Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers) of Christie's Education Ltd

November 2015

Contents

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 Christie's Education Ltd. The review took place from 17 to 19 November 2015 and was conducted by a team of three reviewers, as follows:

- Professor Geoffrey Elliott
- Mrs Amanda Greason
- Miss Amanda McCalla (student reviewer).

The main purpose of the review was to investigate the higher education provided by Christie's Education Ltd 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 threshold academic standards
  - the quality of student learning opportunities
  - the information provided about higher education provision
  - the enhancement of student learning opportunities
- provides a commentary on the selected theme
- makes recommendations
- identifies features of good practice
- affirms action that the provider is taking or plans to take.

A check is also made on the provider's financial sustainability, management and governance (FSMG) with the aim of giving students reasonable confidence that they should not be at risk of being unable to complete their course as a result of financial failure.

In reviewing Christie's Education Ltd the review team has also considered a theme selected for particular focus across higher education in England and Northern Ireland. The themes for the academic year 2015-16 are Student Employability, and Digital Literacy,[2] and the provider is required to select, in consultation with student representatives, one of these themes to be explored through the review process.

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 6.

The QAA website gives more information about QAA and its mission.[3] A dedicated section explains the method for Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers).[4] For an explanation of terms 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] Higher Education Review themes:
www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/information-and-guidance/publication?PubID=2859.
[3] QAA website: www.qaa.ac.uk/about-us.
[4] Higher Education Review (Alternative Providers):
www.qaa.ac.uk/en/ReviewsAndReports/Pages/Educational-Oversight-.aspx.

Key findings

QAA's judgements about Christie's Education Ltd

The QAA review team formed the following judgements about the higher education provision at Christie's Education Ltd.

- 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 Christie's Education Ltd.

- The vocational context of the learning and assessment which is enabled by the professional profile of the staff (Expectation B3).
- The strategic and multi-dimensional approach to supporting student employability in preparation for the transition to work (Expectation B4, Enhancement).
- The industry focus to the design of assessments that engages students and enables them to achieve the learning outcomes (Expectation B6).

Recommendations

The QAA review team makes the following **recommendation** to Christie's Education Ltd.

By September 2016:

- take a more systematic approach to action planning, to enhance oversight and evaluation of the outcomes of annual monitoring (Expectation B8).

Theme: Student Employability

Christie's Education Ltd (CEDU) places student employability at the heart of its student learning experience and it is a key strategic focus. Employability skills are actively incorporated into the curriculum and are also offered as value-added opportunities that support the transition to work.

The courses run by CEDU are seen as a talent pipeline into the Christie's Group PLC group of companies and the commercial art world. Students have privileged access to sale previews, warehouses and archives as part of their learning experience, allowing specific industry focus to be achieved.

The detail, scope and management of professional development programmes and events are highly effective and clearly focus on supporting student employability. CEDU offers a variety of programmes and activities focused on promoting and encouraging professional development and career networking. The professional development programme is extensive, organised and culminates in one-to-one interviews with a Christie's HR Recruitment Officer.

CEDU offers three types of work experience opportunities: (a) a work experience internship; (b) paid internships for students who have graduated from CEDU or another provider's courses; and (c) a formal work placement. All are individually tailored and allow students to be placed in a Department at Christie's Group PLC, where they will be assigned research and other professional tasks in real working conditions.

Financial sustainability, management and governance

There were no material issues identified at Christie's Education Ltd during the financial sustainability, management and governance check.

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

About Christie's Education Ltd

CEDU was founded in 1978. It is wholly owned by the Christie's International PLC group of companies and forms part of the global division of Christie's Education. It is a specialist provider of higher and continuing education in the fields of art history, art business, curating and connoisseurship and currently operates in London through Christie's Education Ltd, New York through Christie's Education Inc, Hong Kong and the Middle East.

CEDU is aligned with the wider corporate strategies of the Christie's Group PLC and Christie's Education globally, and aims to develop specialist expertise, customer engagement and new markets. As such, CEDU has developed the following mission statements:

- to provide an exceptional education in the fields of art history, art market studies, curatorial practice and connoisseurship
- to generate intellectual capital and to make academic contributions that will enable greater understanding and appreciation of the role that the historical evolution of connoisseurship and the art market has played in development of the arts globally
- to function as the primary talent pipeline for Christie's Group PLC
- to promote customer acquisition and engagement by offering a continuous lifetime client touch point
- to act as a vehicle for unlocking new markets
- to be a cornerstone of Christie's International PLC's corporate social responsibility programme, by sharing Christie's expertise, market knowledge and core values, providing an authentic voice in a non-transactional environment
- to expand the Christie's network by ensuring that Christie's Education Ltd alumni find top quality positions in the art world, and remain friends of CEDU throughout their lives.

