



Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers) of ESCP Europe-Business School

November 2016

Contents

About this review	1
Key findings.....	2
QAA's judgements about ESCP Europe-Business School	2
Good practice	2
Recommendations	2
Affirmation of action being taken	2
About ESCP Europe-Business School.....	3
Explanation of the findings about ESCP Europe-Business School.....	5
1 Judgement: The maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered on behalf of degree-awarding bodies and/or other awarding organisations	6
2 Judgement: The quality of student learning opportunities.....	19
3 Judgement: The quality of the information about learning opportunities	39
4 Judgement: The enhancement of student learning opportunities	42
Glossary.....	45

About this review

This is a report of a Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers) conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) at the London campus of ESCP Europe-Business School. The review took place from 15 to 17 November 2016 and was conducted by a team of three reviewers, as follows:

- Dr Mary Meldrum
- Ms Jeanette Rowley
- Mr Harry Williams (student reviewer).

The main purpose of the review was to investigate the higher education provided by the London campus at ESCP Europe-Business School and to make judgements as to whether or not its academic standards and quality meet UK expectations. These expectations are the statements in the [UK Quality Code for Higher Education](#) (the Quality Code)¹ setting out what all UK [higher education providers](#) expect of themselves and of each other, and what the general public can therefore expect of them.

In Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers) the QAA review team:

- makes judgements on
 - the setting and maintenance of academic standards
 - the quality of student learning opportunities
 - the information provided about higher education provision
 - the enhancement of student learning opportunities
- makes recommendations
- identifies features of good practice
- affirms action that the provider is taking or plans to take.

A summary of the findings can be found in the section starting on page 2. [Explanations of the findings](#) are given in numbered paragraphs in the section starting on page 5.

The QAA website gives more information [about QAA](#) and its mission.² A dedicated section explains the method for [Higher Education Review \(Alternative Providers\)](#).³ For an explanation of terms please see the [glossary](#) at the end of this report.

¹ The UK Quality Code for Higher Education is published at: www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code

² QAA website: www.qaa.ac.uk/about-us.

³ Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers): www.qaa.ac.uk/en/ReviewsAndReports/Pages/Educational-Oversight.aspx

Key findings

QAA's judgements about ESCP Europe-Business School

The QAA review team formed the following judgements about the higher education provision at ESCP Europe-Business School.

- The maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered on behalf of its degree-awarding body **meets** UK expectations.
- The quality of student learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.
- The quality of the information about learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.
- The enhancement of student learning opportunities **meets** UK expectations.

Good practice

The QAA review team identified the following features of **good practice** at ESCP Europe-Business School:

- the strategic approach to programme design which is employment focused and closely matched to market demands (Expectations B1, B10 and Enhancement)
- the multinational learning experience which develops students' cultural adaptability and employability (Expectation B4)
- the extensive use of live projects and range of internships which enhance students' employability (Expectations B6 and B10).

Recommendations

The QAA review team makes the following **recommendation** to ESCP Europe-Business School.

By September 2017:

- apply a consistent campus-wide approach to determining penalties for late submission of coursework (Expectation B6).

Affirmation of action being taken

The QAA review team **affirms** the following actions that the ESCP Europe-Business School is already taking to make academic standards secure and/or improve the educational provision offered to its students:

- the actions being taken to further engage students as partners in quality assurance and enhancement (Expectation B5)
- the steps being taken to improve the quality and consistency of assessment feedback to students (Expectation B6)
- the steps being taken to enhance moderation processes by routinely including assessment briefs (Expectation B6)
- the steps being taken to further embed the use of action plans in programme monitoring and review (Expectation B8).

Further explanation of the key findings can be found in the handbook available on the QAA webpage explaining [Higher Education Review \(Alternative Providers\)](#).

About ESCP Europe-Business School

ESCP Europe-Business School (the School) is a pan-European business school with six campuses: Paris, London, Berlin, Madrid, Turin and Warsaw. The British, German, Italian and Spanish campuses each have separate and different legal identities and are wholly owned by the parent organisation, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry Paris Ile de France (CCI). The London campus is a registered charity governed by a Board of Trustees.

The School holds degree awarding powers in France and Germany, has validation agreements in Italy and Spain, and accreditation arrangements in France. In the UK, the School has a validation agreement with City, University of London (the University) for the European MSc in Management (MIM). Programmes offered by the School involve an extended study period in two or more European countries. Awards are made under different national frameworks, on occasion in combination. Students may choose to specialise in particular areas of management, study at the campus most appropriate to their specialist choice, and improve their language skills. Students successfully completing the MIM will achieve the French Master degree Diplôme Grande Ecole (Grade de Master II). Dependent upon their study track, successful completion of the MIM programme may result in two, three or four degree awards, one of which may be a UK award.

The School's mission and values state that '...the School connects and shapes the business world by advancing cross-cultural management knowledge and practice. Teaching management from an interdisciplinary perspective at the highest level of academic excellence, the School develops culturally intelligent, multilingual leaders, who are open-minded, adaptable and responsible. As managers and entrepreneurs, ESCP Europe's graduates are equipped to lead and inspire in a globalised world.'

The School's London campus is situated in substantial Victorian buildings in Hampstead, North London where a full range of study facilities are available for students. The day to day running of the School is delegated to the UK Director. The Director of the London campus leads 21 full-time academic staff and 38 professional services/administrative staff, with 29 visiting lecturers, seven of whom are language teachers. The London campus contributes credits (ECTS) and study blocks to programmes validated or accredited in the UK, France, Germany, Italy and Spain. Of the programmes listed below the two showing no recruitment are included because students will recommence their studies at the London campus in January. At the time of the review there were 391 full-time students studying at the London campus on the following programmes:

- European MSc in Management (MIM) (validated by City, University of London, accredited by French Ministry of Education and Berlin Senate) (204)
- Master in European Business (MEB) (accredited by French Ministry of Education and Berlin Senate) (40)
- Master in Energy Management (MEM) (accredited by Conférence des Grandes Écoles) (32)
- MSc in Marketing and Creativity (MMK) (accredited by Conférence des Grandes Écoles) (0)
- Executive MBA (EMBA) (accredited by French Ministry of Education and Berlin Senate) (0)
- Bachelor in Management (BIM) (accredited by Berlin Senate) (115).

The School is accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) and the European Foundation for Management Development accrediting body (EQUIS). EQUIS accreditation requires conformity with the guidelines issued under the European Quality Link (EQUAL), which is the international association of quality assessment

and accreditation agencies in the field of European management education. The School's Executive MBA and the Master in European Business (MEB) programmes are accredited by the Association of MBAs (AMBA).

Key challenges faced by the London campus include continuing to raise the profile of the already highly ranked School and enabling the increasing number of students to spend quality time on the London campus.

The School continues to make progress to introduce measures that meet UK expectations for students undertaking the London element of their study. Progress with matters arising from the previous QAA review and subsequent monitoring visits includes further action being taken to improve the provision of individual feedback to students. Systematic action planning is also being enhanced with the requirement for formal action plans to be incorporated into the annual reports of Programme Academic Directors.

Explanation of the findings about ESCP Europe-Business School

This section explains the review findings in more detail.

Terms that may be unfamiliar to some readers have been included in a [brief glossary](#) at the end of this report. A fuller [glossary of terms](#) is available on the QAA website, and formal definitions of certain terms may be found in the operational description and handbook for the [review method](#), also on the QAA website.

1 Judgement: The maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered on behalf of degree-awarding bodies and/or other awarding organisations

Expectation (A1): In order to secure threshold academic standards, degree-awarding bodies:

a) ensure that the requirements of *The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ)* are met by:

- positioning their qualifications at the appropriate level of the relevant framework for higher education qualifications
- ensuring that programme learning outcomes align with the relevant qualification descriptor in the relevant framework for higher education qualifications
- naming qualifications in accordance with the titling conventions specified in the frameworks for higher education qualifications
- awarding qualifications to mark the achievement of positively defined programme learning outcomes

b) consider and take account of QAA's guidance on qualification characteristics

c) where they award UK credit, assign credit values and design programmes that align with the specifications of the relevant national credit framework

d) consider and take account of relevant Subject Benchmark Statements.

Quality Code, Chapter A1: UK and European Reference Points for Academic Standards

Findings

1.1 The School is responsible for delivering the European MSc in Management (MIM). Ultimate responsibility for the threshold academic standards of the UK award, setting these during programme design, validation and review by ensuring that consideration is given to the requirements of the FHEQ and relevant Subject Benchmark Statements rests with the University. The School and University work in partnership, the respective roles and responsibilities of each for setting and maintaining academic standards is set out in the University's Validation and Institutional Partnership Handbook. The School shares responsibility for the development, approval and modification of its academic programmes with its awarding partner. The MIM was successfully revalidated in July 2016.

1.2 The London campus also delivers credits and study blocks for programmes validated or accredited elsewhere in Europe. The School's international model requires observance of multiple national frameworks as awards are made under different frameworks, sometimes in combination. The School operates in accordance with the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) and is accredited with European Quality Improvement System (EQUIS) which complies with the guidelines of The European Quality Link (EQUAL). The complementary relationships between these and the FHEQ assist in setting and maintaining academic standards at an appropriate level across the provision. The School is also accredited by two bodies concerned with professional requirements: EQUIS, which is

the main accrediting body for the European Foundation for Management Development (EFMD) and the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). In addition, the School's Executive MBA and MEB (Master in European Business programme) is accredited by the Association of MBAs (AMBA). The approval and review processes that the School engages in with its validating partner, together with its own arrangements, would enable the Expectation to be met.

