22%	8	35%

**Question 3.6b Does the institution measure the development of Digital Capability Skills among staff?**

**Table A3.6ba Measurement of the development of Digital Capability Skills among staff. By institution type.**

Measurement of the development of Digital Capability Skills among staff (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
No, but working towards this	26	45%	11	37%	14	56%	1	33%
No	17	29%	9	30%	6	24%	2	67%
Yes	15	26%	10	33%	5	20%	0	0%





**Table A3.6bb Measurement of the development of Digital Capability Skills among staff. By country.**

Measurement of the development of Digital Capability Skills among staff (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
No, but working towards this	26	45%	23	47%	1	25%	1	33%	1	50%
No	17	29%	14	29%	2	50%	1	33%	0	0%
Yes	15	26%	12	24%	1	25%	1	33%	1	50%

**Table A3.6bc Measurement of the development of Digital Capability Skills among staff. By institution type.**

Measurement of the development of Digital Capability Skills among staff (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
No, but working towards this	26	45%	5	42%	11	48%	10	43%
No	17	29%	5	42%	8	35%	4	17%
Yes	15	26%	2	17%	4	17%	9	39%

**Question 3.7 How do you measure the development of Digital Capability Skills? What systems do you use to do this and what data is collected (e.g. Jisc Digital Discovery Tool)?**

**Table A3.7a Measurement of the development of Digital Capability Skills, the systems used and the data collected. By institution type.**

Measurement of Digital Capability Skills (Base: All respondents indicating that they measure Digital Capability Skills for staff or students)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(17)		(12)		(5)		(0)	
Self-assessment tool	17	100%	12	100%	5	100%	0	-
[Jisc Discovery tool]	[14]	[82%]	[9]	[75%]	[5]	[100%]	0	-
[In house assessment tool]	[3]	[18%]	[3]	[25%]	[0]	[0%]	0	-
Programme assessment	1	6%	1	8%	0	0%	0	-
Jisc Digital Insights	1	6%	0	0%	1	20%	0	-
Linked In Learning data	1	6%	1	8%	0	0%	0	-

**Table A3.7b Measurement of the development of Digital Capability Skills, the systems used and the data collected. By country.**

Measurement of Digital Capability Skills <i>(Base: All respondents indicating that they measure Digital Capability Skills for staff or students)</i>	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(17)		(13)		(2)		(1)		(1)	
Self-assessment tool	17	100%	13	100%	2	100%	1	100%	1	100%
[Jisc Discovery tool]	[14]	[82%]	[10]	[77%]	[2]	[100%]	[1]	[100%]	[1]	[100%]
[In house assessment tool]	[3]	[18%]	[3]	[23%]	[0]	[0%]	[0]	[0%]	[0]	[0%]
Programme assessment	1	6%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Jisc Digital Insights	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Linked In Learning data	1	6%	0	8%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A3.7c Measurement of the development of Digital Capability Skills, the systems used and the data collected. By size.**

Measurement of Digital Capability Skills <i>(Base: All respondents indicating that they measure Digital Capability Skills for staff or students)</i>	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(17)		(3)		(5)		(9)	
Self-assessment tool	17	100%	3	[100%]	5	[100%]	9	[100%]
[Jisc Discovery tool]	[14]	[82%]	[3]	[100%]	[4]	[80%]	[7]	[78%]
[In house assessment tool]	[3]	[18%]	[0]	[0%]	[1]	[20%]	[2]	[22%]
Programme assessment	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%
Jisc Digital Insights	1	6%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%
Linked In Learning data	1	6%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%

### Question 3.8 And what use is made of the resultant data?

**Table A3.8a How the collected data is used. By institution type.**

Use made of data <i>(Base: All respondents indicating that they measure Digital Capability Skills for staff or students)</i>	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(16)		(11)		(5)		(0)	
To inform future training	10	63%	6	55%	4	80%	0	-
Reports to committees/schools/departments	4	25%	3	27%	1	20%	0	-
Creating targeted interventions based on groups	3	19%	3	27%	0	0%	0	-
None	2	13%	2	18%	0	0%	0	-
Strategic planning e.g. Student Experience or Digital transformations	1	6%	1	9%	0	0%	0	-
Badge	1	6%	1	9%	0	0%	0	-

**Table A3.8b How the collected data is used. By country.**

Use made of data <i>(Base: All respondents indicating that they measure Digital Capability Skills for staff or students)</i>	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(16)		(12)		(2)		(1)		(1)	
To inform future training	10	63%	7	58%	2	100%	1	100%	0	0%
Reports to committees/schools/departments	4	25%	2	17%	1	50%	0	0%	1	100%
Creating targeted interventions based on groups	3	19%	2	17%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%
None	2	13%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Strategic planning e.g. Student Experience or Digital transformations	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Badge	1	6%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A3.8c How the collected data is used. By size.**

Use made of data <i>(Base: All respondents indicating that they measure Digital Capability Skills for staff or students)</i>	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(16)		(3)		(5)		(8)	
To inform future training	10	63%	3	100%	3	60%	4	50%
Reports to committees/schools/departments	4	25%	1	33%	2	40%	1	13%
Creating targeted interventions based on groups	3	19%	1	33%	0	0%	2	25%
None	2	13%	0	0%	1	20%	1	13%
Strategic planning e.g. Student Experience or Digital transformations	1	6%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%
Badge	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	1	13%

### Q3.9 Approximately, what proportion of courses within your institution use each of the following TEL tools?

**Table A3.9aa Percentage using accessibility tools. By institution type.**

% Using accessibility tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	16	28%	7	23%	8	32%	1	33%
75% - 99%	17	29%	8	27%	9	36%	0	0%
50% - 74%	7	12%	4	13%	3	12%	0	0%
25% - 49%	2	3%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	3	5%	1	3%	2	8%	0	0%
0%	4	7%	3	10%	1	4%	0	0%
Don't Know	9	16%	5	17%	2	8%	2	67%

**Table A3.9ab Percentage using accessibility tools. By country.**

% Using accessibility tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	16	28%	13	27%	2	50%	1	33%	0	0%
75% - 99%	17	29%	14	29%	0	0%	2	67%	1	50%
50% - 74%	7	12%	7	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	2	3%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
1% - 24%	3	5%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
0%	4	7%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	9	16%	7	14%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A3.9ac Percentage using accessibility tools. By size.**

% using accessibility tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	16	28%	3	25%	7	30%	6	26%
75% - 99%	17	29%	3	25%	7	30%	7	30%
50% - 74%	7	12%	1	8%	4	17%	2	9%
25% - 49%	2	3%	1	8%	0	0%	1	4%
1% - 24%	3	5%	1	8%	1	4%	1	4%
0%	4	7%	0	0%	1	4%	3	13%
Don't Know	9	16%	3	25%	3	13%	3	13%



**Table A3.9ba Percentage using asynchronous tools. By institution type.**

% Using asynchronous tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	9	16%	7	23%	2	8%	0	0%
50% - 74%	16	28%	6	20%	10	40%	0	0%
25% - 49%	17	29%	9	30%	7	28%	1	33%
1% - 24%	9	16%	3	10%	4	16%	2	67%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	7	12%	5	17%	2	8%	0	0%

**Table A3.9bb Percentage using asynchronous tools. By country.**

% Using asynchronous tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	9	16%	9	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	16	28%	14	29%	0	0%	1	33%	1	50%
25% - 49%	17	29%	14	29%	1	25%	1	33%	1	50%
1% - 24%	9	16%	8	16%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	7	12%	4	8%	2	50%	1	33%	0	0%

**Table A3.9bc Percentage using asynchronous tools. By size.**

% Using asynchronous tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	9	16%	1	8%	4	17%	4	17%
50% - 74%	16	28%	3	25%	7	30%	6	26%
25% - 49%	17	29%	5	42%	7	30%	5	22%
1% - 24%	9	16%	3	25%	3	13%	3	13%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	7	12%	0	0%	2	9%	5	22%

Table A3.9ca Percentage using blog tools. By institution type.

% Using blog tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	2	3%	0	0%	2	8%	0	0%
25% - 49%	9	16%	3	10%	5	20%	1	33%
1% - 24%	34	59%	20	67%	14	56%	0	0%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	13	22%	7	23%	4	16%	2	67%

Table A3.9cb Percentage using blog tools. By country.

% Using blog tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	2	3%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	9	16%	9	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	34	59%	29	59%	2	50%	1	33%	2	100%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	13	22%	9	18%	2	50%	2	67%	0	0%

Table A3.9cc Percentage using blog tools. By size.

% Using blog tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	2	3%	1	8%	1	4%	0	0%
25% - 49%	9	16%	2	17%	4	17%	3	13%
1% - 24%	34	59%	6	50%	14	61%	14	61%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	13	22%	3	25%	4	17%	6	26%

**Table A3.9da Percentage using Collaborative tools. By institution type.**

% Using Collaborative tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	2	3%	0	0%	2	8%	0	0%
75% - 99%	8	14%	6	20%	2	8%	0	0%
50% - 74%	10	17%	4	13%	5	20%	1	33%
25% - 49%	13	22%	5	17%	6	24%	2	67%
1% - 24%	14	24%	6	20%	8	32%	0	0%
0%	1	2%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	10	17%	8	27%	2	8%	0	0%

**Table A3.9db Percentage using Collaborative tools. By country.**

% Using Collaborative tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	2	3%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	8	14%	7	14%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	10	17%	9	18%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
25% - 49%	13	22%	12	24%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	14	24%	12	24%	0	0%	1	33%	1	50%
0%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	10	17%	6	12%	2	50%	2	67%	0	0%

**Table A3.9dc Percentage using Collaborative tools. By size.**

% Using Collaborative tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	2	3%	0	0%	2	9%	0	0%
75% - 99%	8	14%	3	25%	3	13%	2	9%
50% - 74%	10	17%	3	25%	4	17%	3	13%
25% - 49%	13	22%	4	33%	5	22%	4	17%
1% - 24%	14	24%	2	17%	5	22%	7	30%
0%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%
Don't Know	10	17%	0	0%	4	17%	6	26%



**Table A3.9ea Percentage using content management system tools. By institution type.**

% Using content management system tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	31	53%	18	60%	10	40%	3	100%
75% - 99%	12	21%	4	13%	8	32%	0	0%
50% - 74%	1	2%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	6	10%	4	13%	2	8%	0	0%
1% - 24%	6	10%	2	7%	4	16%	0	0%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	2	3%	1	3%	1	4%	0	0%

**Table A3.9eb Percentage using content management system tools. By country.**

% Using content management system tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	31	53%	27	55%	2	50%	2	67%	0	0%
75% - 99%	12	21%	9	18%	2	50%	1	33%	0	0%
50% - 74%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	6	10%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%
1% - 24%	6	10%	6	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	2	3%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A3.9ec Percentage using content management system tools. By size.**

% Using content management system tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	31	53%	8	67%	12	52%	11	48%
75% - 99%	12	21%	2	17%	6	26%	4	17%
50% - 74%	1	2%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
25% - 49%	6	10%	1	8%	2	9%	3	13%
1% - 24%	6	10%	1	8%	2	9%	3	13%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	2	9%

Table A3.9fa Percentage using digital/learning repository tools. By institution type.

% Using digital/learning repository tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	24	41%	13	43%	8	32%	3	100%
75% - 99%	11	19%	7	23%	4	16%	0	0%
50% - 74%	2	3%	1	3%	1	4%	0	0%
25% - 49%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	6	10%	2	7%	4	16%	0	0%
0%	5	9%	2	7%	3	12%	0	0%
Don't Know	10	17%	5	17%	5	20%	0	0%

Table A3.9fb Percentage using digital/learning repository tools. By country.

% Using digital/learning repository tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	24	41%	20	41%	3	75%	1	33%	0	0%
75% - 99%	11	19%	9	18%	0	0%	1	33%	1	50%
50% - 74%	2	3%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	6	10%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
0%	5	9%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	10	17%	8	16%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%

Table A3.9fc Percentage using digital/learning repository tools. By size.

% Using digital/learning repository tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	24	41%	8	67%	8	35%	8	35%
75% - 99%	11	19%	2	17%	6	26%	3	13%
50% - 74%	2	3%	0	0%	2	9%	0	0%
25% - 49%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	6	10%	1	8%	2	9%	3	13%
0%	5	9%	0	0%	2	9%	3	13%
Don't Know	10	17%	1	8%	3	13%	6	26%

**Table A3.9ga Percentage using Digital Skills tools. By institution type.**

% Using Digital Skills tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	4	7%	0	0%	3	12%	1	33%
25% - 49%	9	16%	4	13%	5	20%	0	0%
1% - 24%	26	45%	16	53%	10	40%	0	0%
0%	5	9%	3	10%	2	8%	0	0%
Don't Know	14	24%	7	23%	5	20%	2	67%

**Table A3.9gb Percentage using Digital Skills tools. By country.**

% Using Digital Skills tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	4	7%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	9	16%	7	14%	1	25%	0	0%	1	50%
1% - 24%	26	45%	23	47%	1	25%	1	33%	1	50%
0%	5	9%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	14	24%	10	20%	2	50%	2	67%	0	0%

**Table A3.9gc Percentage using Digital Skills tools. By size.**

% Using Digital Skills tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	4	7%	2	17%	2	9%	0	0%
25% - 49%	9	16%	2	17%	3	13%	4	17%
1% - 24%	26	45%	3	25%	12	52%	11	48%
0%	5	9%	1	8%	1	4%	3	13%
Don't Know	14	24%	4	33%	5	22%	5	22%

Table A3.9ha Percentage using document sharing tools. By institution type.

% Using document sharing tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	8	14%	5	17%	2	8%	1	33%
75% - 99%	10	17%	4	13%	5	20%	1	33%
50% - 74%	11	19%	6	20%	5	20%	0	0%
25% - 49%	7	12%	3	10%	4	16%	0	0%
1% - 24%	9	16%	5	17%	4	16%	0	0%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	13	22%	7	23%	5	20%	1	33%

Table A3.9hb Percentage using document sharing tools. By country.

% Using document sharing tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	8	14%	8	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	10	17%	10	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	11	19%	7	14%	1	25%	1	33%	2	100%
25% - 49%	7	12%	7	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	9	16%	7	14%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	13	22%	10	20%	1	25%	2	67%	0	0%

Table A3.9hc Percentage using document sharing tools. By size.

% Using document sharing tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	8	14%	4	33%	2	9%	2	9%
75% - 99%	10	17%	2	17%	4	17%	4	17%
50% - 74%	11	19%	1	8%	4	17%	6	26%
25% - 49%	7	12%	1	8%	6	26%	0	0%
1% - 24%	9	16%	2	17%	3	13%	4	17%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	13	22%	2	17%	4	17%	7	30%

**Table A3.9ia Percentage using e-Portfolio tools. By institution type.**

% Using e-Portfolio tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	3	5%	1	3%	1	4%	1	33%
50% - 74%	5	9%	1	3%	3	12%	1	33%
25% - 49%	11	19%	4	13%	7	28%	0	0%
1% - 24%	32	55%	20	67%	12	48%	0	0%
0%	5	9%	3	10%	1	4%	1	33%
Don't Know	2	3%	1	3%	1	4%	0	0%

**Table A3.9ib Percentage using e-Portfolio tools. By country.**

% Using e-Portfolio tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	3	5%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	5	9%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	11	19%	11	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	32	55%	25	51%	3	75%	3	100%	1	50%
0%	5	9%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
Don't Know	2	3%	1	2%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A3.9ic Percentage using e-Portfolio tools. By size.**

% Using e-Portfolio tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	3	5%	2	17%	0	0%	1	4%
50% - 74%	5	9%	1	8%	3	13%	1	4%
25% - 49%	11	19%	2	17%	7	30%	2	9%
1% - 24%	32	55%	6	50%	10	43%	16	70%
0%	5	9%	1	8%	3	13%	1	4%
Don't know	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	2	9%

**Table A3.9ja Percentage using Electronic Management of Assignments tools. By institution type.**

% Using Electronic Management of Assignments tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	19	33%	8	27%	10	40%	1	33%
75% - 99%	23	40%	15	50%	8	32%	0	0%
50% - 74%	2	3%	1	3%	1	4%	0	0%
25% - 49%	1	2%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
1% - 24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
0%	7	12%	4	13%	2	8%	1	33%
Don't Know	6	10%	2	7%	3	12%	1	33%

**Table A3.9jb Percentage using Electronic Management of Assignments tools. By country.**

% Using Electronic Management of Assignments tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	19	33%	16	33%	0	0%	2	67%	1	50%
75% - 99%	23	40%	18	37%	4	100%	1	33%	0	0%
50% - 74%	2	3%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
0%	7	12%	6	12%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
Don't Know	6	10%	6	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A3.9jc Percentage using Electronic Management of Assignments tools. By size.**

% Using Electronic Management of Assignments tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	19	33%	4	33%	9	39%	6	26%
75% - 99%	23	40%	3	25%	7	30%	13	57%
50% - 74%	2	3%	0	0%	1	4%	1	4%
25% - 49%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%
1% - 24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
0%	7	12%	3	25%	3	13%	1	4%
Don't Know	6	10%	2	17%	3	13%	1	4%

Table A3.9ka Percentage using Formative eAssessment tools. By institution type.