CEDU is an Associate Institute of the University of Glasgow, who validate the following current provision:

- undergraduate MA (Hons) History of Art and Art-world Practice
- postgraduate MLitt and PgDip History of Art and Art-world Practice
- postgraduate MSc Art, Law and Business.

Student numbers have fluctuated between 115 and 150 over recent years. In 2014-15 CEDU had 122 full-time students, comprising 33 undergraduate and 89 taught postgraduate students, recruited from across 26 different countries.

Staffing levels have grown from four full-time lecturers in 1978 to a current total of 30 staff. There are 15 academic staff (14 full-time and one part-time) and 15 professional services staff (14 full-time and one part-time). As part of the Memorandum of Agreement with the University of Glasgow, all academic staff became Associated Teachers, which allows them to lecture on higher education programmes validated by the University. All faculty CVs must therefore be approved by the University and staff are required to have appropriate academic and/or professional qualifications at a minimum of MSc level.

QAA carried out a Review for Specific Course Designation (RSCD) in December 2013. The report made three advisable and five desirable recommendations. CEDU created an action plan and has made progress in addressing all of these recommendations individually. There have been a number of changes to staff including the appointment of a Deputy Academic Director, the creation of the role of Student Services and Business Manager and the appointment of a Development Officer. There have also been a number of financial investments in the building and facilities aimed at enhancing the quality of student learning opportunities. Further developments include the introduction of terms of reference for committees, the establishment of a Student Engagement Committee and the development of a Teaching and Learning Strategy. The processes for managing information have also been strengthened.

CEDU states that its biggest challenge is to grow its student numbers so that it remains a sustainable and scalable business. CEDU recognises that it is operating in a changing global education market and realises the challenges that this can pose.

Explanation of the findings about Christie's Education Ltd

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

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* 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 academic awards delivered by CEDU are approved and validated by the University of Glasgow (the University). CEDU is defined as an Associated Institution of the University. It follows the policies, guidance and practices of the University in setting and monitoring academic standards. CEDU's provision and internal mechanisms for setting and maintaining standards are mapped to the University's academic and regulatory framework for all awards delivered in London. The awards are only offered at its London location.

1.2 The arrangements that CEDU has in place with regard to maintaining the academic standards of awards would enable this Expectation to be met.

1.3 The review team tested the Expectation through scrutiny of documentation including specifications, course handbooks, and committee and Joint Board minutes. The team also met the International Managing Director, senior staff and students.

1.4 The review team heard and read evidence that the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF) is the key reference point in curriculum design and development, and is used as a means to set academic standards. The review team found evidence that the nomenclature used in course handbooks is in line with SCQF guidelines and relevant subject benchmarks. All courses are overseen by the University of Glasgow's

Joint Board of Christie's Education (JBCE) that in turn reports to the University of Glasgow's Academic Standards Committee (ASC). CEDU operates within the University of Glasgow's Code of Practice for Validated Provision.

1.5   The review team found evidence from scrutinising policies, procedures and committee minutes that the design of the academic framework for setting and approving standards maps to the University. Oversight of standards is evident in the design and development of courses and these are codified in course handbooks and validated specifications. The review team discovered that the learning outcomes are referred to as learning objectives in the documentation and these are used effectively as the basis of assessment outcomes.

1.6   The team discovered that JBCE is responsible and effective in ensuring CEDU's academic awards are positioned within the SCQF and set at the appropriate level. CEDU's Regulations and Calendar are aligned with those of the University and kept up to date through systematic annual monitoring and oversight by the JBCE.

1.7   The review team concludes that the academic awards at CEDU are positioned and aligned at the appropriate level and in accordance with the relevant qualifications framework. On this basis the review team concludes that CEDU meets the Expectation 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   CEDU's arrangements for academic governance operate within the University's academic and regulatory framework for all awards. This regulatory framework and the governance structures are mapped to those of the University. The JBCE provides the overarching governance of the partnership. CEDU's awards are reviewed and monitored through the JBCE that in turn reports to the ASC of the University of Glasgow.

1.9   The JBCE is ultimately responsible for ensuring the awards at CEDU are compliant with the regulations, policies and guidelines of the University of Glasgow. These arrangements would enable the Expectation to be met.

1.10   The review team tested CEDU's arrangements for academic governance through scrutinising the minutes of the JBCE, process documents, the virtual learning environment (VLE) and in meetings with staff.

1.11   Effective oversight of standards is evident in the approval and monitoring of courses delivered. These standards are suitably codified in handbooks and validated specifications. Information on the academic framework was effectively made available to staff and students via the VLE and suitable use was made of this information to inform course changes. The Regulations and Calendar are aligned with those of the University and effectively kept up to date through annual monitoring by the JBCE. These arrangements were found to be appropriate and effective in the governance and oversight of awards delivered.

