ESCP Europe London campus

Review for Educational Oversight by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education

October 2012

Key findings about ESCP Europe London Campus

As a result of its Review for Educational Oversight carried out in October 2012, the QAA review team (the team) considers that there can be **confidence** in how the provider manages its stated responsibilities for the standards of the awards it offers on behalf of City University.

The team was able to conclude that the provider manages its responsibilities for the management of academic standards on its study abroad programmes, as set out in agreements with its accrediting and validating bodies.

The team also considers that there can be **confidence** in how the provider manages its stated responsibilities for the quality and enhancement of the learning opportunities it offers on behalf of this awarding body and these accrediting and validating bodies.

The team considers that **reliance can** be placed on the accuracy and completeness of the information that the provider is responsible for publishing about itself and the programmes it delivers.

Good practice

The team has identified the following **good practice**:

- the robust deliberative and reporting structures for higher education (paragraph 1.4)
- responsiveness to student feedback (paragraphs 2.2, 2.8, 2.15 and 3.4)
- the management of teaching blocks and activities in London (paragraph 2.5)
- support for internships (paragraph 2.9)
- the use of the online discussion forums and assessment facilities (paragraph 2.17)
- the high quality and comprehensive scope of public information (paragraphs 2.6, 3.1 and 3.2).

Recommendations

The team has also identified a number of **recommendations** for the enhancement of the higher education provision.

The team considers that it is **advisable** for the provider to:

- implement consistent external moderation for the approval of coursework assignment and projects (paragraph 1.7)
- implement the proposed revised internal moderation process (paragraph 1.8)
- improve the transparency and consistency of assessment feedback across the School (paragraph 2.7).

The team considers that it would be **desirable** for the provider to:

- further develop the draft Academic Staff Quality Handbook to ensure that it aligns with relevant external reference points (paragraphs 1.5 and 2.3)
- extend peer observation of teaching across all staff (paragraph 2.6)
- formalise support for the professional development of staff as educators (paragraphs 2.12 and 2.14).

About this report

This report presents the findings of the [Review for Educational Oversight](1) (REO) conducted by [QAA](#) at ESCP Europe (London campus) (the provider; the School). The purpose of the review is to provide public information about how the provider discharges its stated responsibilities for the management and delivery of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities available to students. The review applies to programmes of study that the provider delivers on behalf of City University and the study abroad provisions of ESCP Europe master's programmes validated in France and Germany. The review was carried out by Dr Colin Fryer, Professor Chris Hudson, Dr Hayley Randle (reviewers), and Dr John Hurley (coordinator).

The review team conducted the review in agreement with the provider and in accordance with the [*Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook*](2) [2] Evidence in support of the review included documentation supplied by the provider and its awarding body, and meetings with staff, students and an internship provider.

The review team also considered the provider's use of the relevant external reference points:

- the Academic Infrastructure
- the national reference points for degree-awarding organisations in France and Germany specified by:
  - in France: the Ministry of Education
  - in Germany: the Berlin Senate
- requirements of international accrediting bodies for the business sector:
  - Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business
  - Association of Masters in Business Administration
  - European Quality Improvement System.

Please note that if you are unfamiliar with any of the terms used in this report you can find them in the [Glossary](#).

ESCP Europe (the School) is a pan-European business school with campuses in five cities: Paris, London, Berlin, Madrid and Turin. It is formally a part of the Chambre de Commerce et d'Industrie de Paris. It has degree-awarding powers in Paris and Berlin and validation agreements with universities in London, Turin and Madrid. In the UK, the School is a full member of the Association of Business Schools and is a registered charity for the delivery of higher education. The Charity's objectives are to advance the education of the public in the science and practice of professional management in a European context, to conduct study and research into professional management and related subjects in a European context, and to publish the useful results of such study and research.

The London campus of the School is based in Hampstead, North London, in substantial Victorian buildings, which were formerly a seminary. The School, which was established in Oxford in 1973, moved to the current campus in 2004. It provides a full range of study facilities for students. Because of the flexible nature of the study programmes, the number of students on campus varies slightly, but at the time of the review there were 270 full-time master's students studying at the School. EU students form over 95 per cent of the intake. Programmes generally last between 18 months and two years, and involve study in more than one European country. The qualifications lead to a higher number of European Credit points than normal UK master's degrees.