1.3 The review team tested the arrangements by considering documentation, including the accreditation and validation of qualifications and the process for approval and monitoring of programmes, and external examiner reports and discussion with senior staff, academic staff, students and a University representative.

1.4 Overall, the evidence reviewed demonstrates arrangements to be effective in practice. Responsibility for oversight of the quality and standards framework for the partnership for the UK MIM award rests with the federal level Course Board which includes University and School representatives. This has responsibility for oversight of academic matters and reports to the federal level European Teaching and Learning Committee (ETLC). The ETLC works internationally and is concerned with quality of programmes and regulatory controls. An element of the role of the ETLC is to ensure that programmes delivered in all campuses are harmonised. Operationally, the relatively new London campus Academic Programme Directors Group (ADG) is concerned with ensuring teaching and learning standards are consistent across programmes. For those awards validated or accredited elsewhere in Europe for which credits and study blocks are delivered at the London campus, oversight arrangements are similar. For the MEB and BIM Boards are federal, and for the MMK and MEM Boards are local.

1.5 The programme specification developed by the School forms part of the University approval process for the UK award. These are made available to staff and students on the intranet and in student handbooks. Students are informed of the programme structure, subjects and their credit values, marking criteria, assessment guidelines, together with the role of the Board of Examiners to secure academic standards in their handbooks. Staff are also guided by the Academic Staff Quality Handbook (ASQH) and Teaching Handbook on teaching and assessment practice, marking criteria and grade descriptors, the roles of internal and external moderators and the Quality Code.

1.6 External examiners are appointed by the University for the MIM programme and by the School for those awards to which the London campus contributes which are validated or accredited elsewhere in Europe. External examiner reports are addressed at ADG, at Board meetings and through internal memoranda. Examination scripts are internally and externally moderated prior to issue. For modules taught across campuses, 80 per cent of delivery content is common by target and there is a 20 per cent discretionary element to enable each campus to accommodate local cultural differences. This is agreed through Federal Directors, local Academic Directors and teaching staff. External examiner reports confirm threshold academic standards are met and align with Subject Benchmark Statements and the FHEQ and confirm achievement of defined programme learning outcomes.

1.7 The College works effectively within its agreement with its awarding partner to manage its responsibilities for ensuring adherence to external reference points. This is confirmed through University revalidation and the conclusions from external examiner reports. Therefore the team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A2.1): In order to secure their academic standards, degree-awarding bodies establish transparent and comprehensive academic frameworks and regulations to govern how they award academic credit and qualifications.

Quality Code, Chapter A2: Degree-Awarding Bodies' Reference Points for Academic Standards

Findings

1.8 For the UK MIM award the academic governance arrangements and frameworks in place to secure academic standards and govern the award of academic credit and qualifications are articulated in the University's Validation and Institutional Partnership Handbook. The School holds exam boards to consider module marks and then the University exam board considers overall performance for the University award.

1.9 The School has comprehensive governance arrangements. In Germany and France the School is a degree-awarding body, thus governance arrangements are informed by the national requirements of those countries and the requirements of the UK validating body.

1.10 The board for each programme oversees programme delivery, ensures the curriculum is followed and that modules are assessed in accordance with assessment regulations. Examination boards at which marks are approved are in place for each programme and Graduation Juries are in place for award approval. These arrangements would enable the Expectation to be met.

1.11 The review team tested the Expectation by examining minutes of meetings, validation and revalidation documents, programme guides and external examiner reports. The team also met senior and teaching staff, students and a University representative.

1.12 Overall, the evidence reviewed demonstrates arrangements to be effective in practice. The recent University revalidation confirms the School operates within the framework outlined in the validation handbook. Overall, the School's own governance structure for oversight is effective in enabling discussion at local and federal level. The arrangements are as described under Expectation A1. For example, the requirement to accurately align credit requirements and comparability of teaching content across campuses on the MIM programme, which was identified at the 2016 revalidation, has progressed through committee action.

1.13 Staff receive comprehensive guidance about the regulatory frameworks through the University's Validation and Institutional Partnership Handbook and the Assessment Regulations. For awards validated or accredited elsewhere in Europe the Academic Staff Quality Handbook and Teaching Handbook also provide clear information. Staff confirm meeting their understanding of the requirements. Students are informed through the MIM Student Handbook of the course structure and design, regulations, assessment and grading with corresponding ECTS for modules taught at different campuses. The Student Handbook explains how marks are converted to grades and the definition of the grades.

1.14 The School works effectively with its awarding partner to uphold the regulatory academic frameworks and regulations which govern how academic credit and qualifications are awarded. Therefore the review team concludes that the Expectation is met with a low associated level of risk.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A2.2): Degree-awarding bodies maintain a definitive record of each programme and qualification that they approve (and of subsequent changes to it) which constitutes the reference point for delivery and assessment of the programme, its monitoring and review, and for the provision of records of study to students and alumni.

Quality Code, Chapter A2: Degree-Awarding Bodies' Reference Points for Academic Standards

Findings

1.15 The School shares responsibility for the production, development, and maintenance of definitive records in the form of programme specifications for the University-validated UK MIM award. The respective responsibilities of the School and the University are detailed in the formal governance documentation existing between the School and its awarding partner. The London campus also delivers modules for programmes validated or accredited elsewhere in Europe. Ultimate responsibility for the maintenance of definitive records for each of these is outside of the scope of this review. The processes in place would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.16 The review team examined meeting minutes, documentation relating to programme administration, structure, and student support. The team also met senior, teaching and support staff, students, and a representative of the University.

1.17 Overall, the evidence reviewed demonstrates arrangements to be effective in practice. Programme specifications produced by the School confirm the programme learning aims and outcomes. Contextual information about the School and information relating to programme administration and student services are also contained in handbooks. Complementing these the School has also produced module specifications which include information relating to learning outcomes, teaching methods, and assessment for individual modules.

1.18 The London campus Academic Programme Director has responsibility for producing the content for individual programme specifications prior to approval by the ETLC. Responsibility for annual review of programme specifications, in collaboration with the programme team, also rests with the London campus Academic Programme Director. Modifications to programmes and the respective specification are taken to programme boards for approval and finally to the ETLC. For the University-validated UK MIM, programme specifications form part of the revalidation documentation and process. The School is required to seek University approval prior to making any substantial changes to the programme specification. Minor changes to the MIM programme, and therefore programme specification can be actioned at the board for the programme.

1.19 Records of study are maintained through the School's electronic systems. Students are issued with credit summaries throughout their course and these are available from the School's intranet. Students are provided with transcripts following graduation.

1.20 The College fulfils its responsibilities for maintaining definitive records within its partnership agreements. The review team concludes that the College meets the Expectation and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A3.1): Degree-awarding bodies establish and consistently implement processes for the approval of taught programmes and research degrees that ensure that academic standards are set at a level which meets the UK threshold standard for the qualification and are in accordance with their own academic frameworks and regulations.

Quality Code, Chapter A3: Securing Academic Standards and an Outcomes-Based Approach to Academic Awards

Findings

1.21 For the UK MIM award, the University is responsible, during validation and revalidation, for ensuring that academic standards are set at an appropriate level in accordance with their academic frameworks and regulations. University procedures require externality in programme review - this process and the use of external examiners facilitates checks on adherence to UK threshold standards.

1.22 The School has a formal process for the approval of taught programmes. For awards offered at the London campus the approval process takes place at local and federal level. Programme approval involves an initial proposal to the federal Dean of Academic Affairs and subsequent presentation to the European Board (EXCOM). Approved proposals proceed to development of a detailed programme specification. Subsequent presentation for approval is made to the ETLC, which is also responsible for approval of programme and module modification. This process also applies to the programmes validated or accredited elsewhere in Europe for which the London campus delivers credits and study blocks. These arrangements would enable the Expectation to be met.

1.23 The team scrutinised programme approval documentation and meeting minutes. The team also met senior, academic and professional support staff, students and a University representative.

1.24 Overall the evidence demonstrates arrangements to be effective in practice. For the UK MIM award the School follows the processes included in the University Validation and Institutional Partnership Handbook. The UK MIM award was successfully revalidated in 2016 and external examiner reports raise no concerns about threshold academic standards.

1.25 The London campus ADG comprises the London campus Director, Academic Programme Directors for BIM, MIM, MEB, EMBA, MMK and MEM and Director of Academic Quality and Student Services. The Group discusses new programme proposals prior to presentation for approval to EXCOM and the ETLC. The Group also reviews annual programme reports, discusses programme design and development, module approval, modification and discontinuation. The London campus Academic Staff Quality Handbook outlines the federal and campus approval process for programmes, and for module development and modification.

1.26 Each programme has a federal Academic Director responsible for the quality and currency of programme content and for writing programme specifications. For the UK MIM award, programme specifications are prepared to meet University standards. Programme specifications are in student handbooks for all awards. There is no formal School-wide standard for programme specifications. Module outlines are available, but there is some inconsistency in the level of detail presented for each module for UK MIM and also for modules taught on other programmes.