1.12   The review team found that the design of the academic and regulatory framework for setting and approving standards meets the Expectation and found the governance of academic standards to be effective. There is clear evidence in processes, discussions and minutes of the JBCE for oversight of academic standards.

1.13   The review team concludes that CEDU's academic governance arrangements used in the maintenance of standards meet the Expectation and the associated level of risk is low.

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

1.14   CEDU is responsible for all modifications to programmes approved by the JBCE. Programmes are produced internally through committees and a writing group and validated by the University. Programmes are benchmarked against other institutions for validation.

1.15   CEDU has developed a full record of each programme using the programme specifications and records any amendments made. These are made available on the shared staff computer drive. Finalised versions are placed on the virtual learning environment (VLE), are detailed and have been created using guidelines and a template from the University. Course module information is made available to students in detail within the student handbook.

1.16   The processes in place enable CEDU to keep a record of all programmes effectively. Evidence from the meetings shows that the programme specifications are used to plan teaching and assessment. These arrangements would allow the Expectation to be met.

1.17   The review team tested the Expectation using documentation detailing the proposed and agreed changes to a programme and specification, the Institutional Strategy and the JBCE committee minutes. The team also met senior staff, students and teaching staff.

1.18   The programme design, delivery and modifications are recorded effectively on the VLE. Previous students have raised an issue with the information provided regarding assessments. Feedback from current students and staff with regards to the assessments has been positive.

1.19   Lecturers have always used verbal communication to feed back and feed forward on assessments. This is in conjunction with a new feedback form to ensure students fully understand the feedback.

1.20   Programme specifications are used to plan teaching and assessment. Students are informed of the programme handbooks which relate back to the programme specifications.

1.21   Clarity of the assessment guidelines was raised by students during the academic years 2013-14 and 2014-15. However, an overhaul of the handbook was made in the first academic term and Directors have been encouraged to elaborate verbally on guidelines during the academic year. A new feedback form is being trialled which is signed off by the Lecturer.

1.22   The team concludes that the arrangements in place are effective. The Expectation is therefore met with a low level of associated risk.

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

1.23   Since 1996 CEDU has been approved as an associate institution under the provisions of the University of Glasgow's Code of Practice for Validated Provision which is aligned with the Expectations of the Quality Code.

1.24   With the exception of the MSc Art, Business and Law which was validated in 2013, all other programmes have had their validation period extended. This was partly due to the University's change to its validation cycle which revised the validation period of all its programmes from five to six years and to the renegotiation of the Memorandum of Agreement which took place during 2015. A decision was taken to extend the validation of programmes to provide time for the renewal of the Memorandum of Agreement. The University will undertake a periodic review of all CEDU's programmes in 2016 with a view to revalidating them. The JBCE has a responsibility to exercise oversight of the provision with particular reference to academic standards.

1.25   The University retains responsibility for the approval of new modules and programmes and for the approval of modifications to existing modules and programmes. This ensures that programmes are approved which meet relevant academic standards as set out in the SCQF as well as relevant subject and qualification benchmarks, and that any modifications ensure the maintenance of academic standards. CEDU implements a three-stage process in advance of the validation panel convened by the University. This commences with the submission of a Statement of Intent. This Statement requires clear reference to academic standards and relevant benchmarks and is considered first by Christie's Academic Board and then by the University's Academic Standards Committee (ASC).

1.26   Following approval of the Statement of Intent, CEDU's development team prepares validation documentation with the input of external industry and academic advisers. CEDU then implements a local process which sees validation documentation progressing through its committee structure. In the future this will include a newly constituted Programme and Course Development Committee which will consider validation documents prior to their transmission to the University. This approved documentation will then progress to a University-established and managed validation panel which includes external academic membership.

1.27   CEDU adheres to the University's requirements for the validation of and modifications to programmes. This enables it to ensure that the relevant academic standards are set and so would enable it to discharge its responsibilities and meet the Expectation.

1.28   The review team tested CEDU's approach to the management of its responsibilities under its agreement with the University through the examination of a range of relevant documentation which included some specific to the latest validation, the terms of reference of key committees involved in the development and approval process and minutes of relevant meetings. The team also met staff, students and employers.

1.29   The most recently validated programme is the MSc Art, Law and Business which was validated in 2013. The development was undertaken jointly with University staff and there was evidence of strong communication between CEDU and the University throughout the development. This provided an additional check that the programme was designed to meet the relevant academic standards. The JBCE considered the validation documentation before it progressed to the University validation panel to assure itself that the relevant standards had been used in the programme design. The development team was represented by both CEDU and the University at the validation event. The validation panel confirmed that standards had been set at the appropriate level and the programme was validated with minor conditions and recommendations which were confirmed as met by the University before the programme commenced.