---

[1] www.qaa.ac.uk/InstitutionReports/types-of-review/tier-4.
[2] www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/informationandguidance/pages/reo-handbook.aspx.

At the time of the review, the provider offered the following higher education programmes, listed with their awarding body and accrediting and validating bodies:

- Master's in Management (validated as the European Master's in Management by City University, and in Paris, Berlin, Madrid and Turin) (205 students)
- Master's in European Business (validated in Paris and Berlin) (65 students)
- ESCP Europe Diploma - Master's in Marketing and Creativity (validation from the Conference des Grandes Ecoles at MSc level is pending) (students are currently studying in Europe).

The provider's stated responsibilities

For the European Master's in Management, the School has full responsibility for the programme, teaching, assessment and learning opportunities, subject to monitoring and review by City University. For other programmes, the School has full responsibility discharged through a European Board of Studies. For the purposes of this review, the Master's in European Business and Master's in Marketing and Creativity are regarded as study abroad programmes and are commented upon in paragraph 1.9.

Recent developments

Student numbers are broadly stable, with a reduction in the Master's in European Business studying in London offset by enrolments to the Master's in Marketing and Creativity. The validation of the European Master's by City University was renewed in June 2012. A new overall director of ESPC Europe took up his post in September.

Students' contribution to the review

Students studying on higher education programmes at the provider were invited to present a submission to the review team. Students from the outgoing cohort of the Master's in Management programme produced an evaluative submission. This was updated by the current cohort of Master's in European Business students, who provided an edited version of the submission that confirmed the positive evaluations, evidenced some improvements and identified a very small number of problems specific to their group. Reviewers met students from the new intake of the Master's in Management and the current Master's in European Business, who confirmed the evaluations in the edited submission.

Detailed findings about ESPC Europe London Campus

1   Academic standards

How effectively does the provider fulfil its responsibilities for the management of academic standards?

1.1   The School manages its responsibilities to City University effectively. The School's Master's in Management was revalidated by the University in 2012 as a European MSc in Management. The two awards are identical and the programme leading towards them is delivered in accordance with UK requirements. The roles and responsibilities of the School are clearly specified in the partnership agreement. The School is responsible for programme delivery, curriculum development, assessment, internal moderation, day-to-day management, annual monitoring and student support, subject to quality review by the University. The School has an excellent relationship with City University and reports are positive.

1.2   There is a clear organisational structure that ensures strong leadership for both administrative and academic functions within the School. The UK Director and senior management team are responsible for the strategic management of higher education. The UK Director of Studies, who reports to the Director, has delegated responsibility for the development and implementation of policies and procedures for quality assurance, monitoring and enhancement. Links with the University are well established. The Director of Studies has a pivotal role as the contact on matters relating to the continuing development of the validation agreement. Day-to-day responsibility for the Master's in Management, Master's in European Business and the Master's in Marketing and Creativity rests with the Director of Studies, who oversees programme directors and course leaders in their management of the standards set by the validating and accrediting bodies.

1.3   The School discharges its responsibilities through its committee structure effectively. The structure includes London-based Faculty meetings with responsibility for the academic oversight of programmes and a European Teaching and Learning Committee responsible for teaching activities and regulatory controls. A Board of Studies for each programme oversees delivery at the campus. An International Board of Studies ensures that the curriculum is followed at each campus with the Director of Studies overseeing delivery at the campus reporting to the UK Director and faculty during Faculty Meetings. All modules are assessed in accordance with the School's assessment regulations.

1.4   The School's deliberative structure is further strengthened, in the case of the Master's in Management, through the auspices of City University's Course Board. The Board provides effective oversight of academic standards and quality. It is chaired by a senior member of staff from the University, and is attended by the directors of studies from each campus and an external adviser. Due consideration is given to the approval and appointment of external examiners, oversight of the annual monitoring process, reports from external examiners, notification of academic staff changes and proposed amendments to the programme content. Minutes of the Master's in Management Board of Studies are received by the City Course Board, which establishes clear lines of reporting. The annual programme review report provides evidence of a self-critical and analytical approach with well focused development plans. The robust deliberative and reporting structures for higher education, which give effective support to the maintenance of academic standards for complex provision across several European campuses, are good practice.

How effectively are external reference points used in the management of academic standards?