% Using Formative eAssessment tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	3	5%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%
75% - 99%	14	24%	9	30%	4	16%	1	33%
50% - 74%	19	33%	10	33%	9	36%	0	0%
25% - 49%	9	16%	3	10%	5	20%	1	33%
1% - 24%	7	12%	4	13%	2	8%	1	33%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	6	10%	2	7%	4	16%	0	0%

Table A3.9kb Percentage using Formative eAssessment tools. By country.

% Using Formative eAssessment tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	3	5%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	14	24%	12	24%	1	25%	0	0%	1	50%
50% - 74%	19	33%	14	29%	2	50%	2	67%	1	50%
25% - 49%	9	16%	9	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	7	12%	7	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	6	10%	4	8%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%

Table A3.9kc Percentage using Formative eAssessment tools. By size.

% Using Formative eAssessment tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	3	5%	1	8%	2	9%	0	0%
75% - 99%	14	24%	3	25%	5	22%	6	26%
50% - 74%	19	33%	3	25%	10	43%	6	26%
25% - 49%	9	16%	3	25%	2	9%	4	17%
1% - 24%	7	12%	2	17%	2	9%	3	13%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	6	10%	0	0%	2	9%	4	17%

**Table A3.9Ia Percentage using Summative eAssessment tools. By institution type.**

% Using Summative eAssessment tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	3	5%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	15	26%	9	30%	5	20%	1	33%
50% - 74%	17	29%	7	23%	10	40%	0	0%
25% - 49%	7	12%	4	13%	2	8%	1	33%
1% - 24%	12	21%	5	17%	6	24%	1	33%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	4	7%	2	7%	2	8%	0	0%

**Table A3.9Ib Percentage using Summative eAssessment tools. By country.**

% Using Summative eAssessment tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	3	5%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	15	26%	11	22%	2	50%	1	33%	1	50%
50% - 74%	17	29%	14	29%	0	0%	2	67%	1	50%
25% - 49%	7	12%	7	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	12	21%	11	22%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	4	7%	3	6%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A3.9Ic Percentage using Summative eAssessment tools. By size.**

% Using Summative eAssessment tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	3	5%	1	8%	2	9%	0	0%
75% - 99%	15	26%	4	33%	5	22%	6	26%
50% - 74%	17	29%	2	17%	9	39%	6	26%
25% - 49%	7	12%	1	8%	1	4%	5	22%
1% - 24%	12	21%	4	33%	5	22%	3	13%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	4	7%	0	0%	1	4%	3	13%



**Table A3.9ma Percentage using digital exams tools. By institution type.**

% Using digital exams tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	3	5%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	3	5%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	7	12%	7	23%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	11	19%	5	17%	6	24%	0	0%
0%	26	45%	11	37%	13	52%	2	67%
Don't Know	8	14%	1	3%	6	24%	1	33%

**Table A3.9mb Percentage using digital exams tools. By country.**

% Using digital exams tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	3	5%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	3	5%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	7	12%	6	12%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%
1% - 24%	11	19%	8	16%	2	50%	0	0%	1	50%
0%	26	45%	22	45%	2	50%	1	33%	1	50%
Don't Know	8	14%	7	14%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%

**Table A3.9mc Percentage using digital exams tools. By size.**

% Using digital exams tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3	13%
50% - 74%	3	5%	1	8%	1	4%	1	4%
25% - 49%	7	12%	0	0%	3	13%	4	17%
1% - 24%	11	19%	1	8%	4	17%	6	26%
0%	26	45%	8	67%	12	52%	6	26%
Don't Know	8	14%	2	17%	3	13%	3	13%

**Table A3.9na Percentage using proctoring software tools. By institution type.**

% Using proctoring software tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	1	2%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	9	16%	5	17%	4	16%	0	0%
0%	39	67%	21	70%	15	60%	3	100%
Don't Know	9	16%	3	10%	6	24%	0	0%

**Table A3.9nb Percentage using proctoring software tools. By country.**

% Using proctoring software tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	9	16%	8	16%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
0%	39	67%	33	67%	2	50%	2	67%	2	100%
Don't Know	9	16%	7	14%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%

**Table A3.9nc Percentage using proctoring software tools. By size.**

% Using proctoring software tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	1	2%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	9	16%	0	0%	3	13%	6	26%
0%	39	67%	10	83%	17	74%	12	52%
Don't Know	9	16%	1	8%	3	13%	5	22%

Table A3.9oa Percentage using Learning analytics tools. By institution type.

% Using Learning analytics tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	8	14%	4	13%	4	16%	0	0%
75% - 99%	5	9%	2	7%	3	12%	0	0%
50% - 74%	4	7%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	4	7%	2	7%	2	8%	0	0%
1% - 24%	13	22%	8	27%	5	20%	0	0%
0%	13	22%	5	17%	6	24%	2	67%
Don't Know	11	19%	5	17%	5	20%	1	33%

Table A3.9ob Percentage using Learning analytics tools. By country.

% Using Learning analytics tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	8	14%	7	14%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%
75% - 99%	5	9%	4	8%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%
50% - 74%	4	7%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	4	7%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
1% - 24%	13	22%	12	24%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
0%	13	22%	11	22%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%
Don't Know	11	19%	8	16%	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%

Table A3.9oc Percentage using Learning analytics tools. By size.

% Using Learning analytics tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	8	14%	2	17%	1	4%	5	22%
75% - 99%	5	9%	0	0%	2	9%	3	13%
50% - 74%	4	7%	0	0%	2	9%	2	9%
25% - 49%	4	7%	0	0%	3	13%	1	4%
1% - 24%	13	22%	4	33%	3	13%	6	26%
0%	13	22%	3	25%	9	39%	1	4%
Don't Know	11	19%	3	25%	3	13%	5	22%

**Table A3.9pa Percentage using Lecture capture tools. By institution type.**

% Using Lecture capture tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	10	17%	5	17%	4	16%	1	33%
75% - 99%	24	41%	16	53%	7	28%	1	33%
50% - 74%	10	17%	6	20%	4	16%	0	0%
25% - 49%	8	14%	1	3%	6	24%	1	33%
1% - 24%	5	9%	2	7%	3	12%	0	0%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	1	2%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%

**Table A3.9pb Percentage using Lecture capture tools. By country.**

% Using Lecture capture tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	10	17%	9	18%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	24	41%	20	41%	1	25%	2	67%	1	50%
50% - 74%	10	17%	8	16%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	8	14%	8	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	5	9%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%

**Table A3.9pc Percentage using Lecture capture tools. By size.**

% Using Lecture capture tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	10	17%	4	33%	3	13%	3	13%
75% - 99%	24	41%	3	25%	10	43%	11	48%
50% - 74%	10	17%	3	25%	5	22%	2	9%
25% - 49%	8	14%	2	17%	3	13%	3	13%
1% - 24%	5	9%	0	0%	2	9%	3	13%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%

**Table A3.9qa Percentage using Media streaming tools. By institution type.**

% Using Media streaming tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	7	12%	3	10%	3	12%	1	33%
75% - 99%	17	29%	8	27%	8	32%	1	33%
50% - 74%	13	22%	8	27%	5	20%	0	0%
25% - 49%	9	16%	3	10%	5	20%	1	33%
1% - 24%	5	9%	5	17%	0	0%	0	0%
0%	3	5%	1	3%	2	8%	0	0%
Don't Know	4	7%	2	7%	2	8%	0	0%

**Table A3.9qb Percentage using Media streaming tools. By country.**

% Using Media streaming tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	7	12%	6	12%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	17	29%	14	29%	0	0%	2	67%	1	50%
50% - 74%	13	22%	12	24%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	9	16%	8	16%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	5	9%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
0%	3	5%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	4	7%	2	4%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%

**Table A3.9qc Percentage using Media streaming tools. By size.**

% Using Media streaming tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	7	12%	3	25%	3	13%	1	4%
75% - 99%	17	29%	3	25%	7	30%	7	30%
50% - 74%	13	22%	2	17%	7	30%	4	17%
25% - 49%	9	16%	3	25%	2	9%	4	17%
1% - 24%	5	9%	0	0%	2	9%	3	13%
0%	3	5%	1	8%	1	4%	1	4%
Don't Know	4	7%	0	0%	1	4%	3	13%

Table A3.9ra Percentage using Mobile apps. By institution type.

% Using Mobile apps (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	16	28%	7	23%	9	36%	0	0%
75% - 99%	11	19%	5	17%	6	24%	0	0%
50% - 74%	5	9%	3	10%	2	8%	0	0%
25% - 49%	4	7%	3	10%	1	4%	0	0%
1% - 24%	7	12%	6	20%	1	4%	0	0%
0%	7	12%	2	7%	2	8%	3	100%
Don't Know	8	14%	4	13%	4	16%	0	0%

Table A3.9rb Percentage using Mobile apps. By country.

% Using Mobile apps (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	16	28%	12	24%	2	50%	1	33%	1	50%
75% - 99%	11	19%	11	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	5	9%	3	6%	0	0%	1	33%	1	50%
25% - 49%	4	7%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	7	12%	7	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
0%	7	12%	6	12%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	8	14%	6	12%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%

Table A3.9rc Percentage using Mobile apps. By size.

% Using Mobile apps (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	16	28%	3	25%	5	22%	8	35%
75% - 99%	11	19%	1	8%	7	30%	3	13%
50% - 74%	5	9%	1	8%	2	9%	2	9%
25% - 49%	4	7%	0	0%	0	0%	4	17%
1% - 24%	7	12%	2	17%	3	13%	2	9%
0%	7	12%	4	33%	2	9%	1	4%
Don't Know	8	14%	1	8%	4	17%	3	13%

**Table A3.9sa Percentage using Personal response systems. By institution type.**

% Using Personal response systems (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	3	5%	1	3%	2	8%	0	0%
75% - 99%	2	3%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	9	16%	6	20%	3	12%	0	0%
25% - 49%	19	33%	9	30%	9	36%	1	33%
1% - 24%	18	31%	8	27%	9	36%	1	33%
0%	2	3%	1	3%	0	0%	1	33%
Don't Know	5	9%	3	10%	2	8%	0	0%

**Table A3.9sb Percentage using Personal response systems. By country.**

% Using Personal response systems (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	3	5%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
75% - 99%	2	3%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	9	16%	7	14%	0	0%	1	33%	1	50%
25% - 49%	19	33%	18	37%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	18	31%	15	31%	2	50%	1	33%	0	0%
0%	2	3%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	5	9%	3	6%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%

**Table A3.9sc Percentage using Personal response systems. By size.**

% Using Personal response systems (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	3	5%	1	8%	1	4%	1	4%
75% - 99%	2	3%	0	0%	2	9%	0	0%
50% - 74%	9	16%	0	0%	4	17%	5	22%
25% - 49%	19	33%	3	25%	9	39%	7	30%
1% - 24%	18	31%	6	50%	6	26%	6	26%
0%	2	3%	1	8%	0	0%	1	4%
Don't Know	5	9%	1	8%	1	4%	3	13%

Table A3.9ta Percentage using Text matching tools. By institution type.

% Using Text matching tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	15	26%	8	27%	6	24%	1	33%
75% - 99%	32	55%	14	47%	18	72%	0	0%
50% - 74%	7	12%	6	20%	1	4%	0	0%
25% - 49%	1	2%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	2	3%	1	3%	0	0%	1	33%
0%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%
Don't Know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Table A3.9tb Percentage using Text matching tools. By country.

% Using Text matching tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	15	26%	13	27%	0	0%	1	33%	1	50%
75% - 99%	32	55%	26	53%	4	100%	1	33%	1	50%
50% - 74%	7	12%	6	12%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%
25% - 49%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	2	3%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
0%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Table A3.9tc Percentage using Text matching tools. By size.

% Using Text matching tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	15	26%	4	33%	5	22%	6	26%
75% - 99%	32	55%	5	42%	15	65%	12	52%
50% - 74%	7	12%	0	0%	3	13%	4	17%
25% - 49%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%
1% - 24%	2	3%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%
0%	1	2%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%



**Table A3.9ua Percentage using Podcasting tools. By institution type.**

% Using Podcasting tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	2	3%	1	3%	1	4%	0	0%
75% - 99%	1	2%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	2	3%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	5	9%	1	3%	3	12%	1	33%
1% - 24%	31	53%	16	53%	15	60%	0	0%
0%	6	10%	3	10%	1	4%	2	67%
Don't Know	11	19%	6	20%	5	20%	0	0%

**Table A3.9ub Percentage using Podcasting tools. By country.**

% Using Podcasting tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	2	3%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	2	3%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	5	9%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	31	53%	25	51%	2	50%	2	67%	2	100%
0%	6	10%	6	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	11	19%	8	16%	2	50%	1	33%	0	0%

**Table A3.9uc Percentage using Podcasting tools. By size.**

% Using Podcasting tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	2	3%	1	8%	1	4%	0	0%
75% - 99%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%
50% - 74%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	2	9%
25% - 49%	5	9%	1	8%	3	13%	1	4%
1% - 24%	31	53%	7	58%	15	65%	9	39%
0%	6	10%	3	25%	0	0%	3	13%
Don't Know	11	19%	0	0%	4	17%	7	30%

**Table A3.9va Percentage using reading list management software. By institution type.**

% Using reading list management software (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	12	21%	5	17%	6	24%	1	33%
75% - 99%	31	53%	15	50%	15	60%	1	33%
50% - 74%	3	5%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%
25% - 49%	4	7%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	1	2%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%
0%	6	10%	2	7%	3	12%	1	33%
Don't Know	1	2%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A3.9vb Percentage using reading list management software. By country.**

% Using reading list management software (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	12	21%	10	20%	1	25%	0	0%	1	50%
75% - 99%	31	53%	26	53%	2	50%	3	100%	0	0%
50% - 74%	3	5%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	4	7%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
1% - 24%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
0%	6	10%	5	10%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A3.9vc Percentage using reading list management software. By size.**

% Using reading list management software (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	12	21%	4	33%	5	22%	3	13%
75% - 99%	31	53%	3	25%	13	57%	15	65%
50% - 74%	3	5%	1	8%	2	9%	0	0%
25% - 49%	4	7%	0	0%	1	4%	3	13%
1% - 24%	1	2%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
0%	6	10%	4	33%	1	4%	1	4%
Don't Know	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%

Table A3.9wa Percentage using Screencasting tools. By institution type.

% Using Screencasting tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	3	5%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%
75% - 99%	8	14%	4	13%	4	16%	0	0%
50% - 74%	6	10%	4	13%	2	8%	0	0%
25% - 49%	6	10%	2	7%	3	12%	1	33%
1% - 24%	23	40%	10	33%	11	44%	2	67%
0%	3	5%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	9	16%	5	17%	4	16%	0	0%

Table A3.9wb Percentage using Screencasting tools. By country.

% Using Screencasting tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	3	5%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	8	14%	6	12%	0	0%	1	33%	1	50%
50% - 74%	6	10%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
25% - 49%	6	10%	6	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	23	40%	20	41%	2	50%	1	33%	0	0%
0%	3	5%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	9	16%	6	12%	2	50%	1	33%	0	0%

Table A3.9wc Percentage using Screencasting tools. By size.

% Using Screencasting tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	3	5%	1	8%	2	9%	0	0%
75% - 99%	8	14%	0	0%	4	17%	4	17%
50% - 74%	6	10%	1	8%	4	17%	1	4%
25% - 49%	6	10%	1	8%	3	13%	2	9%
1% - 24%	23	40%	8	67%	7	30%	8	35%
0%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3	13%
Don't Know	9	16%	1	8%	3	13%	5	22%

Table A3.9xa Percentage using social networking tools. By institution type.

% Using social networking tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	2	3%	1	3%	1	4%	0	0%
25% - 49%	2	3%	0	0%	1	4%	1	33%
1% - 24%	20	34%	11	37%	9	36%	0	0%
0%	4	7%	2	7%	1	4%	1	33%
Don't Know	30	52%	16	53%	13	52%	1	33%

Table A3.9xb Percentage using social networking tools. By country.

% Using social networking tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	2	3%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
25% - 49%	2	3%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	20	34%	18	37%	1	25%	0	0%	1	50%
0%	4	7%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	30	52%	24	49%	3	75%	3	100%	0	0%

Table A3.9xc Percentage using social networking tools. By size.

% Using social networking tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	2	3%	1	8%	0	0%	1	4%
25% - 49%	2	3%	1	8%	1	4%	0	0%
1% - 24%	20	34%	3	25%	9	39%	8	35%
0%	4	7%	3	25%	0	0%	1	4%
Don't Know	30	52%	4	33%	13	57%	13	57%

**Table A3.9ya Percentage using VLE tools. By institution type.**

% Using VLE tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	46	79%	22	73%	22	88%	2	67%
75% - 99%	11	19%	8	27%	3	12%	0	0%
50% - 74%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%
1% - 24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A3.9yb Percentage using VLE tools. By country.**

% Using VLE tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	46	79%	39	80%	3	75%	3	100%	1	50%
75% - 99%	11	19%	9	18%	1	25%	0	0%	1	50%
50% - 74%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A3.9yc Percentage using VLE tools. By size.**

% Using VLE tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	46	79%	9	75%	19	83%	18	78%
75% - 99%	11	19%	2	17%	4	17%	5	22%
50% - 74%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	1	2%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Table A3.9za Percentage using Webinar/virtual classroom tools. By institution type.