1.30   The JBCE exercises oversight of the setting and maintenance of standards through the receipt and consideration of external examiner reports and annual monitoring reports, and has been able to satisfy itself that programmes remain current and meet relevant levels of academic standards and quality.

1.31   A revised committee structure has been designed and will be implemented for the revalidation of the programmes which is due to take place during 2016. Validation documentation will be considered by the Programme and Course Development Committee before progressing to Academic Board for approval and then to the Strategic Planning Committee for final ratification, before progressing to the University's validation panel. Modifications of programmes and/or modules will follow the same route for approval internally before consideration by the University. This process will provide for an effective oversight of setting academic standards at the appropriate level before consideration by the University panel.

1.32   Modifications to programmes may be made in accordance with the University's regulations and the review team scrutinised a trail of evidence with regard to a title change to assess the effectiveness of the process. A proposal was made to change the title of an option route on the MLitt and PgDip History of Arts and Art-World Practice from Art, Style and Design to Fine and Decorative Arts from the Renaissance to Modernism. Students were consulted before the proposal progressed to the University's ASC and was subsequently approved.

1.33   The processes for the approval of new programmes, as required by the University, ensure that programmes align with the SQCF and relevant Subject Benchmark Statements. These processes are well understood by staff. CEDU effectively implements its own processes to satisfy itself that standards are set appropriately prior to consideration by a University validation panel. The review team considers the processes CEDU follows on behalf of the University, and its own approach to the course approval process, to be reliable and fit for purpose. The Expectation is therefore 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

1.34   CEDU's programmes are governed by the academic regulations of the University. Validation of programmes and modules is secured through the University's validation process through which programme and module outcomes are approved in terms of the relevant levels of the SCQF. This validation process also considers the assessment strategy for each programme to ensure that assessments enable students to demonstrate their achievement of the module learning outcomes.

1.35   Any revisions to learning outcomes are currently presented to the JBCE and then considered for approval by the University's ASC. In future the new committee structure will be used through which the Programme and Course Development Committee and Academic Board will have a role in internally approving revisions before progression through the University's modification approval process.

1.36   The VLE provides student access to the programme specifications which include programme outcomes. Students receive the programme handbooks which include reference to these outcomes, described as learning objectives.

1.37   External examiners are required to comment on the appropriateness of learning outcomes and the extent to which assessments enable students to achieve the outcomes.

1.38   The arrangements CEDU has in place with regard to setting and assessing learning outcomes, their publication to students and the use made of external examiners' reports would enable this Expectation to be met.

1.39   The review team tested CEDU's approach to the management of its responsibilities for setting and assessing learning outcomes through the examination of a range of relevant documentation which included programme handbooks, programme specifications, the VLE and external examiner reports. It also met staff, students and employers.

1.40   Outcomes are contained in the specifications for each programme which are made available to students on the VLE. These outcomes are contained in each programme handbook where they are described as learning objectives. Module outcomes are clearly referred to in assessment briefs. Students informed the review team that they are clear on the location and purpose of module learning outcomes which are routinely emphasised to them by academic staff, particularly in the explanation of assessment tasks.

1.41   CEDU ensures that programme and module outcomes reflect the SCQF and relevant benchmarks before programme validation by the University. Reference is made to the University's Programme and Course Design and Review Guidelines which are made available to all staff. These include a checklist which will be used to prepare for the 2016 revalidations. Staff are clearly aware of the required academic standards and staff

development has taken place to enhance their understanding and practice. The Academic Director provides support and training to enable staff to develop learning outcomes and associate assessment tasks for inclusion in the programme handbooks and programme specifications.

1.42 Staff also refer to the College's Assessment Strategy which seeks to ensure that modules are designed to enable students to attain the learning outcomes. Assessment briefs which are contained in the programme handbooks clearly indicate the specific learning outcomes which the tasks seek to test.

1.43 External examiners, who are proposed by CEDU and appointed by the University, confirm that learning outcomes are appropriate to subject and level and that assessment enables students to fulfil these outcomes. Examinations boards are held twice annually to confirm student attainment and progression.

1.44 CEDU fulfils its responsibilities for setting learning outcomes which meet the relevant academic standards and use them effectively in the design and marking of assessments. External examiners confirm that the learning outcomes are used appropriately and that students who are awarded credit have satisfied them fully. The review team therefore concludes that the Expectation is met with a low level of associated risk.

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

1.45   CEDU follows the University procedure for the annual review of programmes. This requires the provision of a single report to cover all of the provision delivered. At a local level, annual monitoring reports are produced by programme leaders and by the various service providers to include the library and student services. These reports are considered at an Annual General Meeting and Academic Board. The outcomes of this process inform an annual report to the University which is considered by the JBCE prior to submission to the University's ASC.

1.46   Periodic review, under the University's regulations, takes the form of partnership review when all programmes are revalidated.