1.5   The Master's in Management programme meets the expectations of *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* (FHEQ) at level 7. The programme is clearly articulated and reflects appropriate subject benchmark statements. The School's engagement with external reference points is primarily implicit through the use of the University's quality assurance systems, for example the validation process, use of external examiners and annual monitoring and review. Adherence to these requirements is partially reflected in a draft Academic Staff Quality Handbook. While staff are aware of the Academic Infrastructure, there is no explicit reference to the *Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education* (the *Code of practice*) in the Quality Handbook. There is scope to ensure that the Quality Handbook covers the School's procedures comprehensively and aligns with the forthcoming UK Quality Code for Higher Education. It is desirable that the draft Academic Staff Quality Handbook is further developed to ensure that it aligns with relevant external reference points.

1.6   External reference points underpin the School's maintenance of academic standards for each of its master's programmes. The School is diligent in ensuring that the standards of its provision accord with the accreditation requirements stipulated by the relevant accreditation body. The School is one of the few business schools in the world to hold triple accreditation from the three leading international accreditation bodies for the business sector, in addition to the national requirements in France, Germany, Italy and Spain. As a condition of rigorous accreditation requirements, the School is required to put in place robust procedures and control mechanisms covering those aspects of quality and standards for which it is responsible. These rigorous approval processes provide confirmation of the international scope and standing of the School.

How does the provider use external moderation, verification or examining to assure academic standards?

1.7   Oversight of academic standards for the Master's in Management is assured through the use of external examiners, but there is some scope to strengthen practice. Examiners are nominated by City University and approved for appointment by the University's Course Board. Examination papers are externally moderated by external examiners, but briefs for coursework are not. It is advisable that the School implements consistent external moderation for the approval of coursework assignment and projects. While the external examiner's comments concerning the examination papers were apposite and forthright, the implementation of suggested changes is not documented. External moderation of assessed work is systematic. Assessed results from the different campuses are formally ratified at a dedicated ESCP European assessment board (the Jury meeting), which convenes annually and is attended by the external examiners.

1.8   The School's internal moderation system requires development. There is a clear framework for the submission and marking of student work, as set out in both the draft Quality Handbook and the Teaching Handbook provided to academic staff. Internal moderation takes place under the auspices of a local examination board, which is convened for each programme and is held no more than one month after the examinations. The Board is chaired by the UK Director of Studies and membership comprises academic staff and an administrator. However, records of these meetings indicate that attendance by academic staff is poor, and in many instances decisions are being taken by a small number of staff. The minutes of the meetings are cursory and there is a lack of transparency about how marks are awarded, moderated and formally approved. The School is aware of these shortcomings and a process for internal moderation is set out in the draft Quality Handbook, but as yet this has not been implemented. It is advisable that the School implements the

proposed revised internal moderation process to ensure that there is greater clarity and more effective standardisation of assessment decisions.

1.9   External moderation of study abroad programmes is being strengthened. While the Master's in European Business and the Master's in Marketing and Creativity do not currently require external scrutiny, the School is planning to introduce external examiners in the 2013-14 academic year to strengthen the assurance of standards and to harmonise practice across all programmes. Although the School undertakes annual reviews of the Master's in European Business and Master's in Marketing and Creativity, the arrangements are not set out in the draft Quality Handbook. Programme managers attend a review meeting held over two consecutive days, where emerging themes and issues are discussed. The minutes of these meetings provide a record of the evaluation of the programmes and actions to be taken. The School manages its responsibilities for the management of academic standards on its study abroad programmes, as set out in agreements with its accrediting and validating bodies.

The review team has **confidence** in the provider's management of its responsibilities for the standards of the awards it offers on behalf of its awarding body and accrediting and validating bodies.

---

2   Quality of learning opportunities

How effectively does the provider fulfil its responsibilities for managing and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities?

2.1   The quality of learning opportunities is managed through the structures detailed in paragraphs 1.1 to 1.4.

2.2   The evaluation of the effectiveness of these structures and the enhancement of learning opportunities is achieved primarily through student feedback. At the end of each module, students are required to complete a module evaluation form before they can receive the final marks for the module. These are analysed by the Director of Studies and discussed with the appropriate Programme Director and the Board of Studies as appropriate. Student feedback is also generated by student representatives who meet twice per term with the programme directors. Minutes of these meetings are provided to the representatives. There is clear evidence of enhancements made as a result of these meetings, and this was confirmed by the students. The responsiveness to student feedback is good practice.

How effectively are external reference points used in the management and enhancement of learning opportunities?