% Using Webinar/virtual classroom tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	4	7%	2	7%	2	8%	0	0%
75% - 99%	12	21%	5	17%	6	24%	1	33%
50% - 74%	14	24%	7	23%	7	28%	0	0%
25% - 49%	10	17%	4	13%	5	20%	1	33%
1% - 24%	15	26%	10	33%	4	16%	1	33%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	3	5%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%

Table A3.9zb Percentage using Webinar/virtual classroom tools. By country.

% Using Webinar/virtual classroom tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	4	7%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
75% - 99%	12	21%	12	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	14	24%	12	24%	1	25%	0	0%	1	50%
25% - 49%	10	17%	10	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	15	26%	11	22%	2	50%	2	67%	0	0%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	3	5%	1	2%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%

Table A3.9zc Percentage using Webinar/virtual classroom tools. By size.

% Using Webinar/virtual classroom tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	4	7%	1	8%	1	4%	2	9%
75% - 99%	12	21%	2	17%	6	26%	4	17%
50% - 74%	14	24%	2	17%	5	22%	7	30%
25% - 49%	10	17%	2	17%	4	17%	4	17%
1% - 24%	15	26%	5	42%	6	26%	4	17%
0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	3	5%	0	0%	1	4%	2	9%

Table A3.9aaa Percentage using Wiki tools. By institution type.

% Using Wiki tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	2	3%	1	3%	1	4%	0	0%
75% - 99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	8	14%	4	13%	4	16%	0	0%
1% - 24%	32	55%	19	63%	11	44%	2	67%
0%	7	12%	3	10%	4	16%	0	0%
Don't Know	9	16%	3	10%	5	20%	1	33%

Table A3.9aab Percentage using Wiki tools. By country.

% Using Wiki tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	2	3%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
75% - 99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	8	14%	8	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	32	55%	27	55%	2	50%	2	67%	1	50%
0%	7	12%	7	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	9	16%	6	12%	2	50%	1	33%	0	0%

Table A3.9aac Percentage using Wiki tools. By size.

% Using Wiki tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	2	9%
75% - 99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	8	14%	1	8%	2	9%	5	22%
1% - 24%	32	55%	7	58%	14	61%	11	48%
0%	7	12%	2	17%	3	13%	2	9%
Don't know	9	16%	2	17%	4	17%	3	13%

**Table A3.9aba Percentage using generative AI tools. By institution type.**

% Using generative AI tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	1	2%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	1	2%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
25% - 49%	3	5%	0	0%	1	4%	2	67%
1% - 24%	24	41%	14	47%	10	40%	0	0%
0%	5	9%	2	7%	3	12%	0	0%
Don't Know	24	41%	13	43%	10	40%	1	33%

**Table A3.9abb Percentage using generative AI tools. By country.**

% Using generative AI tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	3	5%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	24	41%	20	41%	1	25%	1	33%	2	100%
0%	5	9%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Don't Know	24	41%	19	39%	3	75%	2	67%	0	0%

**Table A3.9abc Percentage using generative AI tools. By size.**

% Using generative AI tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%
50% - 74%	1	2%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
25% - 49%	3	5%	2	17%	1	4%	0	0%
1% - 24%	24	41%	4	33%	9	39%	11	48%
0%	5	9%	1	8%	3	13%	1	4%
Don't Know	24	41%	5	42%	9	39%	10	43%



**Table A3.9aca Percentage using AI for academic skills/writing tools. By institution type.**

% Using AI for academic skills/writing tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	1	2%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
50% - 74%	1	2%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
25% - 49%	2	3%	0	0%	2	8%	0	0%
1% - 24%	19	33%	10	33%	7	28%	2	67%
0%	12	21%	6	20%	6	24%	0	0%
Don't Know	23	40%	14	47%	8	32%	1	33%

**Table A3.9acb Percentage using AI for academic skills/writing tools. By country.**

% Using AI for academic skills/writing tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	2	3%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	19	33%	17	35%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%
0%	12	21%	10	20%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%
Don't Know	23	40%	18	37%	3	75%	2	67%	0	0%

**Table A3.9acc Percentage using AI for academic skills/writing tools. By size.**

% Using AI for academic skills/writing tools (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	1	2%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	1	2%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
25% - 49%	2	%	0	0%	1	4%	1	4%
1% - 24%	19	33%	4	33%	8	35%	7	30%
0%	12	21%	2	17%	6	26%	4	17%
Don't Know	23	40%	5	42%	7	30%	11	48%

Table A3.9ada Percentage using Intelligent agents. By institution type.

% Using Intelligent agents (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	1	2%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	7	12%	3	10%	3	12%	1	33%
0%	22	38%	11	37%	10	40%	1	33%
Don't Know	28	48%	15	50%	12	48%	1	33%

Table A3.9adb Percentage using Intelligent agents. By country.

% Using Intelligent agents (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1% - 24%	7	12%	6	12%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
0%	22	38%	19	39%	1	25%	1	33%	1	50%
Don't Know	28	48%	23	47%	3	75%	2	67%	0	0%

Table A3.9adc Percentage using Intelligent agents. By size.

% Using Intelligent agents (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
75% - 99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50% - 74%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25% - 49%	1	2%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
1% - 24%	7	12%	3	25%	1	4%	3	13%
0%	22	38%	4	33%	11	48%	7	30%
Don't Know	28	48%	5	42%	10	43%	13	57%

**Question 3.10 Has the institution evaluated the impact of digital education on the student learning experience across the institution as a whole over the past two years?**

**Table A3.10a** Evaluation of the impact of digital education on the student learning experience over the past two years. By institution type.

Whether evaluated the impact of digital education on the student learning experience (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes	30	52%	57%	1	52%	1	0%	3
No institutional evaluation, but individual departments/schools have evaluated	12	21%	17%	3	24%	=2	33%	2
No evaluation	16	28%	27%	2	24%	=2	67%	1

**Table A3.10b** Evaluation of the impact of digital education on the student learning experience over the past two years. By country.

Whether evaluated the impact of digital education on the student learning experience (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	30	52%	47%	1	100%	1	100%	1	0%	3
No institutional evaluation, but individual departments/schools have evaluated	12	21%	22%	3	0%	=2	0%	=2	50%	=1
No evaluation	16	28%	31%	2	0%	=2	0%	=2	50%	=1

**Table A3.10c** Evaluation of the impact of digital education on the student learning experience over the past two years. By size.

Whether evaluated the impact of digital education on the student learning experience (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes	30	52%	67%	1	48%	1	48%	1
No institutional evaluation, but individual departments/schools have evaluated	12	21%	8%	3	13%	3	35%	2
No evaluation	16	28%	25%	2	39%	2	17%	3

**Question 3.11 What aspects of the impact of digital education on the student learning experience have been evaluated over the past two years?**

**Table A3.11a Aspects of the impact of digital education that have been evaluated over the past two years. By institution type**

Aspects of student learning experience (All respondents that have evaluated impact)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(30)		(17)		(13)		(0)	
Accessibility of learning and teaching resources	19	63%	59%	1	69%	1	0%	-
General review of digital education services	16	53%	53%	2	54%	=2	0%	-
Effectiveness of blended/online learning	12	40%	41%	3	38%	=5	0%	-
Use of generative Artificial Intelligence	12	40%	29%	=6	54%	=2	0%	-
Use of learning analytics in supporting students	11	37%	24%	=8	54%	=2	0%	-
Take up/usage/adoption by students of lecture capture	9	30%	35%	=4	23%	8	0%	-
Student digital fluency/capability	9	30%	24%	=8	38%	=5	0%	-
eAssessment	8	27%	35%	=4	15%	9	0%	-
Electronic Management of Assignments (EMA)	6	20%	12%	10	31%	7	0%	-
Other aspects	6	20%	29%	=6	8%	10	0%	-

**Table A3.11b Aspects of the impact of digital education that have been evaluated over the past two years. By country.**

Aspects of student learning experience (All respondents that have evaluated impact)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(30)		(23)		(4)		(3)		(0)	
Accessibility of learning and teaching resources	19	63%	65%	1	75%	1	33%	=5	0%	-
General review of digital education services	16	53%	52%	2	50%	=2	67%	=1	0%	-
Effectiveness of blended/online learning	12	40%	35%	=5	50%	=2	67%	=1	0%	-
Use of generative Artificial Intelligence	12	40%	39%	=3	25%	=7	67%	=1	0%	-
Use of learning analytics in supporting students	11	37%	30%	=7	50%	=2	67%	=1	0%	-
Take up/usage/adoption by students of lecture capture	9	30%	39%	=3	0%	=9	0%	=8	0%	-
Student digital fluency/capability	9	30%	30%	=7	50%	=2	0%	=8	0%	-
eAssessment	8	27%	35%	=5	0%	=9	0%	=8	0%	-
Electronic Management of Assignments (EMA)	6	20%	13%	10	50%	=2	33%	=5	0%	-
Other aspects	6	20%	17%	9	25%	=7	33%	=5	0%	-



**Table A3.11c Aspects of the impact of digital education that have been evaluated over the past two years. By size.**

Aspects of student learning experience <i>(All respondents that have evaluated impact)</i>	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
	(30)		(8)		(11)		(11)	
Accessibility of learning and teaching resources	19	63%	75%	1	55%	=1	64%	=1
General review of digital education services	16	53%	63%	2	36%	=3	64%	=1
Effectiveness of blended/online learning	12	40%	50%	=3	27%	=6	45%	3
Use of generative Artificial Intelligence	12	40%	25%	=6	55%	=1	36%	=4
Use of learning analytics in supporting students	11	37%	50%	=3	27%	=6	36%	=4
Take up/usage/adoption by students of lecture capture	9	30%	25%	=6	36%	=3	27%	=7
Student digital fluency/capability	9	30%	25%	=6	36%	=3	27%	=7
eAssessment	8	27%	25%	=6	18%	9	36%	=4
Electronic Management of Assignments (EMA)	6	20%	38%	5	9%	10	18%	=9
Other aspects	6	20%	13%	10	27%	=6	18%	=9

## Section 4: Enabling Digital Capable Students and Staff

### Question 4.1 How does your institution identify digital capability training and development needs of students or staff?

**Table A4.1a** How many institutions identify digital capability training and development needs of students. By institution type.

How institutions identify digital capability training needs: students (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(52)		(26)		(24)		(2)	
Through discussions in tutorials/line manager meetings	25	48%	14	54%	10	42%	1	50%
Anytime self-assessment of digital capabilities (e.g. via Jisc Digital Capability Discovery Tool)	22	42%	10	38%	12	50%	0	0%
Via analysis of helpdesk support requests	22	42%	10	38%	11	46%	1	50%
As part of implementing new system/service or process/policy	21	40%	9	35%	11	46%	1	50%
Via survey to all staff/students (e.g. Jisc Digital Experience Insights)	19	37%	9	35%	10	42%	0	0%
Other method	8	15%	5	19%	3	13%	0	0%
Do not identify training and development needs	7	13%	3	12%	3	13%	1	50%
Formal assessment of digital capabilities upon entry/induction	5	10%	2	8%	3	13%	0	0%

**Table A4.1b** How many institutions identify digital capability training and development needs of students. By country.

How identify digital capability training needs: students (Base: All Respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(52)		(43)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Through discussions in tutorials/line manager meetings	25	48%	20	47%	3	75%	1	33%	1	50%
Anytime self-assessment of digital capabilities (e.g. via Jisc Digital Capability Discovery Tool)	22	42%	18	42%	2	50%	1	33%	1	50%
Via analysis of helpdesk support requests	22	42%	19	44%	2	50%	1	33%	0	0%
As part of implementing new system/service or process/policy	21	40%	15	35%	3	75%	1	33%	2	100%
Via survey to all staff/students (e.g. Jisc Digital Experience Insights)	19	37%	12	28%	4	100%	1	33%	2	100%
Other method	8	15%	6	14%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Do not identify training and development needs	7	13%	6	14%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%
Formal assessment of digital capabilities upon entry/induction	5	10%	3	7%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%

**Table A4.1c: How many institutions identify digital capability training and development needs of students. By size.**

How identify digital capability training needs: students (Base: All Respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(52)		(10)		(21)		(21)	
Through discussions in tutorials / line manager meetings	25	48%	4	40%	10	48%	11	52%
Anytime self-assessment of digital capabilities (e.g. via Jisc Digital Capability Discovery Tool)	22	42%	3	30%	6	29%	13	62%
Via analysis of helpdesk support requests	22	42%	7	70%	10	48%	5	24%
As part of implementing new system/service or process/policy	21	40%	5	50%	6	29%	10	48%
Via survey to all staff/students (e.g. Jisc Digital Experience Insights)	19	37%	3	30%	9	43%	7	33%
Other method	8	15%	4	40%	2	10%	2	10%
Do not identify training and development needs	7	13%	2	20%	3	14%	2	10%
Formal assessment of digital capabilities upon entry/induction	5	10%	3	30%	0	0%	2	10%

**Table A4.1d How many institutions identify digital capability training and development needs of staff. By institution type.**

How identify digital capability training needs: staff (Base: All Respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(52)		(26)		(24)		(2)	
Through discussions in tutorials / line manager meetings	41	79%	22	85%	18	75%	1	50%
As part of implementing new system/service or process/policy	35	67%	19	73%	15	63%	1	50%
Via analysis of helpdesk support requests	33	63%	18	69%	14	58%	1	50%
Anytime self-assessment of digital capabilities (e.g. via Jisc Digital Capability Discovery Tool)	26	50%	14	54%	12	50%	0	0%
Via survey to all staff/students (e.g. Jisc Digital Experience Insights)	21	40%	10	38%	11	46%	0	0%
Other method	15	29%	7	27%	8	33%	0	0%
Do not identify training and development needs	2	4%	0	0%	1	4%	1	50%
Formal assessment of digital capabilities upon entry/induction	1	2%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%



**Table A4.1e: How many institutions identify digital capability training and development needs of staff. By country.**

How identify digital capability training needs: staff (Base: All Respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(52)		(43)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Through discussions in tutorials / line manager meetings	41	79%	33	77%	3	75%	3	100%	2	100%
As part of implementing new system/service or process/policy	35	67%	27	63%	3	75%	3	100%	2	100%
Via analysis of helpdesk support requests	33	63%	26	60%	2	50%	3	100%	2	100%
Anytime self-assessment of digital capabilities (e.g. via Jisc Digital Capability Discovery Tool)	26	50%	23	53%	2	50%	0	0%	1	50%
Via survey to all staff/students (e.g. Jisc Digital Experience Insights)	21	40%	14	33%	4	100%	1	33%	2	100%
Other method	15	29%	11	26%	2	50%	2	67%	0	0%
Do not identify training and development needs	2	4%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Formal assessment of digital capabilities upon entry/induction	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A4.1f: How many institutions identify digital capability training and development needs of staff. By size**

How identify digital capability training needs: staff (Base: All Respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(52)		(10)		(21)		(21)	
Through discussions in tutorials / line manager meetings	41	79%	8	80%	17	81%	16	76%
As part of implementing new system/service or process/policy	35	67%	7	70%	13	62%	15	71%
Via analysis of helpdesk support requests	33	63%	7	70%	14	67%	12	57%
Anytime self-assessment of digital capabilities (e.g. via Jisc Digital Capability Discovery Tool)	26	50%	2	20%	8	38%	16	76%
Via survey to all staff/students (e.g. Jisc Digital Experience Insights)	21	40%	3	30%	9	43%	9	43%
Other method	15	29%	5	50%	6	29%	4	19%
Do not identify training and development needs	2	4%	1	10%	1	5%	0	0%
Formal assessment of digital capabilities upon entry/induction	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%

**Question 4.2 Which departments lead on staff or students' digital capabilities development and which methods do they use.**

**Table A4.2aa Departments who lead on digital capabilities through embedded throughout curriculum approach. By institution type.**

Embedded throughout teaching/curriculum (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(53)		(26)		(24)		(3)	
Library	30	57%	15	58%	13	54%	2	67%
IT Services	7	13%	2	8%	3	13%	2	67%
Academic/Study Skills	28	53%	13	50%	13	54%	2	67%
Disability Support	8	15%	3	12%	4	17%	1	33%
Digital Education team or equivalent	22	42%	7	27%	12	50%	3	100%
Careers Service/Employability	16	30%	6	23%	10	42%	0	0%
Student Support	5	9%	2	8%	3	13%	0	0%
Academic Department/School	31	58%	16	62%	14	58%	1	33%
Academic Development	8	15%	3	12%	5	21%	0	0%
Other	3	6%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%

**Table A4.2ab Departments who lead on digital capabilities through embedded throughout curriculum approach. By country.**