1.27 The review team concludes that, within the context of the partnership agreement with the University, the School fulfils its responsibilities. The London campus works closely

with the University and operates appropriately to comply with academic frameworks and regulations. Therefore the team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met

Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A3.2): Degree-awarding bodies ensure that credit and qualifications are awarded only where:

- **the achievement of relevant learning outcomes (module learning outcomes in the case of credit and programme outcomes in the case of qualifications) has been demonstrated through assessment**
- **both UK threshold standards and their own academic standards have been satisfied.**

Quality Code, Chapter A3: Securing Academic Standards and an Outcomes-Based Approach to Academic Awards

Findings

1.28 For the UK MIM award the School is required to operate within the assessment regulations established by the University as set out in the validation documentation. The School is responsible for assessment design. External examiners appointed by the University approve assessment tasks and review marked scripts. Assessment Boards for the University award are managed and chaired by the University. For other modules taught at the London campus the programme boards oversee the standards on the modules and an examination jury makes the final award.

1.29 Programme learning outcomes are specified during programme approval and modules are matched to programme learning outcomes. Module outlines state the intended module learning outcomes and how these will be assessed. Some of the programmes validated elsewhere in Europe for which the London campus delivers study blocks, are mapped to UK threshold standards and European threshold standards through the EQUAL Guidelines. Programme learning outcomes are also mapped to the School's mission statement. These arrangements would enable the Expectation to be met.

1.30 The review team examined programme documents including handbooks, programme and module specifications, assurance of learning (AOL) reports and external examiner reports. The team also met senior, academic and professional support staff, students and a University representative.

1.31 Overall the evidence reviewed demonstrates arrangements to be effective in practice. For the UK MIM award, the University Validation and Institutional Partnership Handbook determines the procedures to be followed for internal and external moderation, the approval and award of marks and final award, appeals and complaints. The School holds exam boards to consider module marks and then the University exam board considers overall performance for the University award.

1.32 For all awards taught at the London campus the ASQH and the Teaching Handbook detail the procedures to be followed including appointment of external examiners. The Guide for External Examiners is sent to all new external examiners appointed by the School and details the expectations of the role.

1.33 Externality is evident on the UK MIM award through the use of an external panel member on the 2016 review and through the appointment of external examiners on the programme. External examiner reports for the UK MIM award confirm comparable standards with other UK institutions and that students achieve the intended learning outcomes and meet UK threshold standards.

1.34 For all awards the School assesses learning outcomes based on AACSB AOL principles which require module learning outcomes to map to the programme learning outcomes and to be measurable. The School uses the AACSB AOL process to check that a high percentage of students are achieving the programme learning outcomes through mapping specific assessment to these learning outcomes and tracking student achievement. Module assessors provide a report on a sample of student assessments to show how students have met the learning outcomes. AACSB AOL monitoring reports produced at course level confirm students are achieving programme learning outcomes and identify areas where student performance against learning outcomes could be enhanced.

1.35 For the awards validated or accredited elsewhere in Europe, external examiners are not required by the approval systems of those countries. The School introduced external examiners for 2015-16 for the programmes to which the London campus contributes. External examiners for each of these programmes, the Bachelor in Management (BIM), Master in European Business (MEB), Master in Energy Management (MEM) and Master in Marketing and Creativity (MMK), confirm comparable standards with UK awards and that learning outcomes are achieved. The School acknowledges that outcomes-based assessment criteria are not yet fully defined for all modules and that they are working towards this for the awards validated or accredited elsewhere in Europe.

1.36 Evidence from documentation and meetings shows the School is effective in managing its responsibilities for the award of credit or qualification within the partnership arrangements. The School is aware that further work is required to develop outcomes-based assessment criteria for the modules validated or accredited elsewhere in Europe. Therefore the team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A3.3): Degree-awarding bodies ensure that processes for the monitoring and review of programmes are implemented which explicitly address whether the UK threshold academic standards are achieved and whether the academic standards required by the individual degree-awarding body are being maintained.

Quality Code, Chapter A3: Securing Academic Standards and an Outcomes-Based Approach to Academic Awards

Findings

1.37 For monitoring and review of the UK MIM award the School is required to follow the procedures in the University's Validation and Institutional Partnership Handbook. In addition, the School has its own procedures for monitoring and review of programmes which is overseen by the ETLC. Every programme has a board with responsibility for producing an annual report that includes assessment of student progression and achievement. In addition, action plans are produced for each programme.

1.38 External examiners are asked to confirm whether UK threshold academic standards are achieved for the UK MIM award. External examiner reports for the awards validated or accredited elsewhere in Europe also require confirmation that academic standards are being maintained. These arrangements would enable the Expectation to be met.

1.39 The review team examined documents including minutes from the ETLC and ADG, external examiner reports and procedural documents. The team also met senior and academic staff and a University representative.

1.40 Overall, the evidence reviewed demonstrates arrangements to be effective in practice. Annual course reports and action plans produced by boards for each programme include examination of each module and confirm that academic standards are being maintained. The London campus provides additional scrutiny and, following discussion at the programme board, annual reports and action plans are reviewed by ADG. ETLC has oversight of the standard of academic awards and minutes show extensive discussions related to review of elective choice on the UK MIM award based on a review of performance data. However, the School acknowledges that the annual monitoring and procedures for action planning in place require further development. The School intends to include action plans as part of the annual report rather than as separate documents. Therefore the affirmation made in Expectation B8 is also of relevance here.

1.41 For the UK MIM award, University appointed external examiner reports confirm that UK threshold academic standards are being met; responses to the reports are monitored by the University. For the awards validated or accredited elsewhere in Europe that are taught at the London campus, there is an implicit rather than explicit process of mapping to UK threshold standards based on mapping to European characteristics of programmes using the EQUAL guidelines.

1.42 In the successful review of the UK MIM award undertaken by the University in June 2016, the review panel noted that the School met the standards required for major international accreditation from AACSB, EQUIS and AMBA and that external examiner reports confirmed the maintenance of UK threshold academic standards. The School's response to the findings of the University review includes an action plan to meet conditions set by the panel.

1.43 Overall, the evidence demonstrates that the School manages its responsibilities for monitoring and review appropriately; monitoring and review systems are in place and the

review processes of the awarding partner are implemented. Therefore the team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met

Level of risk: Low

Expectation (A3.4): In order to be transparent and publicly accountable, degree-awarding bodies use external and independent expertise at key stages of setting and maintaining academic standards to advise on whether:

- **UK threshold academic standards are set, delivered and achieved**
- **the academic standards of the degree-awarding body are appropriately set and maintained.**

Quality Code, Chapter A3: Securing Academic Standards and an Outcomes-Based Approach to Academic Awards

Findings

1.44 For the UK MIM award the University has ultimate responsibility for making use of external and independent expertise to set and maintain academic standards. The use of external expertise in the design, operation and review of programmes is specified in the Validation and Institutional Partnership Handbook.

1.45 External examiners are appointed by the awarding body to provide an impartial external perspective and to oversee the academic standards of the UK MIM award. The School has also recently begun to appoint its own external examiners for the awards validated or accredited elsewhere in Europe which are delivered or taught in significant part at the London campus. External examination is not a requirement for those awards. External examiners review samples of assignment briefs, examinations and assessed work and comment on whether threshold academic standards are successfully achieved and maintained. These arrangements would enable the School to meet the Expectation.

1.46 The review team examined documents including external examiner reports, the Revalidation Panel Report and minutes of meetings. The team also met senior and academic staff and a University representative.

1.47 Overall, the evidence reviewed demonstrates the arrangements to be effective in practice. External and independent expertise is used at key stages of setting and maintaining academic standards. For the UK MIM award external panel members participated in the recent successful revalidation. External examiners provide independent external perspective and oversee the academic standards of programmes. Examination questions devised by the School are approved by the external examiner for the UK MIM award. External examiners also comment on students' achievement of threshold academic standards. For the UK MIM award, the use of external examiners is well established. Formal arrangements for receipt and response to the reports rest with the University. The external examiner reports are received by the University prior to entering the School's process. At the School, external examiner reports are received by the Academic Programme Director and the Director of Academic Quality. Actions are planned in response to matters raised. Discussion and progress monitoring occurs at the London campus ADG and the programme board. For those awards validated or accredited elsewhere in Europe, external examiners are not a requirement. The School's appointment and use of external examiners is relatively recent and thus not yet fully embedded for all programmes. In addition to the arrangements made by the University to inform external examiners of their role and responsibilities, the School publishes a Guide for External Examiners which gives a list of responsibilities and refers to the Quality Code within the expectations of this role for UK-based programmes.

1.48 Staff have a high level of relevant knowledge of industry requirements through their own research and ongoing industry engagement. Those met by the team gave examples of their links with industry that, together with School accreditations through EQUIS and AACSB

and AMBA accreditation of the Executive MBA and MEB programmes, has a positive impact on professional standards and the curriculum currency.

1.49 Overall, the Group is effectively managing its responsibilities for maintaining academic standards and making use of external expertise. The University has ultimate responsibility for setting and maintaining academic standards and for making use of external and independent expertise when doing so for the UK MIM award. Additionally, the School has developed industry links and networks which it uses effectively to support its curriculum. The review team therefore concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

The maintenance of the academic standards of awards offered on behalf of degree-awarding bodies/and or awarding organisations: Summary of findings

1.50 In reaching its judgement, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook. The Expectation is met with a low level of risk. The review team made no recommendations or affirmations in this section. No features of good practice are identified.