2.3   UK and international reference points are identified in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6. Although it is evident that in most areas the practice of the School aligns with the *Code of practice*, this is not made explicit in the draft Quality Handbook and other staff documents.

How does the provider assure itself that the quality of teaching and learning is being maintained and enhanced?

2.4   The School recruits highly qualified lecturers, who are deployed according to their professional skills, personal choice and the needs of the subject area. In consequence, individual lecturers' responsibilities are aligned with their subject specialisms and interests.

New staff experience a phased teaching load to the full 180-hour commitment by their third year as part of their probationary period.

2.5   Students indicated that the general quality of teaching is high. Contributions from external lecturers who are current practitioners are especially appreciated. The structure of the three-hour teaching blocks facilitates the integration of lectures, seminars, discussions and exercises. Students appreciate the real-life case study approach used at the London campus in comparison with teaching at other campuses, which is more theoretical. The longer more intensive blocks used to facilitate modules taught by expert visiting professors from Paris or Berlin are less favoured. The School's management of teaching blocks and activities in London is good practice.

2.6   There is an excellent Teaching Handbook with full details of the expectations and requirements of staff, including on academic matters. Information on teaching quality is fed back to staff from module evaluations and student representatives meeting. The School does not systematically peer review teaching, although this may be provided to support new lecturers. It is desirable to extend peer observation of teaching across all staff to share good practice.

2.7   There are some cases where the implementation of the policies in the Teaching Handbook could be improved, particularly in relation to assessment practice. Although the Handbook indicates that staff are expected to provide feedback on how the assignment mark was derived, it is clear from the sample assignment work provided to the team that feedback is not always totally clear. The contribution of feedback to support learning is variable. Comments are provided, in some cases in handwritten bullet points, and in other cases typed, detailed comments. However, there is no indication of the weighting of each section to the final mark in most examples sampled. Students commented that they would appreciate more feedback on how assignment marks are made up. There is scope to share better feedback practice in the School in explaining how marks are derived and how work can be improved. It is advisable that the transparency and consistency of assessment feedback is improved across the School.

How does the provider assure itself that students are supported effectively?

2.8   The School provides support for students that is appropriate for an international master's programme. Support is provided for the administrative requirements of programmes and study abroad issues through a programme office. Academic guidance is available from teaching staff when initiated by students. A Careers Office supports students with skills development and finding work experience. Information on the School's management of student support is provided mainly through student evaluations.

2.9   Internships are well supported. High-quality documentation is provided to both students and the internship providers. Students are expected to find their own internship placements, but the Careers Office provides help and advice through a current list of internship providers, alumni and other sources. In addition, help and advice is provided on the preparation of their curriculum vitae and applications, presentations and how to behave at interviews. Students rate this service highly. Support for internships is good practice.

2.10   Academic support is provided as required. Students are only at the London campus for one or two semesters and so a personal tutoring system is not in operation. However, students can request to see the Course Director if they have any queries about their results or progress. Where students are not contributing to classroom discussions, the member of staff or Programme Director would meet with the student to discuss this. Students are able to email members of staff and the Programme Director if they have any concerns, and they

have always received prompt replies. Student progress is effectively tracked through the Examination Board system.

2.11   As students are required to have a high level English fluency to study in the UK, English language support is not routinely provided. Students in London may study other European languages as part of their programme. English is used as a common language between students in London, which provides mutual support. The team noted that all the students they met demonstrated an excellent command of English, even when they professed a lack of confidence in their ability.

What are the provider's arrangements for staff development to maintain and/or enhance the quality of learning opportunities?

2.12   All new staff undergo induction in which they are familiarised with the relevant School documentation. There is an effective annual appraisal process during the five-year probationary period for staff before they can gain tenure. Staff performance is appraised on five aspects: teaching, research, development, management responsibilities, and activities such as consultancy. Although identified targets include both research and pedagogy-based development, evidence of the latter is not extensive.

2.13   The School encourages and recognises individuals' needs to develop their fields of specialism. Staff are expected to undertake scholarly activity to maintain subject currency, conduct research and publish. A wide range of staff development activities are funded, including professional membership, conference attendance, leave of absence and sabbaticals in order to support scholarly activity and research. There is a strong emphasis on the conduct of research: for example staff must present papers in order to attend conferences. It is established practice that staff will make their own development proposals to meet these expectations.