Embedded throughout teaching/curriculum (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(53)		(45)		(3)		(3)		(2)	
Library	30	57%	25	56%	2	67%	2	67%	1	50%
IT Services	7	13%	5	11%	1	33%	0	0%	1	50%
Academic/Study Skills	28	53%	22	49%	2	67%	3	100%	1	50%
Disability Support	8	15%	7	16%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
Digital Education team or equivalent	22	42%	17	38%	2	67%	1	33%	2	100%
Careers Service/Employability	16	30%	12	27%	2	67%	1	33%	1	50%
Student Support	5	9%	3	7%	0	0%	2	67%	0	0%
Academic Department/School	31	58%	25	56%	3	100%	2	67%	1	50%
Academic Development	8	15%	6	13%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%
Other	3	6%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A4.2ac Departments who lead on digital capabilities through embedded throughout curriculum approach. By size.**

Embedded throughout teaching curriculum (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(53)		(12)		(21)		(20)	
Library	30	57%	7	58%	14	67%	9	45%
IT Services	7	13%	3	25%	2	10%	2	10%
Academic/Study Skills	28	53%	10	83%	11	52%	7	35%
Disability Support	8	15%	2	17%	3	14%	3	15%
Digital Education team or equivalent	22	42%	7	58%	9	43%	6	30%
Careers Service/Employability	16	30%	5	42%	6	29%	5	25%
Student Support	5	9%	1	8%	1	5%	3	15%
Academic Department/School	31	58%	8	67%	11	52%	12	60%
Academic Development	8	15%	3	25%	2	10%	3	15%
Other	3	6%	1	8%	0	0%	2	10%

**Table A4.2ba Departments who lead on digital capabilities through training in specific aspects of digital. By institution type.**

Training in specific aspects of digital (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(54)		(27)		(24)		(3)	
Library	27	50%	12	44%	15	63%	0	0%
IT Services	10	19%	6	22%	4	17%	0	0%
Academic/Study Skills	22	41%	11	41%	10	42%	1	33%
Disability Support	8	15%	3	11%	5	21%	0	0%
Digital Education Team or equivalent	25	46%	10	37%	12	50%	3	100%
Careers Service/Employability	5	9%	1	4%	4	17%	0	0%
Student Support	2	4%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%
Academic Department/School	29	54%	18	67%	11	46%	0	0%
Academic Development	3	6%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%
Other	4	7%	1	4%	3	13%	0	0%

**Table A4.2bb Departments who lead on digital capabilities through training in specific aspects of digital. By country.**

Training in specific aspects of digital (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(54)		(45)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Library	27	50%	23	51%	1	25%	2	67%	1	50%
IT Services	10	19%	7	16%	1	25%	0	0%	2	100%
Academic/Study Skills	22	41%	17	38%	2	50%	2	67%	1	50%
Disability Support	8	15%	3	7%	2	50%	2	67%	1	50%
Digital Education team or equivalent	25	46%	18	40%	2	50%	3	100%	2	100%
Careers Service/Employability	5	9%	1	2%	2	50%	1	33%	1	50%
Student Support	2	4%	1	2%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Academic Department/School	29	54%	22	49%	4	100%	2	67%	1	50%
Academic Development	3	6%	1	2%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%
Other	4	7%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A4.2bc Departments who lead on digital capabilities through training in specific aspects of digital. By size.**

Training in specific aspects of digital (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(54)		(12)		(22)		(20)	
Library	27	50%	4	33%	13	59%	10	50%
IT Services	10	19%	2	17%	1	5%	7	35%
Academic/Study Skills	22	41%	5	42%	10	45%	7	35%
Disability Support	8	15%	2	17%	2	9%	4	20%
Digital Education team or equivalent	25	46%	6	50%	9	41%	10	50%
Careers Service/Employability	5	9%	2	17%	1	5%	2	10%
Student Support	2	4%	1	8%	0	0%	1	5%
Academic Department/School	29	54%	7	58%	12	55%	10	50%
Academic Development	3	6%	2	17%	1	5%	0	0%
Other	4	7%	0	0%	2	9%	2	10%

**Table A4.2ca Departments who lead on digital capabilities through optional in-person sign-up training. By institution type.**

Optional in-person sign-up training (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(57)		(29)		(25)		(3)	
Library	36	63%	17	59%	17	68%	2	67%
IT Services	26	46%	11	38%	14	56%	1	33%
Academic/Study Skills	25	44%	12	41%	12	48%	1	33%
Disability Support	10	18%	4	14%	6	24%	0	0%
Digital Education team or equivalent	45	79%	23	79%	19	76%	3	100%
Careers Service/Employability	14	25%	6	21%	8	32%	0	0%
Student Support	3	5%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%
Academic Department/School	15	26%	9	31%	6	24%	0	0%
Academic Development	16	28%	10	34%	6	24%	0	0%
Other	6	11%	3	10%	3	12%	0	0%

**Table A4.2cb Departments who lead on digital capabilities through optional in-person sign-up training. By country.**

Optional in-person sign-up training (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(57)		(48)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Library	36	63%	29	60%	3	75%	3	100%	1	50%
IT Services	26	46%	21	44%	0	0%	3	100%	2	100%
Academic/Study Skills	25	44%	19	40%	2	50%	3	100%	1	50%
Disability Support	10	18%	5	10%	1	25%	3	100%	1	50%
Digital Education team or equivalent	45	79%	36	75%	4	100%	3	100%	2	100%
Careers Service/Employability	14	25%	8	17%	2	50%	3	100%	1	50%
Student Support	3	5%	1	2%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%
Academic Department/School	15	26%	11	23%	2	50%	1	33%	1	50%
Academic Development	16	28%	12	25%	3	75%	1	33%	0	0%
Other	6	11%	5	10%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A4.2cc Departments who lead on digital capabilities through optional in-person sign-up training. By size.**

Optional in-person sign-up training (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(57)		(12)		(23)		(22)	
Library	36	63%	7	58%	15	65%	14	64%
IT Services	26	46%	3	25%	11	48%	12	55%
Academic/Study Skills	25	44%	5	42%	11	48%	9	41%
Disability Support	10	18%	1	8%	4	17%	5	23%
Digital Education team or equivalent	45	79%	10	83%	19	83%	16	73%
Careers Service/Employability	14	25%	3	25%	2	9%	9	41%
Student Support	3	5%	0	0%	1	4%	2	9%
Academic Department/School	15	26%	1	8%	5	22%	9	41%
Academic Development	16	28%	2	17%	8	35%	6	27%
Other	6	11%	2	17%	2	9%	2	9%

**Table A4.2da Departments who lead on digital capabilities through optional online sign-up training. By institution type.**

Optional online sign-up training (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(57)		(29)		(25)		(3)	
Library	32	56%	14	48%	16	64%	2	67%
IT Services	31	54%	16	55%	14	56%	1	33%
Academic/Study Skills	23	40%	12	41%	11	44%	0	0%
Disability Support	7	12%	5	17%	2	8%	0	0%
Digital Education team or equivalent	46	81%	23	79%	20	80%	3	100%
Careers Service/Employability	10	18%	6	21%	4	16%	0	0%
Student Support	4	7%	2	7%	2	8%	0	0%
Academic Department/School	11	19%	6	21%	5	20%	0	0%
Academic Development	16	28%	10	34%	6	24%	0	0%
Other	9	16%	5	17%	4	16%	0	0%

**Table A4.2db Departments who lead on digital capabilities through optional online sign-up training. By country.**

Optional online sign-up training (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(57)		(48)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Library	32	56%	27	56%	2	50%	2	67%	1	50%
IT Services	31	54%	25	52%	1	25%	3	100%	2	100%
Academic/Study Skills	23	40%	19	40%	1	25%	2	67%	1	50%
Disability Support	7	12%	4	8%	1	25%	1	33%	1	50%
Digital Education team or equivalent	46	81%	37	77%	4	100%	3	100%	2	100%
Careers Service/Employability	10	18%	8	17%	1	25%	0	0%	1	50%
Student Support	4	7%	3	6%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Academic Department/School	11	19%	8	17%	1	25%	1	33%	1	50%
Academic Development	16	28%	13	27%	2	50%	1	33%	0	0%
Other	9	16%	8	17%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A4.2dc Departments who lead on digital capabilities through optional online sign-up training. By size.**

Optional online sign-up training (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(57)		(12)		(23)		(22)	
Library	32	56%	6	50%	14	61%	12	55%
IT Services	31	54%	4	33%	11	48%	16	73%
Academic/Study Skills	23	40%	2	17%	13	57%	8	36%
Disability Support	7	12%	0	0%	2	9%	5	23%
Digital Education team or equivalent	46	81%	12	100%	19	83%	15	68%
Careers Service/Employability	10	18%	1	8%	1	4%	8	36%
Student Support	4	7%	0	0%	2	9%	2	9%
Academic Department/School	11	19%	0	0%	4	17%	7	32%
Academic Development	16	28%	1	8%	7	30%	8	36%
Other	9	16%	2	17%	3	13%	4	18%

**Table A4.2ea Departments who lead on digital capabilities through Webinars. By institution type.**

Webinars (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(49)		(28)		(20)		(1)	
Library	17	35%	8	29%	9	45%	0	0%
IT Services	14	29%	6	21%	8	40%	0	0%
Academic/Study Skills	10	20%	6	21%	4	20%	0	0%
Disability Support	5	10%	3	11%	2	10%	0	0%
Digital Education team or equivalent	38	78%	22	79%	15	75%	1	100%
Careers Service/Employability	10	20%	5	18%	5	25%	0	0%
Student Support	3	6%	2	7%	1	5%	0	0%
Academic Department/School	6	12%	5	18%	1	5%	0	0%
Academic Development	12	24%	8	29%	4	20%	0	0%
Other	6	12%	3	11%	3	15%	0	0%

**Table A4.2eb Departments who lead on digital capabilities through Webinars. By country.**

Webinars (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(49)		(41)		(4)		(2)		(2)	
Library	17	35%	15	37%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%
IT Services	14	29%	12	29%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%
Academic/Study Skills	10	20%	8	20%	1	25%	0	0%	1	50%
Disability Support	5	10%	4	10%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
Digital Education team or equivalent	38	78%	30	73%	4	100%	2	100%	2	100%
Careers Service/Employability	10	20%	9	22%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
Student Support	3	6%	2	5%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Academic Department/School	6	12%	5	12%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
Academic Development	12	24%	10	24%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	6	12%	5	12%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%



**Table A4.2ec Departments who lead on digital capabilities through Webinars. By size.**

Webinars (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(49)		(7)		(21)		(21)	
Library	17	35%	2	29%	6	29%	9	43%
IT Services	14	29%	0	0%	4	19%	10	48%
Academic/Study Skills	10	20%	2	29%	4	19%	4	19%
Disability Support	5	10%	1	14%	0	0%	4	19%
Digital Education team or equivalent	38	78%	5	71%	18	86%	15	71%
Careers Service/Employability	10	20%	2	29%	1	5%	7	33%
Student Support	3	6%	0	0%	1	5%	2	10%
Academic Department/School	6	12%	0	0%	2	10%	4	19%
Academic Development	12	24%	1	14%	7	33%	4	19%
Other	6	12%	1	14%	1	5%	4	19%

**Table A4.2fa Departments who lead on digital capabilities through helpdesk. By institution type.**

Helpdesk (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(53)		(28)		(23)		(2)	
Library	25	47%	11	39%	13	57%	1	50%
IT Services	46	87%	23	82%	23	100%	0	0%
Academic/Study Skills	7	13%	5	18%	2	9%	0	0%
Disability Support	7	13%	5	18%	2	9%	0	0%
Digital Education team or equivalent	28	53%	18	64%	8	35%	2	100%
Careers Service/Employability	5	9%	2	7%	3	13%	0	0%
Student Support	4	8%	1	4%	3	13%	0	0%
Academic Department/School	2	4%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%
Academic Development	5	9%	4	14%	1	4%	0	0%
Other	2	4%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%

**Table A4.2fb Departments who lead on digital capabilities through helpdesk. By country.**

Helpdesk (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(53)		(45)		(4)		(2)		(2)	
Library	25	47%	20	44%	3	75%	1	50%	1	50%
IT Services	46	87%	39	87%	3	75%	2	100%	2	100%
Academic/Study Skills	7	13%	5	11%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%
Disability Support	7	13%	5	11%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%
Digital Education team or equivalent	28	53%	24	53%	2	50%	1	50%	1	50%
Careers Service/Employability	5	9%	3	7%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%
Student Support	4	8%	3	7%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Academic Department/School	2	4%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Academic Development	5	9%	4	9%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	2	4%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A4.2fc Departments who lead on digital capabilities through helpdesk. By size.**

Helpdesk (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(53)		(11)		(23)		(19)	
Library	25	47%	7	64%	11	48%	7	37%
IT Services	46	87%	8	73%	21	91%	17	89%
Academic/Study Skills	7	13%	1	9%	3	13%	3	16%
Disability Support	7	13%	1	9%	2	9%	4	21%
Digital Education team or equivalent	28	53%	6	55%	13	57%	9	47%
Careers Service/Employability	5	9%	0	0%	2	9%	3	16%
Student Support	4	8%	1	9%	1	4%	2	11%
Academic Department/School	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	2	11%
Academic Development	5	9%	0	0%	2	9%	3	16%
Other	2	4%	0	0%	1	4%	1	5%

**Table A4.2ga Departments who lead on digital capabilities through drop-in clinics or appointments. By institution type.**

Drop-in clinics or appointments (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(56)		(29)		(24)		(3)	
Library	33	59%	15	52%	16	67%	2	67%
IT Services	21	38%	11	38%	10	42%	0	0%
Academic/Study Skills	18	32%	9	31%	9	38%	0	0%
Disability Support	11	20%	7	24%	4	17%	0	0%
Digital Education team or equivalent	42	75%	22	76%	17	71%	3	100%
Careers Service/Employability	15	27%	7	24%	8	33%	0	0%
Student Support	5	9%	4	14%	1	4%	0	0%
Academic Department/School	4	7%	1	3%	3	13%	0	0%
Academic Development	6	11%	4	14%	2	8%	0	0%
Other	4	7%	1	3%	3	13%	0	0%

**Table A4.2gb Departments who lead on digital capabilities through drop-in clinics or appointments. By country.**

Drop-in clinics or appointments (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(56)		(48)		(3)		(3)		(2)	
Library	33	59%	28	58%	2	67%	2	67%	1	50%
IT Services	21	38%	15	31%	2	67%	2	67%	2	100%
Academic/Study Skills	18	32%	15	31%	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%
Disability Support	11	20%	9	19%	0	0%	1	33%	1	50%
Digital Education team or equivalent	42	75%	35	73%	3	100%	2	67%	2	100%
Careers Service/Employability	15	27%	11	23%	1	33%	2	67%	1	50%
Student Support	5	9%	4	8%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%
Academic Department/School	4	7%	3	6%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%
Academic Development	6	11%	4	8%	2	67%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	4	7%	3	6%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A4.2gc Departments who lead on digital capabilities through drop-in clinics or appointments. By size.**

Drop-in clinics or appointments (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(56)		(12)		(23)		(21)	
Library	33	59%	9	75%	11	48%	13	62%
IT Services	21	38%	6	50%	5	22%	10	48%
Academic/Study Skills	18	32%	5	42%	8	35%	5	24%
Disability Support	11	20%	2	17%	3	13%	6	29%
Digital Education team or equivalent	42	75%	12	100%	18	78%	12	57%
Careers Service/Employability	15	27%	4	33%	3	13%	8	38%
Student Support	5	9%	1	8%	2	9%	2	10%
Academic Department/School	4	7%	1	8%	1	4%	2	10%
Academic Development	6	11%	1	8%	3	13%	2	10%
Other	4	7%	1	8%	1	4%	2	10%

**Table A4.2ha Departments who lead on digital capabilities through online resources. By institution type.**

Online resources (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(52)		(29)		(21)		(2)	
Library	30	58%	15	52%	14	67%	1	50%
IT Services	28	54%	16	55%	12	57%	0	0%
Academic/Study Skills	16	31%	10	34%	6	29%	0	0%
Disability Support	9	17%	6	21%	3	14%	0	0%
Digital Education team or equivalent	42	81%	23	79%	17	81%	2	100%
Careers Service/Employability	11	21%	7	24%	4	19%	0	0%
Student Support	4	8%	2	7%	2	10%	0	0%
Academic Department/School	5	10%	3	10%	2	10%	0	0%
Academic Development	8	15%	5	17%	3	14%	0	0%
Other	3	6%	2	7%	1	5%	0	0%

**Table A4.2hb Departments who lead on digital capabilities through online resources. By country.**

Online resources (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(52)		(44)		(4)		(2)		(2)	
Library	30	58%	24	55%	3	75%	2	100%	1	50%
IT Services	28	54%	22	50%	2	50%	2	100%	2	100%
Academic/Study Skills	16	31%	13	30%	0	0%	2	100%	1	50%
Disability Support	9	17%	5	11%	1	25%	2	100%	1	50%
Digital Education team or equivalent	42	81%	34	77%	4	100%	2	100%	2	100%
Careers Service/Employability	11	21%	9	20%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%
Student Support	4	8%	2	5%	1	25%	1	50%	0	0%
Academic Department/School	5	10%	3	7%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%
Academic Development	8	15%	6	14%	1	25%	1	50%	0	0%
Other	3	6%	2	5%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A4.2hc Departments who lead on digital capabilities through online resources. By size.**