1.51 The team concludes that, overall, the quality of the information about learning opportunities at the School **meets** UK expectations.

2 Judgement: The quality of student learning opportunities

Expectation (B1): Higher education providers, in discharging their responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, operate effective processes for the design, development and approval of programmes

Quality Code, *Chapter B1: Programme Design, Development and Approval*

Findings

2.1 Ultimate responsibility for the design, development and approval of programmes rests with the awarding partner. The School does not have degree awarding powers in the UK. The validation agreement with the University and the associated processes comprise the framework within which the School operates for the UK MIM award. Other programmes to which the London campus contributes delivery are validated or accredited elsewhere in Europe.

2.2 The School's process for approval of new awards is through local UK and federal School-level committees. Proposals are generally developed at campus level with input from cross-campus academic teams. London campus proposals receive initial scrutiny and consideration at the local Academic Director's Group. Proposals are then submitted to the federal Dean for Academic Affairs for approval and, if successful, proceed to the federal EXCOM for final approval. If successful the ETLC has detailed oversight of the proposal and responsibility for approving the publication of programme specifications. For awards developed through the London campus, UK threshold standards and Subject Benchmark Statements are not formally considered at federal approval level. Validation and ongoing approval of the UK MIM award by the University is governed by the partnership procedures and re-approval processes.

2.3 All changes to programme modules or delivery and all new module proposals are put forward by the European Academic Departments and considered, for the London campus, by the ADG and then by the programme board. If approved, they are then submitted after consultation with the Dean for Academic Affairs to the ETLC, the membership of which includes subject experts. These arrangements would enable the Expectation to be met.

2.4 The review team scrutinised documents including University and School procedures, programme documentation, committee minutes and evidence from an employer. The team also held meetings with senior, academic and professional support staff, students, and a University representative.

2.5 Overall, the evidence reviewed demonstrates arrangements to be effective in practice. Consideration of proposals for new programmes and modules, and discussion of changes to existing programmes and modules take place in ETLC. External input to programme development and review is achieved in various ways. The School operates an independent International Advisory Board which gives external input and advice on strategic development and curriculum enhancement; however, the review team did not have access to any documentation from this Group. The School has international business School accreditations through EQUIS and AACSB and the Executive MBA and MEB programmes have AMBA accreditation which provides external input to programme design and development. For the UK MIM award the University procedures include external input to the approval and revalidation process. Academic staff gave examples of considerable interaction

with employers in the ongoing development of programmes and modules. Programmes are designed with input from employers and staff provided examples of how they ensured that programmes were designed with a strong emphasis on meeting employer needs. Examples included live project briefs with employers, guest speakers, alumni workshops, industry mentors, internships and other employer interactions with the School. International accreditation from AACSB, AMBA and EQUIS also all require the School's strong professional engagement in the curriculum. The review team considers the strategic approach to programme design which is employment focused and closely matched to market demands is **good practice**.

2.6 The School has no formal mechanism for engaging students in programme development and approval and students are not members of the key decision-making bodies at the London campus. The team notes that there is no requirement to include student representation for either German or French validation or accreditation. The cross-campus nature of programmes, with students moving campus as their study progresses, has provided the School with some challenges for student representation in programme development approval processes. However, the team notes the recently established student representation at federal level on ETLC through AGORA. Students met by the team were confident that changes they proposed to modules were acted upon by the School and staff provided an example of a new elective module developed in response to student and employer demand.

2.7 Overall, the School's own processes for the design, development and approval of programmes are appropriate to the procedures of its awarding body for the UK-validated MIM award. The emphasis on external input through professional accreditations and employer engagement is a particular strength. Therefore the team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B2): Recruitment, selection and admission policies and procedures adhere to the principles of fair admission. They are transparent, reliable, valid, inclusive and underpinned by appropriate organisational structures and processes. They support higher education providers in the selection of students who are able to complete their programme.

Quality Code, *Chapter B2: Recruitment, Selection and Admission to Higher Education*

Findings

2.8 The School is responsible for managing the recruitment, selection, and admissions process. Responsibility for ensuring that the students recruited are able to complete their chosen programme of study also rests with the School. Both London campus and federal processes input into recruitment and admissions. The School's admissions policy outlines the process for applying to study at the School and includes other key pieces of information, for example complaints and appeals against admissions decisions. Prospective students are interviewed and permitted to request feedback on their performance from the School. In some cases, prospective students are required to undertake additional selection measures, including entry exams. Decisions on applications are made by federally convened admissions juries. Institutional oversight of recruitment and admissions is the responsibility of the relevant Campus Director reporting to the Federal Academic Dean and the European Board (EXCOM). Information events including open days and online seminars, alongside written and electronic publicity inform both the public and prospective students as to the School's higher education provision. These arrangements would enable the Expectation to be met.

2.9 The review team examined documentation relating to recruitment and admissions, including the School's admissions policy and documents demonstrating the effective monitoring and review of admissions, both locally at the London campus and federally. The review team also met senior, teaching and professional support staff, students, and a University representative.

2.10 Overall, the evidence reviewed demonstrates arrangements to be effective in practice. The School has an admissions policy which articulates the admissions process, individuals involved, and the process for submitting a complaint. Strategically, the School recruits to targets set by EXCOM following consultation between the local London campus programme management and the federal executive. Entry requirements for programmes are set and agreed by the local London campus programme management in conjunction with the federal executive. Institutional oversight of recruitment and admissions is the responsibility of the relevant programme board, Campus Director reporting to the Federal Academic Dean and EXCOM. Locally, on the London campus, recruitment and admissions activities are monitored and reviewed by the Campus Director and through the Faculty Leaders Group and Professional Staff Leaders Group.

2.11 Prospective students are invited to submit their application to study at the School online and, following an initial screening, candidates are invited to the School to attend an interview and undertake one of four admissions tests, including: Service des Admissions Internationales (SAI), European Master Admissions Test (EMAT), Global Admissions Test or Direct Admissions Test. Admissions Coordinators complete the initial screening ensuring that applicants have the required documentation and qualifications for their applied programme. If their application is accepted, the applicant is invited to an admissions interview conducted by a senior member of the faculty or School management. Applicants are scored with aggregate marks arising from their application form (30 per cent), admissions tests (20 per cent), and interview (50 per cent). An admissions jury, including the

federal Dean for Academic Affairs, will then meet to review and approve all admissions decisions.

2.12 In the event the admissions jury declines to make an applicant an offer, the applicant may appeal by communicating directly with the Chair of the admissions jury. Prospective students may also lodge a complaint, using the School's complaints policy, if they are dissatisfied with the service received during the application process, or if an error was made in the handling of their application.

2.13 Recruitment activities, such as open days and online webinars, complement published media and the School's website as a means of marketing their higher education offer. Information is provided to applicants confirming the exact details of which interviews and tests will require completion. Induction events complete the recruitment and admissions process.

2.14 The School has recruitment, selection and admissions policies and procedures which adhere to the principles of fair admission and are underpinned by appropriate organisational structures and processes. Therefore the review team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B3): Higher education providers, working with their staff, students and other stakeholders, articulate and systematically review and enhance the provision of learning opportunities and teaching practices, so that every student is enabled to develop as an independent learner, study their chosen subject(s) in depth and enhance their capacity for analytical, critical and creative thinking.

Quality Code, *Chapter B3: Learning and Teaching*

Findings

2.15 Elements of the School's strategic plan Cultures for Business (C4B) demonstrate the School's strategic approach to enabling students to study their chosen subject in depth, enhance their capacity for analytical, critical and creative thinking, and develop as independent learners. For example, the School's international business teaching is combined with inter-cultural learning and language education. Thus each graduate of the School has the potential to study their chosen subject with experience of multiple campuses, locales and cultures.

2.16 The London campus learning environment includes formal and informal learning spaces. For students, the opportunities available and how to access them is communicated in handbooks, induction sessions, student societies and associations, the Careers Office and the School's administrative offices. The virtual learning environment (VLE) enables students to access documents, grades and feedback electronically from any location and allows students to communicate with professors through discussion forums.

2.17 For staff, the School's approach to effective learning and teaching is set out in a number of documents. The Academic Staff Quality Handbook is a guide to the London campus regulations and procedures for academic and administrative staff and together with the Teaching Handbook provides helpful information for staff. A Company project Tutor Handbook includes information for the designated project tutor about assessing the company project and handbooks for each programme contain key details. These arrangements would enable the Expectation to be met.

2.18 The review team examined documentary evidence, including the School's Strategic Plan and associated documents, online facilities, staff development arrangements, staff CVs and student feedback. The team also met senior, academic and professional support staff, students and a University representative.

2.19 Overall, the evidence reviewed demonstrates arrangements to be effective in practice. The School is committed to supporting student development through its provision of teaching and learning. Staff are well qualified and they enhance their own module delivery by using their experience and also by engaging outside speakers. Innovative teaching includes an in-class trading simulation developed through a trading company. The review team heard about digital lunchtime workshops which enable staff to share good practice. Classroom observations and staff appraisal are in place. Development plans for individual staff establish specific development needs and goals. This process is informed through teaching evaluation which is linked to an annual review. Staff have access to cross-campus VLE training and AOL support is available through the Paris campus. Some staff have completed their PhD at the University and continue to attend research seminars. Staff comment on the School's generosity in continuing professional development provision. Staff are encouraged to attend academic/professional conferences and interact with the relevant professional bodies.