2.14   There is less formal emphasis on pedagogy and professional updating of staff as educators, or on familiarisation with the context of higher education in the UK, such as the Academic Infrastructure. Pedagogy-based training arising from issues identified at formal meetings appears to be arranged on an informal basis, often on the initiative of individual staff members. The School is confident that training needs are met once identified, although recently formal training has been focused largely on the development of information technology communication skills. It is desirable that the School should formalise its support for the professional development of staff as educators.

How effectively does the provider ensure that learning resources are accessible to students and sufficient to enable them to achieve the learning outcomes?

2.15   Resources are effectively managed in London. Major investment decisions are made in Paris. Resource management is responsive to student demand. For example, improvements have been made to the furnishing and running of the canteen in response to student feedback.

2.16   Library resources are satisfactory and are available seven days a week in term time. Students felt that the library is sufficiently well stocked with books and that there is good access to online library resources. However, study space in the library is insufficient, especially at examination periods. More space has been provided in the canteen for students to work in, as well as allowing them to use empty classrooms. Unused and out-of-date books are being removed, or archived, to provide more space in the library.

Applications are being made to extend the building into the car park area to provide more space, which would include an extension to the library.

2.17   The virtual learning environment is being used to provide module information, including lecture notes and assignment details. In some cases, it is being used for discussion forums and assessments. Students indicated that this effectively supports their studies and is far superior to provision at other campuses. The team encourages the continued development of the virtual learning environment. The use of the online discussion forums and assessment facilities is good practice for dissemination in the School.

> The review team has **confidence** that the provider is fulfilling its responsibilities for managing and enhancing the quality of the intended learning opportunities it provides for students.

3   Public information

How effectively does the provider's public information communicate to students and other stakeholders about the higher education it provides?

3.1   There is comprehensive student information. Students receive pre-enrolment information through the website and candidate packs. Once enrolled, they receive welcome packs comprising student handbooks, which contain comprehensive programme information, and generic advice, information and guidance documents detailing School policy and support services. A course outline document contains detailed module information, such as the learning outcomes, teaching methodology and assessment. Additional information is made available by means of a bespoke guide to student life in London, banners, brochures and fliers.

3.2   Students confirmed that programme information is timely and meets their needs fully. In addition to the handbooks, information is provided on the School's intranet and virtual learning environment, and through social networks. The Student Handbook is produced to a highly professional standard and clearly informs students of both academic and communication expectations. Following student feedback, the School has improved the functionality of the intranet. It produces an Internship Handbook, which effectively explains procedural, academic and professional requirements of the internship period for both students and employers. Effective use is made of the virtual learning platform to enable the dissemination of information and, in the case of some staff, as a direct teaching tool. The high quality and comprehensive scope of public information is good practice.

How effective are the provider's arrangements for assuring the accuracy and completeness of information it has responsibility for publishing?

3.3   Marketing material made available online is managed in different countries, for example the Master's in Management information on the School's website is managed and updated by the Paris campus, while information for Master's in European Business and the Master's in Marketing and Creativity is managed and updated in London.

3.4   The School has straightforward and effective systems in place including student feedback, that enable the assurance of the accuracy and completeness of the public information that it publishes. Control is exercised through scrutiny by the Director of Studies, who works with the School's Head of Marketing and the relevant programme directors on the production and validation of material to ensure that the information issued is accurate and

complete. Enquiries to the School are closely monitored and used in the production of Frequently Asked Questions documents in order to address any perceived gaps in the public information literature. These can be circulated promptly while updates are made to the core public information material. Students also contribute to improving available information in other ways. Following their successful use of the virtual learning environment at the London Campus, they submitted a proposal to the European Board of Studies that this practice should be extended to other ESCP campuses. Responsiveness to student feedback in enhancing public information is particularly good practice.

3.5   The issue of publicity materials via the press and social media is tightly controlled. A very small number of staff in the School are authorised to issue material, submitting to the Head of Communications in Paris for prior approval. Press releases relating to the London campus are produced in a targeted manner in order to raise the profile of the courses locally. These are typically based on testimonials from students and internship providers, and are subject to the same level of scrutiny as other materials, not least to protect the commercial sensitivity of information.

The team concludes that **reliance can be placed** on the accuracy and completeness of the information that the provider is responsible for publishing about itself and the programmes it delivers.