Online resources (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(52)		(9)		(22)		(21)	
Library	30	58%	6	67%	13	59%	11	52%
IT Services	28	54%	3	33%	13	59%	12	57%
Academic/Study Skills	16	31%	2	22%	7	32%	7	33%
Disability Support	9	17%	1	11%	3	14%	5	24%
Digital Education team or equivalent	42	81%	8	89%	19	86%	15	71%
Careers Service/Employability	11	21%	0	0%	2	9%	9	43%
Student Support	4	8%	0	0%	1	5%	3	14%
Academic Department/School	5	10%	1	11%	0	0%	4	19%
Academic Development	8	15%	0	0%	5	23%	3	14%
Other	3	6%	0	0%	1	5%	2	10%

**Table A4.2ia Departments who lead on digital capabilities through internal communications. By institution type.**

Internal Communications (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Post-92		Pre-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(53)		(27)		(23)		(3)	
Library	19	36%	8	30%	11	48%	0	0%
IT Services	30	57%	13	48%	17	74%	0	0%
Academic/Study Skills	13	25%	2	7%	10	43%	1	33%
Disability Support	7	13%	3	11%	4	17%	0	0%
Digital Education team or equivalent	35	66%	16	59%	16	70%	3	100%
Careers Service/Employability	11	21%	3	11%	8	35%	0	0%
Student Support	3	6%	0	0%	3	13%	0	0%
Academic Department/School	3	6%	1	4%	2	9%	0	0%
Academic Development	11	21%	5	19%	6	26%	0	0%
Other	6	11%	3	11%	3	13%	0	0%

**Table A4.2ib Departments who lead on digital capabilities through internal communications. By country.**

Internal Communications (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(53)		(44)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Library	19	36%	15	34%	1	25%	2	67%	1	50%
IT Services	30	57%	23	52%	2	50%	3	100%	2	100%
Academic/Study Skills	13	25%	9	20%	1	25%	2	67%	1	50%
Disability Support	7	13%	4	9%	1	25%	1	33%	1	50%
Digital Education team or equivalent	35	66%	28	64%	4	100%	2	67%	1	50%
Careers Service/Employability	11	21%	7	16%	1	25%	2	67%	1	50%
Student Support	3	6%	2	5%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%
Academic Department/School	3	6%	2	5%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%
Academic Development	11	21%	8	18%	2	50%	1	33%	0	0%
Other	6	11%	4	9%	1	25%	0	0%	1	50%

**Table A4.2ic Departments who lead on digital capabilities through internal communications. By size.**

Internal Communications (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(53)		(12)		(20)		(21)	
Library	19	36%	3	25%	7	35%	9	43%
IT Services	30	57%	4	33%	11	55%	15	71%
Academic/Study Skills	13	25%	4	33%	3	15%	6	29%
Disability Support	7	13%	1	8%	2	10%	4	19%
Digital Education team or equivalent	35	66%	9	75%	14	70%	12	57%
Careers Service/Employability	11	21%	2	17%	2	10%	7	33%
Student Support	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3	14%
Academic Department/School	3	6%	1	8%	0	0%	2	10%
Academic Development	11	21%	1	8%	7	35%	3	14%
Other	6	11%	2	17%	0	0%	4	19%

**Question 4.4 How is achievement, in respect of student or staff digital capabilities, recognised?**

**Table A4.4aa How achievement is recognised in respect of student digital capabilities. By institution type.**

How recognise achievement: students (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Certificate/extracurricular options (not credit bearing)	19	33%	14	47%	5	20%	0	0%
None of the above - achievement is not recognised	18	31%	9	30%	6	24%	3	100%
Open or digital badges	17	29%	10	33%	7	28%	0	0%
Digital/champions/ambassadors	16	28%	9	30%	7	28%	0	0%
Award schemes (students)	11	19%	7	23%	4	16%	0	0%
Credit bearing modules	6	10%	3	10%	3	12%	0	0%
External certification e.g. MS Office Specialist (MOS)	6	10%	1	3%	5	20%	0	0%
Acknowledged as part of Higher Education Achievement Record	6	10%	3	10%	3	12%	0	0%
Recognition/acknowledgement (nomination for teaching awards)	5	9%	2	7%	3	12%	0	0%
Other	3	5%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A4.4ab How achievement is recognised in respect of student digital capabilities. By country.**

How recognise achievement students (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Certificate/extracurricular options (not credit bearing)	19	33%	13	27%	3	75%	1	33%	2	100%
None of the above - achievement is not recognised	18	31%	16	33%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%
Open or digital badges	17	29%	13	27%	3	75%	1	33%	0	0%
Digital/champions/ambassadors	16	28%	12	24%	1	25%	1	33%	2	100%
Award schemes (students)	11	19%	9	18%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%
Credit bearing modules	6	10%	3	6%	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%
External certification eg. MS Office Specialist (MOS)	6	10%	6	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Acknowledged as part of Higher Education Achievement Record	6	10%	3	6%	1	25%	1	33%	1	50%
Recognition/acknowledgement (nomination for teaching awards)	5	9%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	3	5%	2	4%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%

**Table A4.4ac How achievement is recognised in respect of student digital capabilities. By size.**

How recognise achievement: students (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Certificate/extracurricular options (not credit bearing)	19	33%	2	17%	7	30%	10	43%
None of the above - achievement is not recognised	18	31%	6	50%	6	26%	6	26%
Open or digital badges	17	29%	3	25%	7	30%	7	30%
Digital/champions/ambassadors	16	28%	4	33%	6	26%	6	26%
Award schemes (students)	11	19%	1	8%	2	9%	8	35%
Credit bearing modules	6	10%	2	17%	2	9%	2	9%
External certification e.g. MS Office Specialist (MOS)	6	10%	0	0%	3	13%	3	13%
Acknowledged as part of Higher Education Achievement Record	6	10%	2	17%	1	4%	3	13%
Recognition/acknowledgement (nomination for teaching awards)	5	9%	1	8%	2	9%	2	9%
Other	3	5%	0	0%	2	9%	1	4%



**Table A4.4ba How achievement is recognised in respect of staff digital capabilities. By institution type.**

How recognise achievement: staff (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Recognition/acknowledgement (nomination for teaching awards)	31	53%	18	60%	12	48%	1	33%
Digital/champions/ambassadors	21	36%	10	33%	11	44%	0	0%
External certification e.g. MS Office Specialist (MOS)	18	31%	10	33%	7	28%	1	33%
Certificate/extracurricular options (not credit bearing)	13	22%	8	27%	5	20%	0	0%
None of the above - achievement is not recognised	12	21%	5	17%	5	20%	2	67%
Open or digital badges	10	17%	7	23%	3	12%	0	0%
Acknowledged as part of Higher Education Achievement Record	7	12%	5	17%	2	8%	0	0%
Credit bearing modules	6	10%	3	10%	3	12%	0	0%
Other	6	10%	4	13%	2	8%	0	0%
Award schemes (students)	1	2%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%

**Table A4.4bb How achievement is recognised in respect of staff digital capabilities. By country.**

How recognise achievement staff (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Recognition/acknowledgement (nomination for teaching awards)	31	53%	25	51%	3	75%	1	33%	2	100%
Digital/champions/ambassadors	21	36%	17	35%	1	25%	2	67%	1	50%
External certification e.g. MS Office Specialist (MOS)	18	31%	14	29%	2	50%	0	0%	2	100%
Certificate/extracurricular options (not credit bearing)	13	22%	8	16%	2	50%	2	67%	1	50%
None of the above - achievement is not recognised	12	21%	11	22%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Open or digital badges	10	17%	8	16%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Acknowledged as part of Higher Education Achievement Record	7	12%	6	12%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
Credit bearing modules	6	10%	5	10%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	6	10%	4	8%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%
Award schemes (students)	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%



**Table A4.4bc How achievement is recognised in respect of staff digital capabilities. By size.**

How recognise achievement: staff (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Recognition/acknowledgement (nomination for teaching awards)	31	53%	7	58%	12	52%	12	52%
Digital/champions/ambassadors	21	36%	4	33%	8	35%	9	39%
External certification e.g. MS Office Specialist (MOS)	18	31%	3	25%	4	17%	11	48%
Certificate/extracurricular options (not credit bearing)	13	22%	4	33%	3	13%	6	26%
None of the above - achievement is not recognised	12	21%	3	25%	5	22%	4	17%
Open or digital badges	10	17%	4	33%	4	17%	2	9%
Acknowledged as part of Higher Education Achievement Record	7	12%	1	8%	2	9%	4	17%
Credit bearing modules	6	10%	2	17%	2	9%	2	9%
Other	6	10%	1	8%	3	13%	2	9%
Award schemes (students)	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%

## Section 5: Accessibility and Inclusion

### Question 5.1 Which of the following measures do you provide to support students and staff in terms of digital inclusion or digital poverty?

Table A5.1aa Measures provided to support students in terms of digital inclusion or digital poverty. By institution type.

Measures to support: students (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Laptop Loan	52	90%	27	90%	23	92%	2	67%
Dedicated spaces on campus	50	86%	27	90%	22	88%	1	33%
Software hub with access to a range of relevant software for home use	48	83%	24	80%	23	92%	1	33%
Dedicated hardship fund for digital poverty related support	44	76%	25	83%	18	72%	1	33%
Specific course related hardware loan (camera, mics, etc)	38	66%	19	63%	19	76%	0	0%
Remote or on-campus access to high spec PC	38	66%	22	73%	16	64%	0	0%
Headset with microphone	21	36%	12	40%	9	36%	0	0%
Institutional Purchase Scheme with discount	19	33%	9	30%	10	40%	0	0%
WiFi Dongles	15	26%	8	27%	7	28%	0	0%
Tablet/Smart phone loan	9	16%	6	20%	3	12%	0	0%
None of above are provided	1	2%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%

Table A5.1ab Measures provided to support students in terms of digital inclusion or digital poverty. By country.

Measures to support: students (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Laptop Loan	52	90%	44	90%	3	75%	3	100%	2	100%
Dedicated spaces on campus	50	86%	42	86%	4	100%	2	67%	2	100%
Software hub with access to a range of relevant software for home use	48	83%	40	82%	3	75%	3	100%	2	100%
Dedicated hardship fund for digital poverty related support	44	76%	38	78%	1	25%	3	100%	2	100%
Specific course related hardware loan (camera, mics, etc)	38	66%	33	67%	2	50%	2	67%	1	50%
Remote or on-campus access to high spec PC	38	66%	31	63%	3	75%	3	100%	1	50%
Headset with microphone	21	36%	19	39%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%

Table A5.1ab (continued).

Measures to support: students (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Institutional Purchase Scheme with discount	19	33%	17	35%	0	0%	1	33%	1	50%
WiFi Dongles	15	26%	12	24%	1	25%	1	33%	1	50%
Tablet/Smart phone loan	9	16%	7	14%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%
None of above are provided	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Table A5.1ac Measures provided to support students in terms of digital inclusion or digital poverty. By size.

Measures to support: students (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Laptop Loan	52	90%	8	67%	22	96%	22	96%
Dedicated spaces on campus	50	86%	10	83%	20	87%	20	87%
Software hub with access to a range of relevant software for home use	48	83%	9	75%	19	83%	20	87%
Dedicated hardship fund for digital poverty related support	44	76%	8	67%	17	74%	19	83%
Specific course related hardware loan (camera, mics, etc)	38	66%	5	42%	17	74%	16	70%
Remote or on-campus access to high spec PC	38	66%	8	67%	15	65%	15	65%
Headset with microphone	21	36%	4	33%	9	39%	8	35%
Institutional Purchase Scheme with discount	19	33%	2	17%	10	43%	7	30%
WiFi Dongles	15	26%	4	33%	4	17%	7	30%
Tablet/Smart phone loan	9	16%	3	25%	3	13%	3	13%
None of above are provided	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%

**Table A5.1ba Measures provided to support students in terms of digital inclusion or digital poverty. By institution type.**

Measures to support: staff (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Othe	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Software hub with access to a range of relevant software for home use	48	83%	25	83%	23	92%	0	0%
Headset with microphone	46	79%	22	73%	23	92%	1	33%
Dedicated spaces on campus	43	74%	21	70%	21	84%	1	33%
Remote or on-campus access to high spec PC	40	69%	21	70%	19	76%	0	0%
Specific course related hardware loan (camera, mics, etc)	35	60%	20	67%	15	60%	0	0%
Laptop Loan	34	59%	15	50%	18	72%	1	33%
Institutional Purchase Scheme with discount	16	28%	10	33%	6	24%	0	0%
Tablet/Smart phone loan	14	24%	6	20%	8	32%	0	0%
WiFi Dongles	14	24%	9	30%	4	16%	1	33%
Dedicated hardship fund for digital poverty related support	2	3%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%
None of above are provided	2	3%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A5.1bb Measures provided to support students in terms of digital inclusion or digital poverty. By country.**

Measures to support: staff (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Software hub with access to a range of relevant software for home use	48	83%	39	80%	4	100%	3	100%	2	100%
Headset with microphone	46	79%	38	78%	4	100%	2	67%	2	100%
Dedicated spaces on campus	43	74%	35	71%	4	100%	2	67%	2	100%
Remote or on-campus access to high spec PC	40	69%	33	67%	3	75%	3	100%	1	50%
Specific course related hardware loan (camera, mics, etc)	35	60%	29	59%	2	50%	2	67%	2	100%
Laptop Loan	34	59%	29	59%	3	75%	2	67%	0	0%
Institutional Purchase Scheme with discount	16	28%	13	27%	1	25%	1	33%	1	50%
Tablet/Smart phone loan	14	24%	12	24%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%
WiFi Dongles	14	24%	11	22%	1	25%	1	33%	1	50%

Dedicated hardship fund for digital poverty related support	2	3%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
None of above are provided	2	3%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A5.1bc Measures provided to support students in terms of digital inclusion or digital poverty. By size.**

Measures to support: staff (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Software hub with access to a range of relevant software for home use	48	83%	8	67%	20	87%	20	87%
Headset with microphone	46	79%	9	75%	18	78%	19	83%
Dedicated spaces on campus	43	74%	9	75%	17	74%	17	74%
Remote or on-campus access to high spec PC	40	69%	8	67%	17	74%	15	65%
Specific course related hardware loan (camera, mics, etc)	35	60%	6	50%	13	57%	16	70%
Laptop Loan	34	59%	9	75%	12	52%	13	57%
Institutional Purchase Scheme with discount	16	28%	2	17%	8	35%	6	26%
Tablet/Smart phone loan	14	24%	3	25%	6	26%	5	22%
WiFi Dongles	14	24%	6	50%	1	4%	7	30%
Dedicated hardship fund for digital poverty related support	2	3%	0	0%	1	4%	1	4%
None of above are provided	2	3%	0	0%	1	4%	1	4%

**Question 5.2 Does your institution have guidelines for the following in respect of supporting staff in developing accessible materials?**

**Table A5.2aa Learning and teaching guidelines on creation of accessible and inclusive documents and resources. By institution type.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On creation of accessible and inclusive documents and resources (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes	55	95%	29	97%	23	92%	3	100%
No, but working towards this	1	2%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%
No	2	3%	0	0%	2	8%	0	0%

**Table A5.2ab Learning and teaching guidelines on creation of accessible and inclusive documents and resources. By country.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On creation of accessible and inclusive documents and resources (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	

Yes	55	95%	47	96%	4	100%	2	67%	2	100%
No, but working towards this	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No	2	3%	1	2%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%

**Table A5.2ac Learning and teaching guidelines on creation of accessible and inclusive documents and resources. By size.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On creation of accessible and inclusive documents and resources (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes	55	95%	10	83%	22	96%	23	100%
No, but working towards this	1	2%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%
No	2	3%	1	8%	1	4%	0	0%

**Table A5.2ba Learning and teaching guidelines on creation of images and diagrams. By institution type.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On creation of images and diagrams (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(57)		(30)		(24)		(3)	
Yes	53	93%	30	100%	21	88%	2	67%
No, but working towards this	2	4%	0	0%	2	8%	0	0%
No	2	4%	0	0%	1	4%	1	33%

**Table A5.2bb Learning and teaching guidelines on creation of images and diagrams. By country.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On creation of images and diagrams (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(57)		(48)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	53	93%	45	94%	4	100%	2	67%	2	100%
No, but working towards this	2	4%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No	2	4%	1	2%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%

**Table A5.2bc Learning and teaching guidelines on creation of images and diagrams. By size.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On creation of images and diagrams (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(57)		(12)		(23)		(22)	
Yes	53	93%	9	75%	22	96%	22	100%
No, but working towards this	2	4%	1	8%	1	4%	0	0%
No	2	4%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%



**Table A5.2ca Learning and teaching guidelines on provision of alternative formats. By institution type.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On provision of alternative formats (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes	53	91%	28	93%	22	88%	3	100%
No, but working towards this	2	3%	1	3%	1	4%	0	0%
No	3	5%	1	3%	2	8%	0	0%

**Table A5.2cb Learning and teaching guidelines on provision of alternative formats. By country.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On provision of alternative formats (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	53	91%	47	96%	2	50%	2	67%	2	100%
No, but working towards this	2	3%	1	2%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
No	3	5%	1	2%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%