2.20 The use of external expertise broadens the learning experience and enables students to study their chosen subjects in greater depth. Arrangements include visiting speakers delivering lectures or providing live project material to develop students' problem-solving skills and receive feedback. Students are able to undertake work placements and internships and work with real clients.

2.21 The implementation of C4B is monitored federally and locally, through the Board for each programme and then federally at ETLC. The School also uses periodic external review, accreditations and external examiners to review provision. The School also works with students to review and enhance the provision of learning opportunities. Monitoring takes place through boards for each programme and students feed back on their learning experiences through online evaluation questionnaires, student representative reports and the AGORA forum. Student participation is high as is the level of student satisfaction with their learning opportunities. The student achievement rates are high. Employers rated student overall achievement highly on an internship survey run by the London campus Careers Service.

2.22 The School has effective procedures to review and enhance the provision of learning opportunities and teaching to enable students to develop as independent learners. Therefore the team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B4): Higher education providers have in place, monitor and evaluate arrangements and resources which enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential.

Quality Code, Chapter B4: Enabling Student Development and Achievement

Findings

2.23 The School's mission is to 'provide students with the opportunity to develop their academic, personal and professional potential, irrespective of background'. The School's strategy and vision for higher education is articulated within the C4B and local operational plans are in place to support implementation. Equality and diversity are reflected in the C4B strategy.

2.24 For the UK MIM award the University operates on a four-year revalidation cycle with Annual Programme Evaluations (APE) to consider programme effectiveness. Reviews by externally accrediting bodies take place every three to five years. The School monitors its provision through boards for each programme and at ETLC. These monitor the implementation of the School's strategy and effectiveness in terms of student development and achievement. The European Research Committee (ERC) monitors the research strategy of the School and supports student academic developments. An Associate Dean is responsible for inclusion and diversity. The School has a 'Talent Spring' initiative to assist applicants from areas of low participation and 20 to 25 per cent of students on the MIM programme receive scholarships. BIM students with scholarships have preferential transition to the MIM programme. These arrangements would enable the Expectation to be met.

2.25 The review team scrutinised relevant documents including committee minutes, Programme Director reports, strategic documents, student representative reports, student and company project handbooks and assessment and computation tables. The team also met senior, academic and professional support staff, students and a University representative.

2.26 Overall, the evidence reviewed demonstrates arrangements to be effective in practice. The formal induction programme introduces students to the key elements of their programme. Induction arrangements apply to each new location and at each level of transition in studies. Professional services participate in induction to enable students to be aware of the services and resources available to them throughout their period of study. A study skills module helps transition to university-level work and there is a pre-master's course to raise student aspirations to postgraduate academic expectations. Students have access to an independent counselling service; those met by the team confirmed their understanding of the appropriate contacts for pastoral and academic support. Student achievement levels are high on all programmes.

2.27 The School has a dedicated professional and career development service that provides careers fairs during which leading companies attend and meet students. Services include a comprehensive programme of talks, lectures and presentations, CV and interview workshops, alumni networking and mentoring, student societies, internship and guidance. Students speak very highly of the London campus careers service.

2.28 Students on internships are supported by the Careers Service and named tutors who act as a liaison point between the School and the employer. The emphasis on international collaborative partnerships, learning additional languages, setting up consultancy projects, internships and multicultural teamwork is strong. The approach is collaborative, with a breadth of international teaching expertise. The choice of placements and internships enables students to gain advanced knowledge and skills in a specific area of

business in order to support their career plans. Students experience different countries, cultures and linguistic diversity through their transition between European campuses. Teaching delivery in the local language of the campus also gives students the opportunity to improve and master their language skills. The multinational learning experience which develops students' cultural adaptability and employability is **good practice**.

2.29 The School has effective arrangements in place to ensure students have access to the resources and support required to develop their academic, personal and professional potential. Therefore the team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B5): Higher education providers take deliberate steps to engage all students, individually and collectively, as partners in the assurance and enhancement of their educational experience.

Quality Code, Chapter B5: Student Engagement

Findings

2.30 The School seeks to engage students in quality assurance through various feedback mechanisms, including module reviews, teaching evaluations, annual reviews of courses, and other questionnaires on an occasional basis. Student representatives are elected from within courses to represent their peers to the programme management. Recently the School introduced the AGORA, an independent student-led board that facilitates liaison between the School management and the student body. AGORA members and student representatives are invited to attend various federal-level committees involved in quality assurance, including boards, the ETLC and EXCOM. Further opportunities for students to engage exist in the form of student societies. The processes in place would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.31 The review team examined documentation relating to student engagement in quality assurance, and minutes from various School committees and groups, such as the ETLC. The team also met senior, academic and professional support staff, students and a University representative.

2.32 Overall, the evidence reviewed demonstrates arrangements to be effective in practice. The School does not have a formally documented approach or strategy for student engagement in quality assurance. However, the review team heard how the School seeks to embed the involvement of students and student representatives in quality assurance processes. Throughout their programme of study, students are encouraged to engage with module reviews, teaching evaluations, annual reviews of courses, and other questionnaires; information from which the School develops course action plans. Students are also able to submit feedback using the School's VLE throughout their programme of study about any aspect of their learning experience. In meetings during the review visit, the review team heard that the School and staff remained approachable and responsive to student feedback and comments, building on good practice identified in the School's 2012 QAA Review for Educational Oversight.

2.33 Students and student representatives are encouraged to work with the School's senior and programme management locally to effect change. Student representatives are elected from within programmes to represent their peers to programme and campus management. Student representatives meet with the School's Director of Academic and Student Services and executive management at least once per semester. These meetings allow student representatives to raise issues with members of staff, the reports from which are submitted to the board for each programme and inform the production of action plans. Student representatives are invited to attend the local London-based programme board. In the case of the UK MIM award, students are invited to attend the federal board.

2.34 In an effort to strengthen and further embed the role of students in quality assurance and the development of the London campus, the School has encouraged and seen the creation of the AGORA. This is a student board that facilitates liaison between the School administration and management and the student body. Students, across the six campuses, elect 16 representatives to the AGORA board filling pre-defined roles.

2.35 AGORA representatives then meet senior academic staff to put questions raised by students. AGORA representatives are now invited to the ETLC and non-restricted elements

of EXCOM. Taking this into consideration, the review team **affirms** the progress being made to further engage students as partners in quality assurance and enhancement.

2.36 Overall, the School has effective processes in place to engage students in the assurance and enhancement of their educational experience. Therefore the team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met

Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B6): Higher education providers operate equitable, valid and reliable processes of assessment, including for the recognition of prior learning, which enable every student to demonstrate the extent to which they have achieved the intended learning outcomes for the credit or qualification being sought.

Quality Code, Chapter B6: Assessment of Students and the Recognition of Prior Learning

Findings

2.37 The University provides a partnership handbook with the assessment procedures for the University award. The School's Teaching Handbook for staff contains the process for setting and conducting assessment, and guidance about the balance of assessment and exams. The Academic Staff Quality Handbook (ASQH) contains the regulations for the conduct of assessment. Examination boards, which are part of board meetings, review and approve exam marks.

2.38 Assessment for each module is defined in the module outline, which is provided to students when they commence study. Assessment strategies for modules and changes to these strategies are approved by the ETLC. For the UK MIM award the University has oversight of changes to modules through the Course Committee.

2.39 Accreditation of prior learning (APL) is permitted on the UK MIM award, the process is contained in the MIM Student Handbook and follows University procedures. APL is not permitted for the awards to which the London campus contributes which are validated or accredited elsewhere in Europe. Plagiarism definition and associated processes are included in Student Handbooks. For the UK MIM award students are issued with a University handbook which outlines University regulations and procedures. Extenuating circumstances are considered by the Academic Director for each programme and the process is documented in the attendance section of the student handbook. Support for study skills is in place. These arrangements would enable the Expectation to be met.

2.40 The team examined procedure documents, minutes of meetings, external examiner reports, course handbooks and course outlines. The team also met senior, academic and professional support staff, students and a University representative.

2.41 Overall, the evidence reviewed demonstrates arrangements to be effective in practice. Internal and external moderation procedures are applied to marked work. Internal moderation reports are completed for a sample of exam papers by the internal moderator appointed for each module by the Faculty Committee. External examiners review assignment papers, exam papers and samples of marked coursework and scripts for modules taught at the London campus. The School confirmed that, while all exam briefs are moderated, moderation of assessment briefs is not consistently undertaken before distribution to students. The team **affirms** the steps being taken to enhance moderation processes by routinely including assessment briefs.

2.42 The Teaching Handbook and ASQH provide guidance for staff on assessment. For each programme at each examination session, an examination board reviews and approves marks. Participants in examination boards are the Programme Director, the Programme Coordinator, the Director of Academic Quality, faculty members and external lecturers. If a student fails a unit they have the right to request a review of the mark by another member of staff. The University chairs exam boards for the UK MIM award. Academic staff confirmed there is a campus-wide policy for extenuating circumstances managed through the local Academic Director for each programme. However, individual

tutors use their discretion over penalties applied for work submitted late without extenuating circumstances, thus permitting inconsistencies in the assessment of students. The team **recommends** that the School should apply a campus-wide approach to determining penalties for late submission of coursework.