1.47   The JBCE has responsibility for overseeing the maintenance of academic standards.

1.48   CEDU implements the University's quality assurance processes for monitoring and review. Adherence to these requirements for annual monitoring and review would enable it to fulfil its responsibilities and meet the Expectation.

1.49   The review team tested this Expectation through scrutiny of a range of documentation which included programme annual monitoring reports and minutes of relevant meetings. It also met staff, students and employers.

1.50   CEDU robustly implements the procedures for annual monitoring and in doing so enables the process to be much more than a paper exercise. Programme reports, which use a standard template, and the subsequent overarching report produced for JBCE make specific reference to the maintenance of academic standards, reflect on external examiner reports and include analysis of performance and progression statistics. The subsequent Annual General Meeting is a key strength of the process in that it identifies generic matters which require attention as well as examples of good practice. The Annual Conference, which focuses on outcomes of the annual monitoring process, provides an opportunity for discussing action points arising and sharing good practice.

1.51   University arrangements for periodic review take the form of partnership review through which programmes are revalidated. As mentioned previously, CEDU's programme validation periods have been extended but the University has, through JBCE consideration of external examiner reports and annual monitoring reports, assured itself that programmes continue to meet academic standards. The review team considered the last revalidation that took place as an example of the revalidation process. This was the revalidation of two programmes: MLitt History of Art and Art-World Connoisseurship and MA/Grad Dip History of Art and Art-World Practice. The revalidation panel approved the programmes for ongoing validation with no conditions or recommendations concerning academic standards and so enabled the University and CEDU to assure themselves of the maintenance of academic standards over the preceding period of validation.

1.52   The JBCE effectively exercises oversight of the setting and maintenance of standards through the receipt and consideration of external examiner reports and annual monitoring reports and has been able to satisfy itself that programmes remain current and meet relevant levels of academic standards and quality.

1.53   The review team concludes that CEDU effectively implements the University's regulations for the monitoring and review of programmes and that explicit reference is made to the progression and achievement of students and the maintenance of academic standards. In doing so, the Expectation is met with a low level of associated risk.

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

1.54   CEDU's courses were validated in 2008 and these are to be revalidated in the early months of 2016. It recognises the value of external expertise in course design and quality assurance processes and the responsibility for engaging external expertise resides with the University as the awarding body.

1.55   Externality is evident in course design and approval with external examiners appointed to oversee the maintenance of academic standards of all the awards. External examiners are normally appointed for a four-year period in line with the University's policies and regulations and are involved throughout the academic year at Examination Boards held at CEDU's premises in London. External examiner reports are sent to the University and CEDU responds through the JBCE that in turn reports to the ASC of the University. These arrangements would enable CEDU to meet the Expectation.

1.56   The review team evaluated CEDU's use of external expertise in course design and the assurance and maintenance of academic standards through scrutiny of external examiner reports and the annual monitoring of external examiner reports through the minutes of the JBCE. The review team evaluated the use of and response to external examiner reports and tested the use by academic staff of external examiner feedback in reports.

1.57   Evidence was found that external examiner reports are distributed to staff for discussion and there is active involvement by external examiners in the Examination Boards. The review team heard evidence that external examiners informed course learning outcomes and objectives in course assessment and engaged in a rich and meaningful way with course teaching teams. Evidence was found in documentation and processes that CEDU responds to the external examiner comments through annual monitoring by the University. The external examiner reports are being used systematically in the annual monitoring process with actions being monitored by the JBCE.

1.58   The review team concludes that independent and external expertise is used in the maintenance of standards. CEDU meets the Expectation with a low level of associated risk.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

1.59   In reaching its judgement the review team matched its findings against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook.

1.60   Of the seven Expectations in this judgement area, all are met with the associated level of risk for each identified as low. There are no examples of good practice, recommendations or affirmations associated with this judgement area.

1.61   As all Expectations in this area are met and the associated risks are low, the review team concludes that the maintenance of the academic standards of awards at CEDU **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   CEDU follows the University of Glasgow's Code of Practice for Validated Provision through which it has responsibility for the design and development of programmes and the University retains responsibility for their validation. One of the aims of the process from CEDU's point of view is to ensure that programmes are designed with an in-built employability focus which means that each piece of work on a programme not only has an academic function but also imparts transferable skills.

2.2   Proposals for new programmes can emanate from a variety of sources including annual monitoring staff-student forums, internal student surveys and programme and course development committees. CEDU implements a three-stage process for the validation of new programmes and revalidation of existing programmes which commences with the submission of a Statement of Intent. Prior to 2015 this was considered first by Academic Board and then by the University's Academic Standards Committee. Following approval of the Statement of Intent, validation documentation was prepared with the input of external industry and academic advisers. This documentation then progressed to a University-established and managed validation panel which included external academic membership. A new committee structure has recently been introduced with effect from September 2015 which will require the validation documentation to be considered initially by the Programme and Course Development Committee prior to its approval by Academic Board for progression to the University validation panel.