**Table A5.2cc Learning and teaching guidelines on provision of alternative formats. By size.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On provision of alternative formats (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes	53	91%	10	83%	22	96%	21	91%
No, but working towards this	2	3%	1	8%	0	0%	1	4%
No	3	5%	1	8%	1	4%	1	4%

**Table A5.2da Learning and teaching guidelines on accessibility checking. By institution type.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On accessibility checking (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes	50	86%	28	93%	20	80%	2	67%
No, but working towards this	5	9%	2	7%	2	8%	1	33%
No	3	5%	0	0%	3	12%	0	0%

**Table A5.2db Learning and teaching guidelines on accessibility checking. By country.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On accessibility checking (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	50	86%	43	88%	3	75%	2	67%	2	100%
No, but working towards this	5	9%	4	8%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
No	3	5%	2	4%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%

**Table A5.2dc Learning and teaching guidelines on accessibility checking. By size.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On accessibility checking (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size							
			Small		Medium		Large			
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)			
Yes	50	86%	8	67%	23	100%	19	83%		
No, but working towards this	5	9%	3	25%	0	0%	2	9%		
No	3	5%	1	8%	0	0%	2	9%		

**Table A5.2ea Learning and teaching guidelines on captioning for lecture capture. By institution type.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On captioning for lecture capture (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type							
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other			
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)			
Yes	49	84%	29	97%	19	76%	1	33%		
No, but working towards this	3	5%	0	0%	2	8%	1	33%		
No	6	10%	1	3%	4	16%	1	33%		

**Table A5.2eb Learning and teaching guidelines on captioning for lecture capture. By country.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On captioning for lecture capture (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	49	84%	42	86%	3	75%	2	67%	2	100%
No, but working towards this	3	5%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No	6	10%	4	8%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%

**Table A5.2ec Learning and teaching guidelines on captioning for lecture capture. By size.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On captioning for lecture capture (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes	49	84%	8	67%	19	83%	22	96%
No, but working towards this	3	5%	1	8%	1	4%	1	4%
No	6	10%	3	25%	3	13%	0	0%

**Table A5.2fa Learning and teaching guidelines on captioning of pre-recorded media. By institution type.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On captioning of pre-recorded media (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes	48	83%	27	90%	20	80%	1	33%
No, but working towards this	4	7%	1	3%	2	8%	1	33%
No	6	10%	2	7%	3	12%	1	33%

**Table A5.2fb Learning and teaching guidelines on captioning of pre-recorded media. By country.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On captioning of pre-recorded media (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(3)	
Yes	48	83%	42	86%	2	50%	2	67%	2	100%
No, but working towards this	4	7%	3	6%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
No	6	10%	4	8%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%

**Table A5.2fc Learning and teaching guidelines on captioning of pre-recorded media. By size.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On captioning of pre-recorded media (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes	48	83%	7	58%	20	87%	21	91%
No, but working towards this	4	7%	2	17%	0	0%	2	9%
No	6	10%	3	25%	3	13%	0	0%

**Table A5.2ga Learning and teaching guidelines on sharing of student-created digital materials. By institution type.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On sharing of student-created digital materials (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes	16	28%	7	23%	8	32%	1	33%
No, but working towards this	13	22%	8	27%	5	20%	0	0%
No	29	50%	15	50%	12	48%	2	67%

**Table A5.2gb Learning and teaching guidelines on sharing of student-created digital materials. By country.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On sharing of student-created digital materials (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	16	28%	16	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No, but working towards this	13	22%	11	22%	0	0%	1	33%	1	50%
No	29	50%	22	45%	4	100%	2	67%	1	50%

**Table A5.2gc Learning and teaching guidelines on sharing of student-created digital materials. By size.**

Learning and teaching guidelines: On sharing of student-created digital materials (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes	16	28%	2	17%	6	26%	8	35%
No, but working towards this	13	22%	3	25%	5	22%	5	22%
No	29	50%	7	58%	12	52%	10	43%

**Table A5.2ha General guidelines on creation of accessible and inclusive documents and resources. By institution type.**

General guidelines: On creation of accessible and inclusive documents and resources (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes	51	88%	29	97%	20	80%	2	67%
No, but working towards this	4	7%	1	3%	2	8%	1	33%
No	3	5%	0	0%	3	12%	0	0%

**Table A5.2hb General guidelines on creation of accessible and inclusive documents and resources. By country.**

General guidelines: On creation of accessible and inclusive documents and resources (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(3)	
Yes	51	88%	43	88%	4	100%	3	100%	1	50%
No, but working towards this	4	7%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
No	3	5%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A5.2hc General guidelines on creation of accessible and inclusive documents and resources. By size.**

General guidelines: On creation of accessible and inclusive documents and resources (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes	51	88%	10	83%	21	91%	20	87%
No, but working towards this	4	7%	2	17%	0	0%	2	9%
No	3	5%	0	0%	2	9%	1	4%

**Table A5.2ia General guidelines on creation of images and diagrams. By institution type.**

General guidelines: On creation of images and diagrams (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes	50	86%	28	93%	20	80%	2	67%
No, but working towards this	3	5%	0	0%	3	12%	0	0%
No	5	9%	2	7%	2	8%	1	33%

**Table A5.2ib General guidelines on creation of images and diagrams. By country.**

General guidelines: On creation of images and diagrams (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	50	86%	43	88%	3	75%	3	100%	1	50%
No, but working towards this	3	5%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
No	5	9%	4	8%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A5.2ic General guidelines on creation of images and diagrams. By size.**

General guidelines: On creation of images and diagrams (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes	50	86%	10	83%	21	91%	19	83%
No, but working towards this	3	5%	1	8%	0	0%	2	9%
No	5	9%	1	8%	2	9%	2	9%

**Table A5.2ja General guidelines on captioning of pre-recorded media. By institution type.**

General guidelines: On captioning of pre-recorded media (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes	48	83%	28	93%	19	76%	1	33%
No, but working towards this	5	9%	1	3%	4	16%	0	0%
No	5	9%	1	3%	2	8%	2	67%

**Table A5.2jb General guidelines on captioning of pre-recorded media. By country.**

General guidelines: On captioning of pre-recorded media (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	48	83%	41	84%	3	75%	3	100%	1	50%
No, but working towards this	5	9%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
No	5	9%	4	8%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A5.2jc General guidelines on captioning of pre-recorded media. By size.**

General guidelines: On captioning of pre-recorded media (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes	48	83%	8	67%	22	96%	18	78%
No, but working towards this	5	9%	1	8%	0	0%	4	17%
No	5	9%	3	25%	1	4%	1	4%

**Table A5.2ka General guidelines on availability of accessible and inclusive software. By institution type.**

General guidelines: On availability of accessible and inclusive software (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes	44	76%	24	80%	18	72%	2	67%
No, but working towards this	6	10%	3	10%	3	12%	0	0%
No	8	14%	3	10%	4	16%	1	33%

**Table A5.2kb General guidelines on availability of accessible and inclusive software. By country.**

General guidelines: On availability of accessible and inclusive software (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	44	76%	38	78%	2	50%	3	100%	1	50%
No, but working towards this	6	10%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
No	8	14%	6	12%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A5.2kc General guidelines on availability of accessible and inclusive software. By size.**

General guidelines: On availability of accessible and inclusive software (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes	44	76%	9	75%	18	78%	17	74%
No, but working towards this	6	10%	1	8%	1	4%	4	17%
No	8	14%	2	17%	4	17%	2	9%

**Table A5.2la General guidelines on creation/purchase of accessible and inclusive software. By institution type.**

General guidelines: On creation/purchase of accessible and inclusive software (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes	33	57%	17	57%	15	60%	1	33%
No, but working towards this	12	21%	6	20%	6	24%	0	0%
No	13	22%	7	23%	4	16%	2	67%

**Table A5.2Ib General guidelines on creation/purchase of accessible and inclusive software. By country.**

General guidelines: On creation/purchase of accessible and inclusive software (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	33	57%	28	57%	2	50%	3	100%	0	0%
No, but working towards this	12	21%	11	22%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
No	13	22%	10	20%	2	50%	0	0%	1	50%

**Table A5.2Ic General guidelines on creation/purchase of accessible and inclusive software. By size.**

General guidelines: On creation/purchase of accessible and inclusive software (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes	33	57%	9	75%	14	61%	10	43%
No, but working towards this	12	21%	1	8%	2	9%	9	39%
No	13	22%	2	17%	7	30%	4	17%

**Question 5.3 Which of the following takes place to help develop student and staff digital capabilities in relation to accessibility and inclusion?**

**Table A5.3aa Methods used to help develop students' digital capabilities in relation to accessibility and inclusion. By institution type.**

Ways of developing digital capabilities: students (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Online resources	34	59%	17	57%	15	60%	2	67%
Helpdesk	32	55%	16	53%	14	56%	2	67%
Optional online training	27	47%	16	53%	10	40%	1	33%
Drop-in clinics or appointments	27	47%	17	57%	8	32%	2	67%
Internal comms	25	43%	13	43%	10	40%	2	67%
Optional sign-up training	21	36%	13	43%	6	24%	2	67%
Webinars	16	28%	9	30%	7	28%	0	0%
Social media	13	22%	9	30%	4	16%	0	0%
No steps taken	13	22%	7	23%	5	20%	1	33%
Mandatory training	4	7%	3	10%	1	4%	0	0%
Mandatory online training	4	7%	3	10%	1	4%	0	0%



**Table A5.3ab Methods used to help develop students' digital capabilities in relation to accessibility and inclusion. By country.**

Ways of developing digital capabilities: students (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Online resources	34	59%	28	57%	3	75%	2	67%	1	50%
Helpdesk	32	55%	26	53%	2	50%	3	100%	1	50%
Optional online training	27	47%	22	45%	2	50%	1	33%	2	100%
Drop-in clinics or appointments	27	47%	22	45%	3	75%	2	67%	0	0%
Internal comms	25	43%	19	39%	2	50%	3	100%	1	50%
Optional sign-up training	21	36%	17	35%	2	50%	0	0%	2	100%
Webinars	16	28%	14	29%	0	0%	1	33%	1	50%
Social media	13	22%	11	22%	0	0%	1	33%	1	50%
No steps taken	13	22%	12	24%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Mandatory training	4	7%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Mandatory online training	4	7%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A5.3ac Methods used to help develop students' digital capabilities in relation to accessibility and inclusion. By size.**

Ways of developing digital capabilities: students (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Online resources	34	59%	6	50%	15	65%	13	57%
Helpdesk	32	55%	7	58%	14	61%	11	48%
Optional online training	27	47%	6	50%	11	48%	10	43%
Drop-in clinics or appointments	27	47%	6	50%	12	52%	9	39%
Internal comms	25	43%	5	42%	11	48%	9	39%
Optional sign-up training	21	36%	6	50%	8	35%	7	30%
Webinars	16	28%	1	8%	8	35%	7	30%
Social media	13	22%	0	0%	8	35%	5	22%
No steps taken	13	22%	3	25%	4	17%	6	26%
Mandatory training	4	7%	0	0%	3	13%	1	4%
Mandatory online training	4	7%	0	0%	3	13%	1	4%

**Table A5.3ba Methods used to help develop staff digital capabilities in relation to accessibility and inclusion. By institution type.**

Ways of developing digital capabilities: staff (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Optional online training	51	88%	30	100%	21	84%	0	0%
Online resources	45	78%	25	83%	18	72%	2	67%
Optional sign-up training	43	74%	25	83%	17	68%	1	33%
Helpdesk	40	69%	21	70%	17	68%	2	67%
Webinars	39	67%	22	73%	17	68%	0	0%
Drop-in clinics or appointments	38	66%	22	73%	14	56%	2	67%
Internal comms	35	60%	19	63%	14	56%	2	67%
Mandatory online training	15	26%	8	27%	7	28%	0	0%
Social media	13	22%	8	27%	5	20%	0	0%
Mandatory training	9	16%	6	20%	2	8%	1	33%
Other steps	2	3%	1	3%	1	4%	0	0%
No steps taken	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%

**Table A5.3bb Methods used to help develop staff digital capabilities in relation to accessibility and inclusion. By country.**

Ways of developing digital capabilities: staff (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Optional online training	51	88%	42	86%	4	100%	3	100%	2	100%
Online resources	45	78%	37	76%	4	100%	2	67%	2	100%
Optional sign-up training	43	74%	37	76%	3	75%	1	33%	2	100%
Helpdesk	40	69%	33	67%	3	75%	3	100%	1	50%
Webinars	39	67%	32	65%	3	75%	2	67%	2	100%
Drop-in clinics or appointments	38	66%	32	65%	3	75%	1	33%	2	100%
Internal comms	35	60%	28	57%	3	75%	3	100%	1	50%
Mandatory online training	15	26%	13	27%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%
Social media	13	22%	12	24%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
Mandatory training	9	16%	8	16%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%
Other steps	2	3%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No steps taken	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A5.3bc Methods used to help develop staff digital capabilities in relation to accessibility and inclusion. By size.**

Ways of developing digital capabilities: staff (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Optional online training	51	88%	9	75%	20	87%	22	96%
Online resources	45	78%	8	67%	19	83%	18	78%
Optional sign-up training	43	74%	6	50%	16	70%	21	91%
Helpdesk	40	69%	9	75%	18	78%	13	57%
Webinars	39	67%	4	33%	16	70%	19	83%
Drop-in clinics or appointments	38	66%	7	58%	16	70%	15	65%
Internal comms	35	60%	6	50%	13	57%	16	70%
Mandatory online training	15	26%	2	17%	8	35%	5	22%
Social media	13	22%	0	0%	6	26%	7	30%
Mandatory training	9	16%	2	17%	2	9%	5	22%
Other steps	2	3%	0	0%	1	4%	1	4%
No steps taken	1	2%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%

**Question 5.4 Does the institution consider accessibility and inclusion in the areas listed below?**

**Table A5.4aa Accessibility and inclusion considered in procurement of digital systems and software. By institution type.**

Accessibility and inclusion considered in procurement of digital systems and software (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes	52	90%	26	87%	24	96%	2	67%
No, but working towards this	5	9%	3	10%	1	4%	1	33%
No	1	2%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A5.4ab Accessibility and inclusion considered in procurement of digital systems and software. By country.**

Accessibility and inclusion considered in procurement of digital systems and software (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	52	90%	43	88%	4	100%	3	100%	2	100%
No, but working towards this	5	9%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A5.4ac Accessibility and inclusion considered in procurement of digital systems and software. By size.**

Accessibility and inclusion considered in procurement of digital systems and software (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes	52	90%	11	92%	21	91%	20	87%
No, but working towards this	5	9%	1	8%	2	9%	2	9%
No	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%

**Table A5.4ba Accessibility and inclusion considered in design and development of new programmes and modules. By institution type.**

Accessibility and inclusion considered in design and development of new programmes and modules (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes	48	83%	26	87%	20	80%	2	67%
No, but working towards this	10	17%	4	13%	5	20%	1	33%
No	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A5.4bb Accessibility and inclusion considered in design and development of new programmes and modules. By country.**

Accessibility and inclusion considered in design and development of new programmes and modules (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	48	83%	39	80%	4	100%	3	100%	2	100%
No, but working towards this	10	17%	10	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A5.4bc Accessibility and inclusion considered in design and development of new programmes and modules. By size.**

Accessibility and inclusion considered in design and development of new programmes and modules (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes	48	83%	9	75%	21	91%	18	78%
No, but working towards this	10	17%	3	25%	2	9%	5	22%
No	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A5.4ca Accessibility and inclusion considered in production of external facing documents. By institution type.**

Accessibility and inclusion considered in production of external facing documents (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes	46	79%	24	80%	20	80%	2	67%
No, but working towards this	9	16%	6	20%	2	8%	1	33%
No	3	5%	0	0%	3	12%	0	0%

**Table A5.4cb Accessibility and inclusion considered in production of external facing documents. By country.**

Accessibility and inclusion considered in production of external facing documents (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	46	79%	38	78%	3	75%	3	100%	2	100%
No, but working towards this	9	16%	8	16%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
No	3	5%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A5.4cc Accessibility and inclusion considered in production of external facing documents. By size.**

Accessibility and inclusion considered in production of external facing documents (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes	46	79%	11	92%	19	83%	16	70%
No, but working towards this	9	16%	1	8%	2	9%	6	26%
No	3	5%	0	0%	2	9%	1	4%

**Table A5.4da Accessibility and inclusion considered in production of in-house templates/documents. By institution type.**

Accessibility and inclusion considered in production of in-house templates/documents (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes	42	72%	22	73%	18	72%	2	67%
No, but working towards this	11	19%	7	23%	3	12%	1	33%
No	5	9%	1	3%	4	16%	0	0%

**Table A5.4db Accessibility and inclusion considered in production of in-house templates/documents. By country.**

Accessibility and inclusion considered in production of in-house templates/documents (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	42	72%	35	71%	3	75%	3	100%	1	50%
No, but working towards this	11	19%	10	20%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
No	5	9%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%

**Table A5.4dc Accessibility and inclusion considered in production of in-house templates/documents. By size.**

Accessibility and inclusion considered in production of in-house templates/documents (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes	42	72%	10	83%	17	74%	15	65%
No, but working towards this	11	19%	2	17%	3	13%	6	26%
No	5	9%	0	0%	3	13%	2	9%