2.43 The team found a considerable focus on live projects and internships in programme design and in assessment strategies. Staff, students and employers all gave examples of practice, these included the requirement for multiple internships in more than one country, consultancy projects with work presented to clients, trading and change management simulations, guest speakers on human resource practice, and the use of a trading room facility. The team considers the extensive use of live projects and the range of internships which enhance students' employability to be **good practice** (see also Expectation B10).

2.44 Group assessment of students is undertaken with care, balanced groups are created for the semester using set criteria. The course outline and assignment brief specify marking and staff told us about a variety of approaches taken to ensure appropriate allocation of marks.

2.45 The School has arrangements in place for modules studied simultaneously on different campuses. To support a standard approach while giving some allowance for local differences, modules have assessment that is 70 per cent similar. Frameworks are provided for aligning marks across different countries and regulatory regimes.

2.46 External examiners' reports confirm that academic standards are set at a level that meets UK threshold standards. Some variability in the quality and consistency of feedback to students across modules is identified by external examiners. The School has recognised this, the matter is addressed in some programme action plans and there is scope to further extend the actions across other programmes. The team **affirms** the steps being taken by the School to improve the quality and consistency of assessment feedback to students.

2.47 Overall, the London campus has appropriate arrangements in place and implements these to ensure that students are able to demonstrate the extent of their achievement of the intended learning outcomes. The team found one feature of good practice concerning the extensive use of live projects and range of internships which enhance students' employability. The team makes one recommendation about applying a campus-wide approach to determining penalties for late submission of coursework. The team also makes two affirmations about the steps being taken to enhance moderation processes by routinely including assessment briefs, and the steps being taken by the School to improve the quality and consistency of assessment feedback to students. Despite the recommendation and two affirmations, the team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B7): Higher education providers make scrupulous use of external examiners.

Quality Code, Chapter B7: External Examining

Findings

2.48 For the UK MIM award, the University appoints the external examiner following nomination by the School. The School appoints its own external examiners for the awards to which the London campus contributes which are validated or accredited elsewhere in Europe. This recent addition to the School's processes is not fully embedded as external examining is not a requirement of those awarding or accrediting bodies.

2.49 The School publishes a Guide for External Examiners which provides clear guidance about the remit, tenure, role relationship with academic staff, and responsibilities in respect of moderation of assignments. The School holds a register of external examiners categorised according to programme and subject expertise. The School's Academic Quality Handbook provides information about the role of the external examiner for staff. These arrangements would enable the Expectation to be met.

2.50 The review team examined documentation including the Guide for External Examiners, Academic Staff Quality Handbook, Revalidation Panel Report, Validation and Institutional Partnership Handbook, external examiner reports and action plans. The team also met senior, academic and professional support staff, students and a University representative.

2.51 For the UK MIM award the report is received by the University and forwarded to the School. Response to the external examiner and the arising action plan is agreed between the School and the University. For the programmes accredited or validated elsewhere in Europe, reports are sent to the School's Academic Director and the London Dean and discussed with academic staff. Action plans are drafted from the report outcomes and monitored by the School.

2.52 External examiners provide feedback on exam questions prior to issue and subsequently samples of assessed student work. External reports are used to inform good practice and enhancement through discussion with academic staff, ADG and the board for each programme. External examiner reports confirm threshold academic standards are met and that students' work is of a high standard for the academic level indicated.

2.53 The review team concludes that the London campus makes effective use of external examiners. Therefore the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B8): Higher education providers, in discharging their responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, operate effective, regular and systematic processes for monitoring and for review of programmes.

Quality Code, Chapter B8: Programme Monitoring and Review

Findings

2.54 The School undertakes programme monitoring at local and federal level. At federal level the ETLC, chaired by the Dean for Academic Affairs, has ultimate authority for the review of programme standards and reports. At a local level the ADG is responsible for monitoring programme quality and ensuring teaching and learning standards are consistent across the programmes delivered at the London campus. Local boards meet annually and their role includes monitoring programme delivery. Reports from the Academic Director, Student Representatives and external examiners are also considered. For the UK MIM award the University also oversees its own monitoring process through a board in which the School is required to participate.

2.55 The programme Academic Director for each programme prepares an annual report and action plan following the annual board. For general management programmes the report is received for consideration by the federal level board. Reports for specialist programmes are received for consideration by a local board. Local reports are discussed at ADG before they are sent to ETLC for federal-level consideration of key strategic and operational issues. The London campus ASQH details the School's processes for monitoring and review. For the University award, the partnership handbook outlines the requirements. These arrangements would enable the Expectation to be met.

2.56 The review team examined a range of documents including annual reports, programme action plans and minutes of meetings. The team also met senior, academic and professional support staff, students and a University representative.

2.57 Overall, the evidence reviewed demonstrates arrangements to be effective in practice. Annual reports are discussed in detail at the federal level board and at the board for UK MIM. Generally, annual reports present data based mainly on student performance. Student feedback is discussed but this is summarised, and detailed analysis is limited. Reports include discussion of external examiner feedback. The inclusion of formal action plans is a recent addition to annual course reports. Justification for the planned actions cannot always be clearly tracked in the discussion contained in the annual report. The team **affirms** the steps being taken to further embed the use of action plans in programme monitoring and review.

2.58 Students are involved in annual programme review through their membership of programme boards and through formal and informal feedback about programmes. Students confirmed that staff are generally very responsive to suggestions for change of assessment of modules and to ideas for new electives.

2.59 Overall, the School has appropriate procedures for programme monitoring and review, and works with its UK awarding partner to discharge its responsibilities effectively. Therefore the team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B9): Higher education providers have procedures for handling academic appeals and student complaints about the quality of learning opportunities; these procedures are fair, accessible and timely, and enable enhancement.

Quality Code, Chapter B9: Academic Appeals and Student Complaints

Findings

2.60 The School has an academic appeals policy and a student complaints policy. For the UK MIM award academic appeals are dealt with jointly by the School and the University. If students enrolled on the UK MIM award are dissatisfied with the outcome of their complaint to the School, they may approach the University and seek a review of the complaint or, alternatively, use the Office of the Independent Adjudicator's (OIA) higher education scheme. Students may submit non-academic complaints directly to the School. Prospective students may use the School's complaints policy to appeal admissions decisions.

2.61 Guidance relating to the procedural aspects of submitting a complaint or academic appeal is contained within student handbooks, the School's VLE, and the School's policy documents. These arrangements would enable the Expectation to be met.

2.62 The review team examined documents including the School's academic appeals policy, student complaints policy and student handbooks. The team also met senior, academic and professional support staff, students and a University representative.

2.63 Overall, the evidence reviewed demonstrates arrangements to be effective in practice. Students who wish to complain are encouraged to approach their programme office or the Director of Academic and Student Services initially to seek informal resolution. If a complaint cannot be resolved informally the time-constrained process for submission, investigation and resolution of a formal complaint is clear.

2.64 Students enrolled on the University UK MIM award may seek a University-level review if they are dissatisfied with the outcome. Ultimately students may appeal to the OIA via the University.

2.65 For the UK MIM award academic appeals are dealt with jointly by the School and the University. The School's academic appeals policy outlines the grounds for an appeal, the process for submission, associated timelines and persons likely to be involved. During the review visit, the review team heard that students and staff found both the academic appeals and student complaints policy accessible and appropriate. Students reiterated to the review team that they knew whom to approach for advice relating to academic and personal issues or alternatively could use their student handbooks to find the information required.

2.66 The School has processes in place to allow academic appeals and student complaints to be dealt with in an appropriate timeframe. The team heard that the London campus has not had any formal student complaints or appeals. Students and student representatives explained to the review team that they can approach members of staff directly with responsibility for running their programme to resolve their concerns informally. This enables the School to work with students to improve their experience proactively. An example of this comes in the work the School has done to improve the VLE in response to student feedback.

2.67 In meetings during the visit, the review team also heard that programme administrators, support staff and student representatives would provide support to students wishing to submit a complaint or academic appeal.

2.68 Overall, the team concludes that appropriate policies and procedures are in place. Therefore the team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B10): Degree-awarding bodies take ultimate responsibility for academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities, irrespective of where these are delivered or who provides them. Arrangements for delivering learning opportunities with organisations other than the degree-awarding body are implemented securely and managed effectively.

Quality Code, Chapter B10: Managing Higher Education Provision with Others

Findings

2.69 All students undertake a specified number of credit-bearing internship weeks at managerial level. This aligns with the School's strategic approach to programme design that reflects a multi-campus model which encourages cross-cultural learning and is highly focused on developing students' knowledge and skills for employability. In addition to internships, students also work in small teams to undertake credit bearing company projects that require the solution of a business issue.

2.70 The School Careers Service seeks work-related learning opportunities from employers and supports students in their preparation for placement and liaison with employers. Most of the companies working with the London campus are UK based or are international businesses with UK activities. These arrangements would enable the Expectation to be met.