2.3   Any required change to programmes and units is subject to the University's regulations and process which requires all modifications to be considered ultimately by the University's ASC.

2.4   Adherence to the University's arrangements for programme development and validation together with CEDU's own internal processes would enable it to meet this Expectation.

2.5   The review team scrutinised a range of documentation including validation and revalidation reports, minutes of meetings and evidence of communication between development team members from both CEDU and the University. It also met staff, students and employers.

2.6   CEDU approaches programme design and development in a systematic and effective way. The most recently validated programme is the MSc Art, Law and Business which was validated in 2013 and provides an exemplar of how CEDU manages the process. The review team considered a range of documentation on the development process which included detailed notes of the development team, which confirmed a highly iterative process has been undertaken. Following initial approval, which was achieved through the Statement of Intent, staff from both CEDU and the University worked effectively together as evidenced by a rich and detailed trail of communications between the two parties. The resulting

validation documentation was approved internally prior to its submission to the University's validation panel. The subsequent validation report confirmed approval of the programme with only minor amendments required, which were addressed to the satisfaction of the University well in advance of the start date of the programme.

2.7   Work has begun to prepare for the revalidation of all programmes which will take place in March to April 2016. Development teams have been established under the lead of the Academic Director. A key enhancement of the process will be the use of the newly established committee structure both within the design and development stage and the internal approval process. For the latter, the documentation will be considered by the Programme and Course Development Committee prior to its consideration by Academic Board and Strategic Planning Committee. Once this process confirms that validation documentation is fit for purpose, it will be submitted to the University's validation panel.

2.8   CEDU effectively implements the University's requirements for both validation and minor modifications. It takes particular steps to ensure that the proposal is fit for purpose through an internal approval process before it progresses to the University panel. Development teams work effectively and the dialogue during the design and development stage indicates attention to detail and a desire to ensure the final programme is fit for purpose. This confirms that CEDU meets this Expectation with a low level of associated risk.

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

2.9 The recruitment, selection and admission procedures are all undertaken by CEDU. The organisational committee structure is in the development stages and the Finance and Risk Committee provides an annual overview. A newly formed Recruitment and Admissions Committee undertakes a regular review of policies and procedures. A draft version of the recruitment and admissions policy has been created and will now go through the committees for approval before implementation.

2.10 International alumni and current students, known as 'Student Ambassadors', actively participate in the recruitment process by offering personal experience and local knowledge to prospective and current students. Entry requirements for all degree-level courses are listed clearly and in bullet form in the prospectus that is provided to prospective students.

2.11 The complaints and appeals procedure for the admissions process is currently being reviewed by CEDU to ensure it is aligned with the University. There are detailed recruitment, selection and admission policies and procedures in place and CEDU is in the process of developing a new complaints and appeals procedure for recruitment and admissions. These policies and procedures would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.12 The review team tested the Expectation through meetings with senior staff, students and support staff. It also viewed documentation such as the prospectus, committee structure and the recruitment and admissions policy.

2.13 Evidence suggests that the recruitment, selection and admissions process is effective. Feedback from students on the process is positive. CEDU appears to be taking active steps to continuously improve on the policies and processes.

2.14 The recruitment and admissions strategy is designed to allow recruitment of students both nationally and internationally. There is a clearly defined strategy for effective recruitment. Interviews use a standard format and template which maintains consistency. Feedback from students following the interview is positive as confirmed by comments from both UK and international students.

2.15 The selection and admissions process is provided to students within the prospectus and stages are listed in detail. The admissions process makes full use of the Schwartz review and a commitment to recruit, select and admit fairly. CEDU monitors and reviews its admissions process through communication with students such as focus groups.

2.16 The team concludes that the Expectation is met. The associated level of risk in this Expectation is low as CEDU has effective and consistent policies and procedures in place with a view to continuous improvement.

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

2.17   CEDU's delivery of courses is underpinned by published regulations and course handbooks that inform the expectations for effective student learning and staff teaching. Good learning and teaching practice is reflected upon, and disseminated, through various forums including an annual provider conference focused on learning and teaching. Course specifications are published on the VLE and are accessible to both staff and students. At the time of the review CEDU was in the process of developing its Learning and Teaching Strategy in response to the previous QAA review report from 2013.

2.18   The current processes and procedures in place allow for effective review and enhancement of provision and incorporate both student and staff input at all levels. This would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.19   The review team tested the Expectation through the analysis of documentation including course handbooks, induction week materials, student feedback, the Institutional Strategy and staff-student forum minutes.The team also met staff and students.