Action plan[3]

ESCP Europe (London campus) action plan relating to the Review for Educational Oversight October 2012						
Good practice	**Action to be taken**	**Target date**	**Action by**	**Success indicators**	**Reported to**	**Evaluation**
The review team identified the following areas of **good practice** that are worthy of wider dissemination within the provider:						
• the robust deliberative and reporting structures for higher education (paragraph 1.4)	Use of external examiners' reports and annual monitoring process to implement a self-critical and analytical approach	Oct 2013	International Board of Studies	All issues reported are dealt with within a month	Director	International Board of Studies minutes, Faculty meetings minutes and Teaching and Learning Committee minutes
• responsiveness to student feedback (paragraphs 2.2, 2.8, 2.15, and 3.4)	Issues raised during student representatives meeting to be dealt with in a timely fashion	Jan 2013 and then after each subsequent meeting	Director of Studies	All issues reported are dealt with within a month	Director	Student representatives meeting minutes
• the management of teaching blocks and activities in London (paragraph 2.5)	Three-hour teaching block to be enforced in the timetable	Dec 2012	Director of Studies	Effective processes are in place to monitor teaching blocks and hours in the timetables	Director	Programme Office meetings minutes

---

[3] The provider has been required to develop this action plan to follow up on good practice and address any recommendations arising from the review. QAA monitors progress against the action plan, in conjunction with the provider's awarding body.

	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
• support for internships (paragraph 2.9)	Monitoring feedback from students and providers	Aug 2013	Careers Office	Effective processes are in place to monitor feedback and to identify issues with providers and/or students	Director of Studies	Team meeting minutes
• the use of the online discussion forums and assessment facilities (paragraph 2.17)	Professor training	Sept 2013	Information Technology department	E-learning platform updated by professors	Director of Studies	Faculty meetings minutes
• the high quality and comprehensive scope of public information (paragraphs 2.6, 3.1, and 3.2).	Frequently Asked Questions updated in programme brochure	May 2013 and then checked every May and Nov	Admission/Marketing Office	Updated material uploaded and/or printed and sent to new students	Head of Marketing	Headquarters Marketing and Communication approval
Advisable	**Action to be taken**	**Target date**	**Action by**	**Success indicators**	**Reported to**	**Evaluation**
The team considers that it is **advisable** for the provider to:						
• implement consistent external moderation for the approval of coursework assignment and projects (paragraph 1.7)	Request coursework assignments to professors and send them to external examiners	Jan 2013	Programme Office Manager	Feedback from external examiners received and sent to professors	Director of Studies	International Board of Studies minutes, Faculty meetings minutes and Teaching and Learning Committee minutes
• implement the proposed revised internal moderation	Coursework assignments and exam papers sent to	Jan 2013	Director of Studies	Feedback received and sent to professor	Director	Faculty meetings minutes

process (paragraph 1.8)	academic Dean					
• improve the transparency and consistency of assessment feedback across the School (paragraph 2.7).	Feedback form implemented on coursework assessment Teaching Handbook updated	Jan 2013	Director of Studies	Feedback form filled in by professors and kept in the Programme Office	Director	Faculty meetings minutes
Desirable	**Action to be taken**	**Target date**	**Action by**	**Success indicators**	**Reported to**	**Evaluation**
The team considers that it is **desirable** for the provider to:						
• further develop the draft Academic Staff Quality Handbook further to ensure that it aligns with relevant external reference points (paragraphs 1.5 and 2.3)	Draft to be completed in alignment with the UK Quality Code for Higher Education	Sept 2013	Director of Studies	Handbook updated and sent to all academic staff	Director	Faculty meetings minutes
• extend peer observation of teaching across all staff (paragraph 2.6)	Peer observation of teaching process designed by Faculty Committee and planned by Faculty Dean in order to contact and observe permanent professors	Sept 2012	Local Faculty Dean	Observation form filled in for all professors	Director	Faculty meeting minutes and Faculty Committee minutes
• formalise support for the professional development of staff	Procedure to be designed by the Faculty Committee	Sept 2013	Head of Human Resources	Academic staff handbook updated and	Director	Faculty Committee minutes

as educators (paragraphs 2.12 and 2.14).	and added in academic staff handbook			sent to all faculty Anticipate 50% of new permanent faculty being professionally developed as educators		Faculty meetings minutes

About QAA

QAA is the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. QAA's mission is to safeguard standards and improve the quality of UK higher education.

QAA's aims are to:

- meet students' needs and be valued by them
- safeguard standards in an increasingly diverse UK and international context
- drive improvements in UK higher education
- improve public understanding of higher education standards and quality.