2.71 The review team scrutinised documents including the company project handbooks, careers service information, student handbooks and project evaluation forms. The team also met senior, academic and professional support staff, students and a University representative.

2.72 Overall, the evidence reviewed demonstrates arrangements to be effective in practice. London campus academic staff and the Careers Service have close links with high profile international businesses which support the provision of internship opportunities and contribute to curriculum currency. These links underpin the School's strategic approach to the provision of an international education which is closely matched to the needs of the industry. Thus the good practice concerning the strategic approach to programme design which is employment-focused and closely matched to market demands identified in Expectation B1 also has relevance here.

2.73 The Careers Service contacts companies, identifies potential offers and assists students in their search for an opportunity which suits their requirements. The Careers Service provide advice on the internship process and one-to-one meetings, coaching sessions, CV workshops, and career focused lectures to assist students. External companies also host events to prepare and inform students. Prior to internship the provider is requested to complete a job description template for the role. The Internship Authorisation Form completed by students includes key details of their internship and the signature of the placement provider for approval by the Director of Academic Quality and Student Services. Students undertake a number of work placements or internships, some internationally, and on completion students receive a certificate of professional experience completed by the placement provider.

2.74 Consultancy assignments arise in a range of sectors, including marketing, finance, and strategy. A small team of students work over a period of three months. Students are selected to form a multinational group with a balance of genders and backgrounds. An academic tutor is assigned to coordinate each assignment, maintain a relationship with the client, and supervise the students' work. The scope of the project is defined by the client in a meeting with students and the supervising staff member. Students self-evaluate their

performance, tutors complete an evaluation, and external clients are invited to provide an evaluation of the process and finished product. Evaluation from the host organisation provides an indication of client satisfaction but does not contribute to the formal marking process. Clients are satisfied with the quality of students and their performance while on placement.

2.75 Documentary support is provided through the Company Tutor Handbook and the Company Project Student Handbook. The respective responsibilities of internship are understood by students and employers.

2.76 The Careers Service support and guidance is comprehensive at the London campus, fully supporting the process of internship. The process is well organised with high appreciation levels expressed by employers. Students speak very positively of the Careers Service and value highly the support provided. The good practice concerning the extensive use of live projects and range of internships which enhance students' employability identified under Expectation B6 is also relevant here.

2.77 Overall, the London campus has effective procedures in place to manage internships in collaboration with employers. Therefore the team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

Expectation (B11): Research degrees are awarded in a research environment that provides secure academic standards for doing research and learning about research approaches, methods, procedures and protocols. This environment offers students quality of opportunities and the support they need to achieve successful academic, personal and professional outcomes from their research degrees.

Quality Code, *Chapter B11: Research Degrees*

2.78 The London campus makes no contribution to research degrees therefore this Expectation is not applicable.

The quality of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

2.79 In reaching its judgement, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook. All of the 10 applicable Expectations are met and the risk to the quality of learning opportunities in each Expectation is low.

2.80 The review team makes one recommendation in this section which relates to applying a consistent campus-wide approach to determining penalties for late submission of coursework (Expectation B6) There are three areas of good practice in this section concerning the strategic approach to programme design which is employment focused and closely matched to market demands (Expectations B1, B10 and Enhancement); the multinational learning experience which develops students' cultural adaptability and employability (Expectation B4); the extensive use of live projects and range of internships which enhance students' employability (Expectations B6 and B10).

2.81 The review team makes four affirmations in this section which relate to the actions being taken to further engage students as partners in quality assurance and enhancement (Expectation B5); the steps being taken to improve the quality and consistency of assessment feedback to students (Expectation B6); the steps being taken to enhance moderation processes by routinely including assessment briefs (Expectation B6); the steps being taken to further embed the use of action plans in programme monitoring and review (Expectation B8).

2.82 Despite the recommendation the team is confident that the School is aware of its significance and proposes to rectify the matter. All of the applicable Expectations have been met, and there is evidence that the London campus is fully aware of its responsibilities for assuring quality. The review team therefore concludes that, overall, the quality of student learning opportunities at the School **meets** UK expectations.

3 Judgement: The quality of the information about learning opportunities

Expectation (C): UK higher education providers produce information for their intended audiences about the higher education they offer that is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy.

Quality Code, Part C: Information about Higher Education Provision

Findings

3.1 The School is responsible for the production of information for the public, prospective students, current students, and other stakeholders that is fit for purpose, accessible, and trustworthy. There is no formal policy relating to the production and maintenance of published information. However, there are established processes in place to ensure the appropriateness and accuracy of published information. The School is responsible for the initial production of information, but in the case of the MIM award, the University has the final approval prior to publication, in some cases documentation will be approved at University validation events.

3.2 Students have access to the School's intranet and other information systems as a primary source of information. Members of the public use the School's website as the primary source of information about their higher education offer. The School also uses a VLE to share learning resources online. Oversight of the production and maintenance of published information is shared between the local campus, programme management teams and the federal management. These arrangements would enable the Expectation to be met.

3.3 The review team examined documents including the School website and handbooks. The team also met senior, academic and professional support staff, students and saw a demonstration of the intranet.

3.4 Overall, the evidence reviewed demonstrates arrangements to be effective in practice. The School's website is used to market its offer and promote its own unique identity. The School includes information relating to admissions and applications to programmes on offer alongside introducing prospective students and the public to the School and its distinct ethos. During the visit, the review team heard that students found the information on the website accessible and helpful when considering whether to attend the School. Complementing published marketing materials, the School also runs a broad range of open events, webinars, and outreach activities to ensure that prospective students understand the higher education offer. Marketing materials are produced in preparation for each recruitment season by the School's marketing department in collaboration with the programme management team and approved locally by the London Campus Director. The federal Dean of Academic Affairs reviews and approves all marketing materials prior to their use by the London campus. Staff confirmed their understanding of this process to the review team during the review visit. In the case of the University provision, published materials must be approved by the University before publication.

3.5 Applicants to the School may be invited to workshops and interview days at which information about the process of applying to the School is provided. Successful applicants are enrolled at the School and follow an induction schedule specific to their individual programme and academic track; the School produces a range of induction materials that introduce new students to the School and the surrounding areas. Each student is also provided with a student handbook which includes information on course requirements, pastoral support, and provides a

contextual introduction to the London campus and the wider federal School. Students on the University-validated UK MIM award are also given City, University of London induction materials with information relating to University facilities and resources they can access. Prior to the commencement of placements and internships, students are provided with handbooks which outline the various responsibilities of the different parties involved in placements. These documents outline the methodology and management of placements and also include an indicative schedule of meetings and deadlines likely to arise during the process of an internship or placement. Meetings with placement providers during the review visit confirmed that students are sufficiently prepared for their experience and that the information provided to them is accurate.

3.6 Programme and module specifications are provided to each student and outline the course of study, relevant policies, resources available, and assessment information. Programme and module specifications for the University-validated UK MIM award contextualise the course, introduce the faculty, and provide students with information relating to assessment.

3.7 The School has recently invested in upgrading its VLE ensuring that learning resources are available to both students and staff for each module. The review team heard that students and staff are pleased with the upgrade to the VLE which is used to store course material, lectures notes, and assessment details. Individual module leaders are responsible for populating the VLE for their particular modules; programme leaders are responsible for providing overarching management of information put online.

3.8 The School provides students with credit summaries and, following graduation, transcripts. New staff members follow both local (London campus-based) and federal induction programmes ensuring that they are suitably aware of key quality assurance and pastoral policies. Federally, new staff are introduced to the School's strategy, diverse higher education office, and procedures at an induction conference while local induction programmes introduce new members of staff to the unique character of the School.

3.9 The review team concludes that, overall, the School has effective procedures for checking that information is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy. Therefore the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

The quality of the information about learning opportunities: Summary of findings

3.10 In reaching its judgement, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook. The Expectation is met with a low level of risk. The review team made no recommendations or affirmations in this section. No features of good practice are identified.

3.11 The team concludes that, overall, the quality of the information about learning opportunities at the School **meets** UK expectations.

4 Judgement: The enhancement of student learning opportunities

Expectation (Enhancement): Deliberate steps are being taken at provider level to improve the quality of students' learning opportunities.

Findings

4.1 Strategic enhancements are driven either federally or at each local campus because of the federal structure of the School. At federal level, major strategic enhancement decisions are taken by EXCOM and implementation overseen by an appropriate subcommittee such as ETLC. At the London campus, the Board of Trustees has oversight of major strategic enhancements. The London Dean and ADG oversee implementation and the London Dean reports back on progress to the Board of Trustees.

4.2 The School's overarching strategy has three themes - growth, specialisation and engagement. Alongside the School's overarching strategy is the School's Cultures for Business Strategy (C4B) which is shaping the future distinctiveness of the School's portfolio of programmes.

4.3 The London Campus Strategy reflects the School's overarching strategy. At the London campus, staff Dialogue Groups work on aspects of the School's nine strategic objectives including enhancing practice and shaping the portfolio. Specific enhancement initiatives identified by the School's London campus include: systematised action planning at programme level and School level; enhancements to student feedback practice; student representation in all programme monitoring and approval instances; enhancements to the appeal procedure; improving facilities and learning environment; enhancing VLE use; and the professional recognition of educators. The arrangements in place would enable the Expectation to be met.