2.20   Students and staff actively use course handbooks. Information about learning and teaching is initially communicated through the induction week process and further reiterated through the course handbooks that contain individual component information and other coursework support documents. Students have access to personal tutorial support with staff actively encouraging students to use self-evaluation forms and reflect on their learning.

2.21   There is detailed evidence of the use of student self-reflection to encourage student learning and use of assessment tailored to the needs of the industry. Assessments are designed with the concept of embedded employability which is complemented by a detailed, well-resourced and systematic approach to professional development.

2.22   The review team evaluated the effectiveness of the learning experience and the employability aspects of the curriculum and discovered that students have privileged access to sale previews, as well as bespoke access opportunities to the warehouses and archives as part of their learning experience. Staff-student meetings gather feedback across all courses and assessed components and respond with actions. On the basis of the evidence the review team found the vocational context of the learning and assessment, which is enabled by the professional profile of the staff, to be highly effective. This is **good practice**.

2.23   CEDU can be seen to work with its staff, students and other stakeholders to articulate and systematically review and enhance the provision of learning opportunities and teaching practices through a range of committees and reflective practices. Students are enabled to develop as independent learners with in-depth assessments modelled around vocationally relevant context. The review 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

2.24   Initiatives to support students' development of their academic, personal and professional potential are in place. Information is provided to students at induction and enrolment and though student services and personal tutoring. CEDU monitors student attendance and operates an Academic Probation. Staff and student research and scholarship is supported through the Learning Resources Centre (LRC). Students with learning difficulties are provided with guidance and support by student services and information is published on the VLE. Students are offered diagnostic testing during the start of the academic year to screen for any learning difficulties.

2.25   These processes would enable the Expectation to be met and should allow the effective monitoring and evaluation of arrangements and resources, which enable students to develop to their potential.

2.26   The Expectation was tested through meetings with staff, students and employers and through the analysis of documentation.

2.27   During registration students are provided with information on resources and facilities to support learning. The review team heard evidence that students are informed and satisfied with resources, from the start of the recruitment, selection and admissions process right through to employment post-graduation. The monitoring of student development and achievement is effectively carried out through the annual monitoring process.

2.28   Procedures for monitoring student attendance and the Academic Probation system provide an early warning of student problems, with a consequential action plan to support them.

2.29   The recently formed Student Engagement Committee provides a forum for students and Student Representatives to raise any academic and non-academic issues or concerns. On the basis of these arrangements the strategic approach to enabling student development and achievement by CEDU would met the Expectation.

2.30   The review team assessed the feedback given to students and the provision of professional development activities to support transition to work and found evidence of a wide range of activities throughout the student experience. The team scrutinised processes and heard evidence of students being provided with feedback and guidance on improving employability skills following one-to-one interviews with a HR recruitment officer, formalised professional development programmes and a range of internal and external activities, and work experience opportunities. These are holistically and systematically structured to support employability and to network the students into the industry. The team found the Professional Development Programme (PDP) operated by CEDU to be a multidimensional approach to supporting student employability in preparation for the transition to work, and identifies this as **good practice**.

2.31   The review team concludes that the strategic approach to enabling student development and achievement by CEDU meets the Expectation 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

2.32   Student representatives are elected by their peers on a modular basis, along with two Lead Student Representatives (LSRs) being chosen to represent the undergraduate and postgraduate programmes for communicating with the awarding body, which highlights a structure for communication. An overall LSR works in collaboration with the Student Services and Business Manager to explain the Student Representative role. Students refer to a Student Representative training programme but note that there is no current written formal guidance for Student Representatives on their role or responsibilities.

2.33   Feedback from students explains that the informal policy was unstructured and created an issue with feedback being replicated. CEDU has responded with the creation of the Student Engagement Committee for students to meet monthly and discuss feedback and issues. This Committee reports to the Strategic Planning Committee. Feedback from students and Student Representatives on issues/enquiries and quality assurance is fed to the Student Engagement Committee. Student representatives are also offered the opportunity to sit on several different committees to represent the student voice.

2.34   CEDU has put processes in place for students to actively engage and participate in decisions made regarding their programmes. This would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.35   The team tested the Expectation using documentation, terms of reference and staff-student forum minutes. The team also met senior staff and students.

2.36   The process for Student Representatives to feed back to CEDU is informal with varying results for the students. Records of student comments and administrative responses are now to be recorded throughout the year to be included in the staff-student forum at the end of the year. The new committee structure has provided the opportunity for engagement to take place in both formal and informal settings, which allows students to engage more effectively with the process.

2.37   Following the previous QAA review, a desirable recommendation was made to 'develop further the opportunities for student engagement'. CEDU has developed a new committee structure, inclusive of a Student Engagement Committee, to engage on quality assurance, enhancement, teaching, learning, assessment and the student experience.

2.38   The Student Representative Handbook and meeting guidance notes for Student Representatives are detailed and concise. Their feedback regarding the handbook and guidance notes is positive.