**Table A5.4ea Accessibility and inclusion considered in staff recruitment, e.g. incorporation into job descriptions. By institution type.**

Accessibility and inclusion considered in staff recruitment, e.g. incorporation into job descriptions (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes	37	64%	19	63%	17	68%	1	33%
No, but working towards this	9	16%	7	23%	1	4%	1	33%
No	12	21%	4	13%	7	28%	1	33%

**Table A5.4eb Accessibility and inclusion considered in production of staff recruitment, e.g. incorporation into job descriptions. By country.**

Accessibility and inclusion considered in staff recruitment, e.g. incorporation into job descriptions (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	37	64%	31	63%	2	50%	2	67%	2	100%
No, but working towards this	9	16%	8	16%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%
No	12	21%	10	20%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A5.4ec Accessibility and inclusion considered in staff recruitment, e.g. incorporation into job descriptions. By size.**

Accessibility and inclusion considered in staff recruitment, e.g. incorporation into job descriptions (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes	37	64%	7	58%	14	61%	16	70%
No, but working towards this	9	16%	3	25%	3	13%	3	13%
No	12	21%	2	17%	6	26%	4	17%

**Question 5.5 Does your institution formally assess or benchmark its progression on accessibility and inclusion over time or across departments?**

**Table A5.5a Whether institutions formally assess or benchmark progression on accessibility and inclusion over time or across departments. By institution type.**

Assessing/benchmarking of progress (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes	27	47%	14	47%	12	48%	1	33%
Have tried, but do not do so regularly	17	29%	8	27%	9	36%	0	0%
No	14	24%	8	27%	4	16%	2	67%

**Table A5.5b Whether institutions formally assess or benchmark progression on accessibility and inclusion over time or across departments. By country.**

Assessing/benchmarking of progress (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	27	47%	22	45%	2	50%	2	67%	1	50%
Have tried, but do not do so regularly	17	29%	14	29%	1	25%	1	33%	1	50%
No	14	24%	13	27%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A5.5c Whether institutions formally assess or benchmark progression on accessibility and inclusion over time or across departments. By size.**

Assessing/benchmarking of progress (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes	27	47%	6	50%	10	43%	11	48%
Have tried, but do not do so regularly	17	29%	2	17%	9	39%	6	26%

No	14	24%	4	33%	4	17%	6	26%
----	----	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----

**Question 5.6 Has your institution claimed disproportionate burden in relation to any aspect of accessibility (as outlined in PSBAR 2018 Regulations)?**

**Table A5.6a Whether institutions have claimed disproportionate burden in relation to accessibility. By institution type.**

Disproportionate burden (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
No	47	81%	24	80%	20	80%	3	100%
Yes	11	19%	6	20%	5	20%	0	0%

**Table A5.6b Whether institutions have claimed disproportionate burden in relation to accessibility. By country.**

Disproportionate burden (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
No	47	81%	39	80%	3	75%	3	100%	2	100%
Yes	11	19%	10	20%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A5.6c Whether institutions have claimed disproportionate burden in relation to accessibility. By size.**

Disproportionate burden (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
No	47	81%	10	83%	18	78%	19	83%
Yes	11	19%	2	17%	5	22%	4	17%



## Section 6: Support for Digital Education Development

**Question 6.1** For each of the following activities, how many staff do you have providing support for this area and which team/department takes the lead?

**Table A6.1a** Staff FTE associated with supporting digital education.

FTE staff supporting digital education (Base: All respondents (51))	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Mode	Median
TEL end user support (e.g. training and guidance)	8.60	1	33	3	6
Pedagogic advice and guidance on using TEL	7.55	1	32	5	5
Learning design and programme development	6.67	0	33	2	4
Digital capabilities support for staff	6.00	0	35	3	4
TEL technical support (e.g. system administrator, developer)	5.28	0	32	2	3
Generative Artificial Intelligence	4.56	0	32	1	2
Physical learning spaces (e.g. design and support of active learning spaces, hybrid learning spaces)	4.49	0	15	4	4
Digital Accessibility	4.39	0	32	1	2
Digital capabilities support for students	4.03	0	32	1	2.5
Assistive technologies	3.29	0	32	1	2
Learning analytics	1.76	0	10	1	1

**Table A6.1b** Mean staff FTE associated with supporting digital education. By size.

FTE staff supporting digital education (Base: All respondents)	Mean			
	Total	Small	Medium	Large
	(51)	(11)	(22)	(18)
TEL end user support (e.g. training and guidance)	8.60	3.74	7.49	12.94
Pedagogic advice and guidance on using TEL	7.55	4.28	6.08	11.27
Learning design and programme development	6.67	3.50	5.48	9.94
Digital capabilities support for staff	6.00	4.84	6.32	6.42
TEL technical support (e.g. system administrator, developer)	5.28	2.68	4.51	7.91
Generative Artificial Intelligence	4.56	2.25	4.21	7.14
Physical learning spaces (e.g. design and support of active learning spaces, hybrid learning spaces)	4.49	5.44	4.87	3.46
Digital Accessibility	4.39	4.00	3.60	5.51
Digital capabilities support for students	4.03	3.84	5.19	2.84
Assistive technologies	3.29	2.80	2.60	4.39
Learning analytics	1.76	1.44	1.04	2.65

**Table A6.1c Mode of staff FTE associated with supporting digital education. By size.**

FTE staff supporting digital education (Base: All respondents)	Mode			
	Total	Small	Medium	Large
	(51)	(11)	(22)	(18)
Pedagogic advice and guidance on using TEL	5	1	6	5
Physical learning spaces (e.g. design and support of active learning spaces, hybrid learning spaces)	4	0	2	4
TEL end user support (e.g. training and guidance)	3	3	6	7
Digital capabilities support for staff	3	3	7	5
TEL technical support (e.g. system administrator, developer)	2	2	4	4
Learning design and programme development	2	10	2	5
Digital Accessibility	1	3	1	1
Assistive technologies	1	4	1	1
Digital capabilities support for students	1	0	1	2
Learning analytics	1	2	1	3
Generative Artificial Intelligence	1	0	0.5	N/A

**Table A6.1d Median of staff FTE associated with supporting digital education. By size.**

FTE staff supporting digital education (Base: All respondents)	Median			
	Total	Small	Medium	Large
	(51)	(11)	(22)	(18)
TEL end user support (e.g. training and guidance)	6.0	3.0	6.0	11.0
Pedagogic advice and guidance on using TEL	5.0	3.0	6.0	6.2
Digital capabilities support for staff	4.0	3.0	5.0	4.7
Learning design and programme development	4.0	2.5	4.0	5.0
Physical learning spaces (e.g. design and support of active learning spaces, hybrid learning spaces)	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.5
TEL technical support (e.g. system administrator, developer)	3.0	2.0	3.0	4.0
Digital capabilities support for students	2.5	2.2	3.0	2.0
Digital Accessibility	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
Assistive technologies	2.0	3.5	1.0	1.5
Generative Artificial Intelligence	2.0	2.0	1.5	5.0
Learning analytics	1.0	1.5	1.0	2.5

**Table A6.1e Teams responsible for TEL technical support. By size.**

TEL technical support (e.g. system administrator, developer) (Base: All respondents)	Total		Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(55)		(12)		(22)		(27)	
IT	20	36%	2	17%	8	36%	10	37%
Digital Education	19	35%	7	58%	6	27%	10	37%
Joint	8	15%	1	8%	4	18%	3	11%
Academic Development	4	7%	1	8%	2	9%	2	7%

Library	2	4%	1	8%	1	5%	1	4%
No response	2	4%	0	0%	1	5%	1	4%

**Table A6.1f Teams responsible for TEL end user support. By size.**

TEL end user support (e.g. training and guidance) (Base: all respondents)	Total		Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(55)		(12)		(22)		(27)	
Digital Education	37	67%	10	83%	14	64%	17	63%
Academic Development	9	16%	1	8%	3	14%	6	22%
Joint	4	7%	0	0%	2	9%	2	7%
IT	3	5%	0	0%	2	9%	1	4%
Library	2	4%	1	8%	1	5%	1	4%

**Table A6.1g Teams responsible for Pedagogic advice and guidance on using TEL. By size.**

Pedagogic advice and guidance on using TEL (Base: all respondents)	Total		Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(55)		(12)		(22)		(27)	
Digital Education	32	58%	9	75%	9	41%	18	67%
Academic Development	13	24%	2	17%	7	32%	5	19%
Joint	7	13%	0	0%	5	23%	2	7%
Library	1	2%	1	8%	0	0%	1	4%
IT	1	2%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%
No response	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%

**Table A6.1h Teams responsible for Learning design and programme development. By size.**

Learning design and programme development (Base: all respondents)	Total		Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(55)		(12)		(22)		(27)	
Academic Development	21	38%	20	25%	9	41%	11	41%
Digital Education	18	33%	18	58%	5	23%	9	33%
Joint	5	9%	6	0%	1	5%	4	15%
HR/Organisational development	1	2%	1	0%	0	0%	1	4%
Other	3	5%	3	0%	3	14%	0	0%
None	2	4%	2	8%	1	5%	1	4%
No response	5	9%	5	8%	3	14%	1	4%

**Table A6.1i Teams responsible for Digital capabilities support for staff. By size.**

Digital capabilities support for staff (Base: all respondents)	Total		Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(55)		(12)		(22)		(27)	
Digital Education	17	31%	6	50%	7	32%	8	30%
Joint	16	29%	1	8%	6	27%	9	33%
IT	6	11%	1	8%	2	9%	3	11%
Academic Development	4	7%	0	0%	2	9%	2	7%
Library	2	4%	0	0%	1	5%	1	4%
Other	2	4%	1	8%	0	0%	2	7%
HR/Organisational development	1	2%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%
None	1	2%	1	8%	0	0%	1	4%
No response	6	11%	1	8%	4	18%	1	4%

**Table A6.1j Teams responsible for Digital capabilities support for students. By size.**

Digital capabilities support for students (Base: all respondents)	Total		Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(55)		(12)		(22)		(27)	
Joint	10	18%	2	17%	5	23%	3	11%
Digital Education	9	16%	4	33%	3	14%	4	15%
Library	6	11%	1	8%	3	14%	3	11%
IT	6	11%	0	0%	3	14%	3	11%
Academic/Study skills	5	9%	0	0%	3	14%	2	7%
Academic Development	2	4%	1	8%	0	0%	2	7%
Other	2	4%	1	8%	0	0%	1	4%
Disability support	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%
None	7	13%	2	17%	1	5%	6	22%
No response	7	13%	1	8%	4	18%	2	7%

**Table A6.1k Teams responsible for Digital Accessibility. By size.**

Digital Accessibility (Base: all respondents)	Total		Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(55)		(12)		(22)		(27)	
Digital Education	20	36%	6	50%	6	27%	10	37%
Joint	11	20%	0	0%	7	32%	4	15%
IT	6	11%	1	8%	2	9%	4	15%
No response	5	9%	3	25%	2	9%	1	4%
Library	4	7%	1	8%	2	9%	2	7%
Academic Development	4	7%	1	8%	1	5%	3	11%
Disability support	3	5%	0	0%	2	9%	1	4%
None	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%

Other	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%
-------	---	----	---	----	---	----	---	----

**Table A6.1l Teams responsible for Assistive technologies. By size.**

Assistive technologies (Base: all respondents)	Total		Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(55)		(12)		(22)		(27)	
Disability support	14	25%	2	17%	5	23%	8	30%
Joint	12	22%	2	17%	5	23%	6	22%
Student support	8	15%	3	25%	3	14%	4	15%
Digital Education	5	9%	3	25%	0	0%	3	11%
Library	3	5%	0	0%	3	14%	0	0%
IT	2	4%	0	0%	1	5%	1	4%
None	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	2	7%
Academic Development	1	2%	1	8%	0	0%	1	4%
No response	8	15%	1	8%	5	23%	2	7%

**Table A6.1m Teams responsible for Physical learning spaces (e.g. design and support of active learning spaces, hybrid learning spaces). By size.**

Physical learning spaces (Base: all respondents)	Total		Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(55)		(12)		(22)		(27)	
Joint	20	36%	3	25%	11	50%	7	26%
IT	13	24%	3	25%	4	18%	9	33%
Other	6	11%	2	17%	0	0%	5	19%
Estates	3	5%	1	8%	1	5%	1	4%
Library	1	2%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%
Academic Development	1	2%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%
None	1	2%	1	8%	0	0%	1	4%
No response	10	18%	2	17%	4	18%	4	15%

**Table A6.1n Teams responsible for Learning analytics. By size.**

Learning analytics (Base: all respondents)	Total		Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(55)		(12)		(22)		(27)	
No response	14	25%	1	8%	10	45%	3	11%
Digital Education	11	20%	4	33%	3	14%	7	26%
IT	8	15%	3	25%	2	9%	5	19%
Other	8	15%	1	8%	3	14%	4	15%
Joint	7	13%	0	0%	3	14%	4	15%
Student support	4	7%	2	17%	0	0%	2	7%
None	2	4%	1	8%	1	5%	1	4%



**Table A6.1o Teams responsible for Generative Artificial Intelligence. By size.**

Generative Artificial Intelligence (Base: all respondents)	Total		Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(55)		(12)		(22)		(27)	
No response	16	29%	4	33%	5	23%	8	30%
Joint	12	22%	1	8%	6	27%	5	19%
Academic Development	11	20%	1	8%	6	27%	5	19%
Digital Education	9	16%	3	25%	3	14%	5	19%
None	3	5%	2	17%	0	0%	3	11%
Other	3	5%	1	8%	1	5%	1	4%
IT	1	2%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%

**Question 6.2 What changes in staff provision for supporting digital education, if any, have been made over the last two years?**

**Table A6.2a Staffing changes made over the last two years. By institution type.**

Changes in staffing provision (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Increase in the number of staff	25	43%	16	53%	9	36%	0	0%
Restructure of departments	25	43%	12	40%	12	48%	1	33%
Recruitment delay/freeze	22	38%	11	37%	11	44%	0	0%
Reduction in the number of staff	19	33%	10	33%	9	36%	0	0%
Change of existing roles/incorporation of other duties	15	26%	8	27%	7	28%	0	0%
Increase in the number of fixed-term staff	14	24%	10	33%	4	16%	0	0%
No changes	13	22%	6	20%	5	20%	2	67%
Increase in the number of temporary staff for emergency cover	8	14%	5	17%	3	12%	0	0%

**Table A6.2b Staffing changes made over the last two years. By country.**

Changes in staffing provision. (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Increase in the number of staff	25	43%	21	43%	1	25%	2	67%	1	50%
Restructure of departments	25	43%	23	47%	1	25%	0	0%	1	50%
Recruitment delay/freeze	22	38%	19	39%	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%
Reduction in the number of staff	19	33%	16	33%	2	50%	1	33%	0	0%

Table A6.2b (continued).

Changes in staffing provision. (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Change of existing roles/incorporation of other duties	15	26%	14	29%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
Increase in the number of fixed-term staff	14	24%	12	24%	1	25%	1	33%	0	0%
No changes	13	22%	11	22%	0	0%	1	33%	1	50%
Increase in the number of temporary staff for emergency cover	8	14%	7	14%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%

Table A6.2c Staffing changes made over the last two years. By size.