4.4 The review team examined documents including strategy documents, meeting minutes and programme action plans. The team also met senior, academic staff and professional support staff, students, and a University representative.

4.5 Overall the evidence reviewed demonstrates arrangements to be effective in practice. The team found deliberate steps are taken at federal and campus level to improve the quality of student learning opportunities. The matrix structure of the School means that programmes are managed at the federal level. Thus initiatives started on one programme may be adopted as good practice by others; for example, the appointment of external examiners for programmes validated elsewhere in Europe with significant delivery at the London campus although not a requirement of their validating or accrediting bodies. The London Dean reports on progress on key federal and campus enhancement activities to EXCOM.

4.6 The School's approach to programme design is strategic. The federal C4B strategy is impacting on programmes through changes to the structure of the curriculum, a focus on the multi-campus experience for students on all programmes, and an emphasis on inter-cultural issues in modules. A strong emphasis is placed on meeting employer needs and there is strong professional engagement in the curriculum. The strategic approach to programme design identified as a feature of **good practice** in Section B1 also applies here. ETLC leads on implementing the C4B strategy and monitoring its progress.

4.7 The formalisation of programme action plans was driven by the UK awarding body partnership requirements and the need at federal level to respond to AACSB accreditation requirements. Programme action planning is implemented across all programmes and, from

2015-16, is included as part of each programme's annual report. Action plans include programme-specific matters such as improving communications to pre-master's students on MIM and enhancements led at federal level such as the introduction of a School-wide VLE in 2015 with associated training for academic staff. There are also London campus level enhancements such as extending peer observation of teaching across all staff. Actions are monitored locally by the ADG Group and at federal level by the board for each programme and ETLC.

4.8 Inconsistency in the quality of feedback to students was identified through external examiner reports and external examiner comments. The ADG initiated action and is monitoring progress. Action plans show that progress is being addressed and monitored at programme level by federal boards and is included in programme action plans.

4.9 Student representation at all levels has been improved. Students are now represented on most boards including the federal level ETLC. The introduction at Federal level of AGORA as the student representation body has made considerable steps in improving the student voice at the School. The London campus Dean meets regularly with the London-based AGORA representatives. Students spoke positively about the London campus response to matters raised by programme student representatives and by AGORA representatives.

4.10 Strategic initiatives to improve facilities and the learning environment include the integration of student record systems. This enables students to access information about their programme, module results and elective outlines. Improvements also include upgrading the campus lecture theatre into a multiplex theatre and the restructuring of professional support services. Progress on the continuous improvements in the academic quality and fabric of the School, campus events and promotions for student benefit are also included in the London Academic Director's report to the local Board of Trustees.

4.11 The federally led initiative to have a single School-wide VLE enables students to see the same system as they move around campuses. The new VLE is clearly an integral part of the learning experience for students which enables discussion groups to support assignments and group work. The Professional Support Leadership Group lead on and monitor enhancements to facilities on the London campus.

4.12 The School confirmed that there had been no progress to date on enhancements to the appeals procedure. The London campus acknowledges the need for further action locally or federally for other awards. The University procedure is applied for the UK MIM award.

4.13 The London campus places a strong emphasis on the professional recognition of educators and a few staff have Higher Education Academy membership. Academic staff talked about adopting good practice from other programmes, and about the support available from Paris for developing assessment practice to meet AACSB AOL requirements. Staff confirm that federal and local support is available to assist them in their use of the VLE. Support includes virtual 'Digital Lunches' and School-wide meetings to encourage sharing good practice. An example of an outcome from the Digital Lunches is that study skills material prepared at the London campus for BIM is being developed into an online resource for use more widely across the federal School. Staff and students gave examples of the growth use of discussion groups and social media to support assessment work including group projects.

4.14 The review team concludes that the London campus takes deliberate and effective steps to enhance the quality of student learning opportunities. The strategically led enhancement initiatives at federal and London campus level lead to continuous quality improvement. Therefore the team concludes that the Expectation is met and the associated level of risk is low.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

The enhancement of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

4.15 In reaching its judgement about the enhancement of student learning opportunities, the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook. The Expectation in this area is met and the level of risk is low.

4.16 The review team identifies three areas of good practice which relate to the following: the strategic approach to programme design which is employment focused and closely matched to market demands (Expectations B1, B10 and Enhancement); the multinational learning experience which develops students' cultural adaptability and employability (Expectation B4); and the extensive use of live projects and range of internships which enhance students' employability (Expectations B6 and B10).

4.17 The review team makes one recommendation as follows: to apply a consistent campus-wide approach to determining penalties for late submission of coursework (Expectation B6).

4.18 The review team also made four recommendations which relate to the following: the actions being taken to further engage students as partners in quality assurance and enhancement (Expectation B5); the steps being taken to improve the quality and consistency of assessment feedback to students (Expectation B6); the steps being taken to enhance moderation processes by routinely including assessment briefs (Expectation B6); and the steps being taken to further embed the use of action plans in programme monitoring and review (Expectation B8).

4.19 Despite the recommendation the review team concludes that, overall, the enhancement of student learning opportunities at the School **meets** UK expectations.

Glossary

This glossary is a quick-reference guide to terms in this report that may be unfamiliar to some readers. Definitions of key operational terms are also given on pages 21-24 of the [Higher Education Review \(Alternative Providers\) handbook](#).

If you require formal definitions of other terms please refer to the section on assuring standards and quality: www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality.

User-friendly explanations of a wide range of terms can be found in the longer **Glossary** on the QAA website: www.qaa.ac.uk/Pages/GlossaryEN.aspx.

Academic standards

The standards set by **degree-awarding bodies** for their courses (programmes and modules) and expected for their awards. See also **threshold academic standard**.

Award

A qualification, or academic credit, conferred in formal recognition that a student has achieved the intended **learning outcomes** and passed the assessments required to meet the academic standards set for a **programme** or unit of study.

Awarding organisation

An organisation authorised to award a particular qualification; an organisation recognised by Ofqual to award Ofqual-regulated qualifications

Blended learning

Learning delivered by a number of different methods, usually including face-to-face and e-learning (see **technology enhanced or enabled learning**).

Credit(s)

A means of quantifying and recognising learning, used by most institutions that provide higher education **programmes of study**, expressed as numbers of credits at a specific level.

Degree-awarding body

A UK higher education provider (typically a university) with the power to award degrees, conferred by Royal Charter, or under Section 76 of the Further and Higher Education Act 1992, or under Section 48 of the Further and Higher Education (Scotland) Act 1992, or by Papal Bull, or, since 1999, granted by the Privy Council on advice from QAA (in response to applications for taught degree awarding powers, research degree awarding powers or university title).

Distance learning

A course of study that does not involve face-to-face contact between students and tutors but instead uses technology such as the internet, intranets, broadcast media, CD-ROM and video, or traditional methods of correspondence - learning 'at a distance'.

See also **blended learning**.

Dual award or double award

The granting of separate awards (and certificates) for the same **programme** by two **degree-awarding bodies** who have jointly delivered the programme of study leading to them. See also **multiple award**.

e-learning

See technology enhanced or enabled learning

Enhancement

The process by which higher education providers systematically improve the quality of provision and the ways in which students' learning is supported. It is used as a technical term in our review processes.

Expectations

Statements in the **Quality Code** that set out what all UK higher education providers expect of themselves and each other, and what the general public can therefore expect of them.

Flexible and distributed learning

A programme or module that does not require the student to attend classes or events at particular times and locations.

See also **distance learning**.

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: *The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* (FHEQ) and *The Framework for Qualifications of Higher Education Institutions in Scotland* (FHEQIS).

Good practice

A process or way of working that, in the view of a QAA review team, makes a particularly positive contribution to a higher education provider's management of academic standards and the quality of its educational provision. It is used as a technical term in QAA's audit and review processes.

Learning opportunities

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

Learning outcomes

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

Multiple awards

An arrangement where three or more **degree-awarding bodies** together provide a single jointly delivered **programme** (or programmes) leading to a separate **award** (and separate certification) of each awarding body. The arrangement is the same as for **dual/double awards**, but with three or more awarding bodies being involved.

Operational definition

A formal definition of a term, establishing exactly what QAA means when using it in reviews and reports.

Programme (of study)

An approved course of study that 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.

Quality Code

Short term for the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, which is the UK-wide set of **reference points** for higher education providers (agreed through consultation with the higher education community, and published by QAA), which states the **Expectations** that all providers are required to meet.

Reference points

Statements and other publications that establish criteria against which performance can be measured.

Self-evaluation document

A report submitted by a higher education provider, assessing its own performance, to be used as evidence in a QAA review.

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.

Technology enhanced or enabled learning (or e-learning)

Learning that is delivered or supported through the use of technology.

Threshold academic standard

The minimum acceptable level of achievement that a student has to demonstrate to be eligible for an academic **award**. Threshold academic standards are set out in the national **frameworks** and **Subject Benchmark Statements**.

Virtual learning environment (VLE)

An intranet or password-only interactive website (also referred to as a platform or user interface) giving access to **learning opportunities** electronically. These might include such resources as course handbooks, information and reading lists; blogs, message boards and forums; recorded lectures; and/or facilities for online seminars (webinars).

Widening participation

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

QAA1221 - R5112 - Feb 17

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2017
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB
Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786

Tel: 01452 557 050
Website: www.qaa.ac.uk