QAA conducts reviews of higher education institutions and publishes reports on the findings. QAA also publishes a range of guidance documents to help safeguard standards and improve quality.

More information about the work of QAA is available at: www.qaa.ac.uk.

More detail about Review for Educational Oversight can be found at: www.qaa.ac.uk/institutionreports/types-of-review/tier-4.

Glossary

This glossary explains terms used in this report. You can find a fuller glossary at: www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus/glossary. Formal definitions of key terms can be found in the *Review for Educational Oversight: Handbook*[4]

Academic Infrastructure Guidance developed and agreed by the higher education community and published by QAA, which is used by institutions to ensure that their courses meet national expectations for academic standards and that students have access to a suitable environment for learning (academic quality). It consists of four groups of reference points: the **frameworks for higher education qualifications**, the **subject benchmark statements**, the **programme specifications** and the **Code of practice**. Work is underway (2011-12) to revise the Academic Infrastructure as the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

academic quality A comprehensive term referring to how, and how well, institutions manage teaching and learning opportunities to help students progress and succeed.

academic standards The standards set and maintained by institutions for their courses and expected for their awards. See also **threshold academic standard**.

awarding body A body with the authority to award academic qualifications located on the **framework for higher education qualifications**, such as diplomas or degrees.

awarding organisation An organisation with the authority to award academic qualifications located on the Qualifications and Credit Framework for England and Northern Ireland (these qualifications are at levels 1 to 8, with levels 4 and above being classed as 'higher education').

Code of practice *The Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education*, published by QAA: a set of interrelated documents giving guidance for higher education institutions.

designated body An organisation that has been formally appointed to perform a particular function.

differentiated judgements In a Review for Educational Oversight, separate judgements respectively for the provision validated by separate awarding bodies.

enhancement Taking deliberate steps at institutional level to improve the quality of **learning opportunities**. It is used as a technical term in QAA's audit and review processes.

feature of good practice A positive aspect of the way a higher education institution manages quality and standards, which may be seen as exemplary to others.

framework A published formal structure. See also **framework for higher education qualifications**.

framework for higher education qualifications A published formal structure that identifies a hierarchy of national qualification levels and describes the general achievement expected of holders of the main qualification types at each level, thus assisting higher education providers in maintaining academic standards. QAA publishes the following frameworks:

---

[4] www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/informationandguidance/pages/reo-handbook.aspx.

The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ) and *The framework for qualifications of higher education institutions in Scotland.*

highly trusted sponsor An education provider that the UK government trusts to admit migrant students from overseas, according to Tier 4 of the UK Border Agency's points-based immigration system. Higher education providers wishing to obtain this status must undergo a successful review by QAA.

learning opportunities The provision made for students' learning, including planned **programmes of study**, teaching, assessment, academic and personal support, resources (such as libraries and information systems, laboratories or studios) and staff development.

learning outcome What a learner is expected to know, understand and/or be able to demonstrate after completing a process of learning.

operational definition A formal definition of a term, which establishes exactly what QAA means when using it in reports.

programme (of study) An approved course of study which provides a coherent learning experience and normally leads to a qualification.

programme specifications Published statements about the intended **learning outcomes** of **programmes of study**, containing information about teaching and learning methods, support and assessment methods, and how individual units relate to levels of achievement.

provider An institution that offers courses of higher education, typically on behalf of a separate **awarding body or organisation**. In the context of REO, the term means an independent college.

public information Information that is freely available to the public (sometimes referred to as being 'in the public domain').

reference points Statements and other publications that establish criteria against which performance can be measured. Internal reference points may be used by providers for purposes of self-regulation; external ones are used and accepted throughout the higher education community for the checking of standards and quality.

quality See **academic quality**.

subject benchmark statement A published statement that sets out what knowledge, understanding, abilities and skills are expected of those graduating in each of the main subject areas (mostly applying to bachelor's degrees), and explains what gives that particular discipline its coherence and identity.

threshold academic standard The minimum standard that a student should reach in order to gain a particular qualification or award, as set out in the **subject benchmark statements** and national qualifications frameworks. Threshold standards are distinct from the standards of performance that students need to achieve in order to gain any particular class of award, for example a first-class bachelor's degree. See also **academic standard**.

widening participation Increasing the involvement in higher education of people from a wider range of backgrounds.