Changes in staffing provision (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Increase in the number of staff	25	43%	4	33%	9	39%	12	52%
Restructure of departments	25	43%	8	67%	7	30%	10	43%
Recruitment delay/freeze	22	38%	3	25%	10	43%	9	39%
Reduction in the number of staff	19	33%	2	17%	8	35%	9	39%
Change of existing roles/incorporation of other duties	15	26%	2	17%	6	26%	7	30%
Increase in the number of fixed-term staff	14	24%	1	8%	8	35%	5	22%
No changes	13	22%	3	25%	5	22%	5	22%
Increase in the number of temporary staff for emergency cover	8	14%	2	17%	4	17%	2	9%



**Question 6.4 Do you foresee changes in the staffing provision for supporting digital education in the near future?**

**Table A6.4a Staffing changes foreseen in the near future. By institution type**

Staffing changes foreseen in near future (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Anticipate change, but unsure as to how it might change	25	43%	13	43%	11	44%	1	33%
Change of existing roles/incorporation of other duties	24	41%	14	47%	10	40%	0	0%
Recruitment delay/freeze	22	38%	11	37%	11	44%	0	0%
Currently reviewing staffing provisions	17	29%	8	27%	8	32%	1	33%
Restructure of departments / TEL provisions	14	24%	11	37%	3	12%	0	0%
Increase in the number of fixed-term staff	12	21%	8	27%	4	16%	0	0%
Increase in the number of staff	11	19%	7	23%	2	8%	2	67%
Reduction in the number of staff	10	17%	6	20%	4	16%	0	0%
Do not foresee any changes in staffing provision in the near future	7	12%	4	13%	3	12%	0	0%
Increase in the number of temporary staff for emergency cover	6	10%	3	10%	3	12%	0	0%
Other	6	10%	4	13%	2	8%	0	0%
Convert existing temporary/fixed-term staff to permanent staff	5	9%	4	13%	1	4%	0	0%

**Table A6.4b Staffing changes foreseen in near future. By country.**

Staffing changes foreseen in near future (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Anticipate change, but unsure as to how it might change	25	43%	18	37%	3	75%	2	67%	2	100%
Change of existing roles/incorporation of other duties	24	41%	21	43%	2	50%	0	0%	1	50%
Recruitment delay/freeze	22	38%	20	41%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Currently reviewing staffing provisions	17	29%	14	29%	2	50%	0	0%	1	50%
Restructure of departments / TEL provisions	14	24%	12	24%	1	25%	0	0%	1	50%
Increase in the number of fixed-term staff	12	21%	11	22%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%

Increase in the number of staff	11	19%	9	18%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%
---------------------------------	----	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	----	---	----

**Table A6.4b (continued).**

Staffing changes foreseen in near future (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Reduction in the number of staff	10	17%	9	18%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Do not foresee any changes in staffing provision in the near future	7	12%	6	12%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%
Increase in the number of temporary staff for emergency cover	6	10%	5	10%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	6	10%	5	10%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Convert existing temporary/fixed-term staff to permanent staff	5	9%	4	8%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A6.4c Staffing changes foreseen in the near future. By size**

Staffing changes foresee in near future (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Anticipate change, but unsure as to how it might change	25	43%	6	50%	9	39%	10	43%
Change of existing roles/incorporation of other duties	24	41%	2	17%	12	52%	10	43%
Recruitment delay/freeze	22	38%	3	25%	11	48%	8	35%
Currently reviewing staffing provisions	17	29%	4	33%	6	26%	7	30%
Restructure of departments / TEL provisions	14	24%	1	8%	6	26%	7	30%
Increase in the number of fixed-term staff	12	21%	2	17%	5	22%	5	22%
Increase in the number of staff	11	19%	4	33%	2	9%	5	22%
Reduction in the number of staff	10	17%	0	0%	4	17%	6	26%
Do not foresee any changes in staffing provision in the near future	7	12%	1	8%	2	9%	4	17%
Increase in the number of temporary staff for emergency cover	6	10%	2	17%	3	13%	1	4%
Other	6	10%	0	0%	3	13%	3	13%
Convert existing temporary/fixed-term staff to permanent staff	5	9%	1	8%	3	13%	1	4%

## Section 7: Looking to the Future

**Question 7.1** Listed below are potential barriers to any (further) development of processes to promote and support digital education. What, in your opinion, might be the barriers in your institution over the coming years?

**Table A7.1a** Potential barriers to any (further) development of processes to promote and support digital education. By institution type.

Potential barriers to processes to promote and support digital education (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Lack of time	3.74	1	3.70	1	3.76	1	4.00	1
Lack of internal sources of funding to support development	3.22	2	3.17	=2	3.28	2	3.33	=3
Competing strategic initiatives	3.19	3	3.17	=2	3.16	3	3.67	2
Departmental/school culture	2.98	4	3.10	4	2.92	=5	2.33	=15
Lack of academic staff knowledge	2.90	5	2.87	6	2.92	=5	3.00	=7
Lack of awareness of available support	2.86	6	2.73	9	3.04	4	2.67	=12
Lack of academic staff commitment	2.72	7	2.77	=7	2.60	10	3.33	=3
Lack of external sources of funding	2.69	8	2.63	=10	2.68	9	3.33	=3
Institutional culture	2.66	=9	2.90	5	2.44	=13	2.00	=17
Changing administrative processes	2.66	=9	2.47	=12	2.84	7	3.00	=7
Lack of incentives	2.66	=9	2.77	=7	2.52	11	2.67	=12
Lack of academic staff development opportunities	2.59	12	2.63	=10	2.44	=13	3.33	=3
Lack of access to support staff	2.57	13	2.40	15	2.76	8	2.67	=12
Lack of availability of suitable physical and/or virtual space	2.45	14	2.47	=12	2.36	15	3.00	=7
Organisational structure	2.36	15	2.43	14	2.20	16	3.00	=7
Lack of access to/capacity of infrastructure	2.34	16	2.27	16	2.48	12	2.00	=17
Technical and infrastructure limitations	2.07	17	2.10	18	2.08	19	1.67	=19
Lack of strategy and leadership	2.03	18	1.93	19	2.12	=17	2.33	=15
Inappropriate policies and procedures	2.02	19	2.13	17	1.76	20	3.00	=7
Lack of access to appropriate kit	1.95	20	1.87	20	2.12	=17	1.33	21
Other technical problems	1.38	21	1.27	21	1.48	21	1.67	=19

**Table A7.1b Potential barriers to any (further) development of processes to promote and support digital education. By country.**

Potential barriers to processes to promote and support digital education (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Lack of time	3.74	1	3.73	1	3.50	1	4.00	1	4.00	=1
Lack of internal sources of funding to support development	3.22	2	3.18	3	3.25	=2	3.67	2	3.50	=10
Competing strategic initiatives	3.19	3	3.20	2	3.25	=2	2.67	=7	3.50	=10
Departmental/school culture	2.98	4	2.98	4	2.75	=7	3.00	=3	3.50	=10
Lack of academic staff knowledge	2.90	5	2.88	=5	2.75	=7	2.67	=7	4.00	=1
Lack of awareness of available support	2.86	6	2.88	=5	2.50	=10	2.67	=7	3.50	=10
Lack of academic staff commitment	2.72	7	2.65	8	3.25	=2	2.33	=14	4.00	=1
Lack of external sources of funding	2.69	8	2.63	=9	2.50	=10	3.00	=3	4.00	=1
Institutional culture	2.66	=9	2.61	=11	2.25	=13	3.00	=3	4.00	=1
Changing administrative processes	2.66	=9	2.69	7	1.75	=17	2.67	=7	3.50	=10
Lack of incentives	2.66	=9	2.63	=9	3.00	=5	2.33	=14	3.00	=18
Lack of academic staff development opportunities	2.59	12	2.53	13	2.75	=7	3.00	=3	3.00	=18
Lack of access to support staff	2.57	13	2.61	=11	1.75	=17	2.67	=7	3.00	=18
Lack of availability of suitable physical and/or virtual space	2.45	14	2.45	=14	3.00	=5	0.67	=19	4.00	=1
Organisational structure	2.36	15	2.45	=14	1.00	20	2.00	16	3.50	=10
Lack of access to/capacity of infrastructure	2.34	16	2.31	16	2.50	=10	1.67	=17	4.00	=1
Technical and infrastructure limitations	2.07	17	2.06	17	2.25	=13	0.67	=19	4.00	=1
Lack of strategy and leadership	2.03	18	1.98	18	1.50	19	2.67	=7	3.50	=10
Inappropriate policies and procedures	2.02	19	1.90	20	2.25	=13	2.67	=7	3.50	=10

Lack of access to appropriate kit	1.95	20	1.94	19	2.00	16	0.67	=19	4.00	=1
Other technical problems	1.38	21	1.41	21	0.75	21	1.67	=17	1.50	21

**Table A7.1c Potential barriers to any (further) development of processes to promote and support digital education over. By size.**

Potential barriers to processes to promote and support digital education (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Lack of time	3.74	1	3.75	1	3.83	1	3.65	1
Lack of internal sources of funding to support development	3.22	2	3.42	3	3.39	2	2.96	4
Competing strategic initiatives	3.19	3	3.50	2	3.30	3	2.91	5
Departmental/school culture	2.98	4	2.75	=9	3.04	4	3.04	=2
Lack of academic staff knowledge	2.90	5	2.83	=7	2.96	6	2.87	6
Lack of awareness of available support	2.86	6	2.75	=9	3.00	5	2.78	=7
Lack of academic staff commitment	2.72	7	3.00	=4	2.52	11	2.78	=7
Lack of external sources of funding	2.69	8	3.00	=4	2.48	12	2.74	=9
Institutional culture	2.66	=9	2.50	=13	2.35	14	3.04	=2
Changing administrative processes	2.66	=9	2.50	=13	2.65	8	2.74	=9
Lack of incentives	2.66	=9	2.58	=11	2.61	9	2.74	=9
Lack of academic staff development opportunities	2.59	12	2.92	6	2.57	10	2.43	14
Lack of access to support staff	2.57	13	2.25	18	2.70	7	2.61	=12
Lack of availability of suitable physical and/or virtual space	2.45	14	2.83	=7	2.39	13	2.30	=16
Organisational structure	2.36	15	2.42	16	2.09	16	2.61	=12
Lack of access to/capacity of infrastructure	2.34	16	2.33	17	2.30	15	2.39	15
Technical and infrastructure limitations	2.07	17	2.50	=13	1.74	18	2.17	18
Lack of strategy and leadership	2.03	18	2.17	19	1.70	19	2.30	=16
Inappropriate policies and procedures	2.02	19	2.58	=11	1.61	20	2.13	19
Lack of access to appropriate kit	1.95	20	2.00	20	1.87	17	2.00	20
Other technical problems	1.38	21	1.75	21	1.09	21	1.48	21

**Question 7.2 Which key initiatives focusing on developing digital education (e.g. new TEL tools, additional support for digital capability and accessibility) does your institution plan to proactively implement or to investigate in the next two years?**

**Table A7.2a Key initiatives focusing on developing digital education institutions plan to proactively implement in the next two years.**

Implement in next two years	%
	(48)
Generative AI tools, training, policy and curriculum development	27%
New digital assessment services (e.g. proctoring, EMA, digital exams)	21%
None	19%
Digital capability developments and support for staff and students	17%
Accessibility improvements (including staff training)	13%
Curriculum developments and transformation	10%
Support new VLE implementation	10%
e-Portfolio solution	6%
Support for new online courses	6%
CPD development and non-HE online courses	6%
Audience response and polling tools	6%
Implement digitally enhanced learning, teaching and assessment strategy	6%
Improving dataflows through and from TEL tools	6%
Module evaluation	4%
Increase amount of online teaching	4%
Improve end-to-end usability and student user experience	4%
VLE upgrade/development	4%
MS Teams and Office for students	4%
Review of all TEL tools	4%
Digital education/student hub	4%
Hyflex teaching	2%
Developing AI strategy	2%
Culture change	2%
Implement Moodle module baseline	2%
Upgrading on-campus infrastructure of teaching spaces	2%
Learner engagement dashboard	2%
Support adoption of LinkedIn Learning	2%
Longitudinal skills portfolio	2%
Lecture capture	2%
Review of digitally enhanced active teaching	2%
Promoting video enhanced learning	2%

**Table A7.2b Key initiatives focusing on developing digital education institutions plan to proactively investigate in the next two years.**

Investigate in next two years	%
	(45)
Generative AI tools	42%
None	31%
Digital assessment (online marking, grading, feedback, exams)	18%
Learning analytics	13%
Collaborative tools (social learning)	9%
AR/VR tools	9%
Staff and student digital capability	9%
Video capture and streaming improvements	7%
e-Portfolio provision	7%
Accessibility audit and support	4%
Accessibility tools (e.g. Ally)	4%
Implementation of university-wide VLE module template	2%
VLE rollout	2%
Review of Turnitin	2%
Virtual proctoring	2%
Hybrid and hyflex delivery	2%
VLE review	2%
Polling tools	2%
Lecture capture policy development	2%
Digital poverty	2%
Digital education strategy & digital transformation	2%
Culture change	2%
Jisc Discovery tool	2%
Campus digital optimisation	2%
Polling systems review	2%
Integration of systems	2%
Partnership with OPM	2%
Team-based learning	2%
Curriculum mapping and management	2%
Improved online experience for postgraduate students	2%
Certification of digital skills development	2%
Digital capabilities tools	2%
MS365 Education	2%

**Question 7.3 Have any recent and prospective developments in digital education started to make new demands upon your institution in terms of the support required by users?**

**Table A7.3a Recent or prospective developments that have started to make new demands. By institution type.**

Recent or prospective developments making demands. (Base: All respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(30)		(25)		(3)	
Yes	50	86%	27	90%	21	84%	2	67%
No	8	14%	3	10%	4	16%	1	33%

**Table A7.3b Recent or prospective developments that have started to make new demands. By country.**

Recent or prospective developments making demands (Base: All respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	N O.	%
	(58)		(49)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Yes	50	86%	41	81%	4	100%	3	100%	2	100%
No	8	14%	8	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A7.3c Recent or prospective developments that have started to make new demands. By size.**

Recent or prospective developments making demands. (Base: All respondents)	Total		Size of Institution					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(58)		(12)		(23)		(23)	
Yes	50	86%	10	83%	21	91%	19	83%
No	8	14%	2	17%	2	9%	4	17%

**Question 7.4 Please enter details of up to three developments that are starting to make new demands in terms of the support required by users – those you think are most important.**

**Table A7.4a Details of the prospective developments that have started to make new demands. By institution type.**

Whether there are any recent or prospective developments making demands. (Base: 47 respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(47)		(26)		(20)		(1)	
Generative AI	41	87%	23	88%	18	90%	0	0%
Digital assessment (inc digital exams)	9	19%	7	27%	2	10%	0	0%
New/replacement systems (e.g. SIS, CRM, VLE)	7	15%	4	15%	2	10%	1	100%
Expanding online learning provision	7	15%	6	23%	1	5%	0	0%
Assessment (authentic, delivery)	3	6%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%
Blended and digitally enabled learning	3	6%	2	8%	1	5%	0	0%
Learning design/content dev	3	6%	1	4%	1	5%	0	0%



Table A7.4a (continued).

Whether there are any recent or prospective developments making demands. (Base: 47 respondents)	Total		Type					
			Pre-92		Post-92		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(47)		(26)		(20)		(1)	
Review DE provision	3	6%	2	8%	0	0%	1	100%
Additional income streams	2	4%	0	0%	2	10%	0	0%
Curriculum portfolio review	2	4%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%
Digital accessibility	2	4%	1	4%	1	5%	0	0%
Learning analytics	2	4%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%
Developing skills in key areas	1	2%	2	8%	0	0%	1	100%
Digital capabilities	1	2%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%
E-portfolios	1	2%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%
Lecture capture	1	2%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%
Lifelong learning	1	2%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%
Old/unsupported devices	1	2%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%
Partnerships	1	2%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%
Self-service support	1	2%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%
Student induction	1	2%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%
System integration	1	2%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%
Transnational education	1	2%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%

Table A7.4b Details of the prospective developments that have started to make new demands. By country

Prospective developments making demands. (Base: 47 respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(47)		(38)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Generative AI	41	87%	33	87%	4	100%	3	100%	1	50%
Digital assessment (inc digital exams)	9	19%	8	21%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
New/replacement systems (e.g. SIS, CRM, VLE)	7	15%	6	16%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Expanding online learning provision	7	15%	5	13%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Assessment (authentic, delivery)	3	6%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
Blended and digitally enabled learning	3	6%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Learning design/content dev	3	6%	2	5%	0	25%	1	33%	0	0%

Review DE provision	3	6%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Additional income streams	2	4%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

**Table A7.4b (continued).**

Prospective developments making demands. (Base: 47 respondents)	Total		Country							
			England		Wales		Scotland		NI	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(47)		(38)		(4)		(3)		(2)	
Curriculum portfolio review	2	4%	1	3%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Digital accessibility	2	4%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Learning analytics	2	4%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Developing skills in key areas	1	2%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Digital capabilities	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
E-portfolios	1	2%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Lecture capture	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
Lifelong learning	1	2%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	500%
Old/unsupported devices	1	2%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Partnerships	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
Self-service support	1	2%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Student induction	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%
System integration	1	2%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	00%
Transnational education	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%

**Table A7.4c Details of prospective developments that have started to make new demands. By size**

Whether there are any recent or prospective developments making demands. (Base: 47 respondents)	Total		Type					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(47)		(8)		(21)		(18)	
Generative AI	41	87%	7	88%	20	95%	14	78%
Digital assessment (inc digital exams)	9	19%	1	13%	3	14%	5	28%
New/replacement systems (e.g. SIS, CRM, VLE)	7	15%	1	13%	3	14%	3	17%
Expanding online learning provision	7	15%	1	13%	2	10%	4	22%
Assessment (authentic, delivery)	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3	17%
Blended and digitally enabled learning	3	6%	1	13%	1	5%	1	6%
Learning design/content dev	3	6%	0	0%	2	10%	0	0%
Review DE provision	3	6%	2	25%	0	0%	1	6%
Additional income streams	2	4%	0	0%	2	10%	0	0%
Curriculum portfolio review	2	4%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%

Digital accessibility	2	4%	0	0%	1	5%	1	6%
Learning analytics	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%
Developing skills in key areas	1	2%	2	25%	1	5%	0	0%

**Table A7.4c (continued).**

Whether there are any recent or prospective developments making demands. (Base: 47 respondents)	Total		Type					
			Small		Medium		Large	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(47)		(8)		(21)		(18)	
Digital capabilities	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%
E-portfolios	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	2	11%
Lecture capture	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%
Lifelong learning	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%
Old/unsupported devices	1	2%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%
Partnerships	1	2%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%
Self-service support	1	2%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%
Student induction	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%
System integration	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%
Transnational education	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%

**UCISA**

Postal Address:  
Ruskin College  
Dunstan Road,  
Oxford  
OX3 9BZ

Email: [admin@ucisa.ac.uk](mailto:admin@ucisa.ac.uk)  
[www.ucisa.ac.uk](http://www.ucisa.ac.uk)

Registered Company No. 09349804