2.39   The team concludes that the Expectation is met with a low level of associated risk. The Student Engagement Committee, new training and information for representatives and opportunities for student feedback provide an effective formalised process that enables students to feed forward, feed back and engage with peers on issues. It also allows for continuous improvement of new structures.

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

2.40   CEDU follows the assessment regulations of the University in the design and conduct of assessment and these are detailed in the Regulations and Calendar.

2.41   Assessment policies and regulations have recently been systematically evaluated by senior management and changes informed by the relevant subcommittees of Academic Board, which approved the changes in 2015. This resulted in the establishment of a new Assessment Strategy which sets out the strategic context for assessment and aims to meet the challenges of e-assessment, exhibitions of student work and group or collaborative work. In particular it acknowledges the central role that assessment plays in student learning. This strategy was approved by Academic Board for implementation in 2015-16. The strategy aims to ensure that assessment tasks are mapped against relevant learning outcomes and the provision of assessment criteria enables students to meet these learning outcomes. It also aims to ensure that students experience a range of assessment methods, receive timely and comprehensive feedback on their work and experience formative as well as summative assessment.

2.42   All assessments are set by CEDU's staff and marked and second marked within programme teams. Sample scripts are made available to external examiners. External examiners and staff consider borderline cases and a record of their decision is made in the reports of the Chair of the Examinations Board.

2.43   There is a plagiarism statement and guidance is provided to students through workshops on referencing and bibliography and through information provided in programme handbooks and the Regulations and Calendar.

2.44   CEDU follows the regulations of the University with regard to the assessment process. In particular it takes steps to ensure that assessment tasks are overtly linked to module learning outcomes. This would enable it to meet this Expectation.

2.45   The review team examined a range of documentation relating to the conduct of the assessment process which included the assessment strategy, assessment tasks, evidence of the marking process and external examiner reports. It also met staff, students and employers.

2.46   CEDU's newly approved Assessment Strategy is in the early stages of implementation but it is clear that it is providing a solid base for effective assessment. Assessment tasks which are set by its staff are very carefully designed and clearly meet the University's academic regulations. They are appropriately mapped against the intended learning outcomes, SQF level descriptors and relevant subject benchmarks. Students are provided with the assessment tasks in programme handbooks which also contain a useful guide to assessment. This includes information on the requirements for the award of credit and detailed assessment criteria.

2.47   CEDU aims to ensure that its programmes are underpinned by the notion of employability which extends to the design of assessments. A strength of its approach lies in the rich variety of methods used and the opportunities these give students to experience real-life industry-related tasks. As well as assignment tasks which include presentations, essays and examinations, the assessment strategy of programmes is characterised by novel and art-world specificity. One example of this is the production of a Themed Sales Catalogue which is followed by a simulation of an auction. Another is the preparation of a Single Object Catalogue which also includes a cataloguing examination for which Christie's auction house is used as the setting. The review team considers the industry focus of the design of assessments that engages students and enables them to achieve the learning outcomes to be **good practice**.

2.48   There is a robust marking regime through which all student work is first and second marked with the first and second markers agreeing final grades. CEDU is considering enhancing this through the implementation of a moderation process which would see a sample of all work moderated by the Academic Director.

2.49   Staff are required to provide detailed written and verbal feedback to students who informed the review team that they are satisfied with the quality of feedback. They feel comments clearly inform them of the reason for the grade and how they can improve next time. There is a Marking Feedback/Feedforward Policy, which is included in the programme handbooks, giving students a clear indication of when they can expect to receive marks. Students the review team met reported that work is generally returned in a timely manner.

2.50   Programme handbooks contain comprehensive information on academic practice which includes particularly detailed information on plagiarism. In addition, the Regulations and Calendar provides students with the definitive statement on plagiarism. Different referencing conventions are used across the various programmes but students confirmed their satisfaction with this practice. An additional support for students on academic protocols is provided through the Learning Resource Centre.

2.51   Examination boards are held at Christie's to confirm student attainment. The external examining process is used effectively and external examiners' reports confirm that assessments enable the meeting of learning outcomes and that academic standards are being maintained.

2.52   CEDU adopts a robust approach to assessment which is informed by the new Assessment Strategy. Assessments are effective in ensuring that they provide students with an opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the learning outcomes. The use of industry-related assignment tasks is a key strength of the provision. There is a robust marking and external examining process which CEDU strictly enforces. Feedback to students is effective. External examiners confirm that academic standards are being maintained. The team concludes that the Expectation is met with a low level of associated risk.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

Quality Code, *Chapter B7: External Examining*

Findings

2.53   The policies and procedures for the use of external examiners and externality is described in the awarding body's code of practice for validated provision. External examiners are recommended by CEDU, based on their academic specialisms, but approved and appointed by the University as the awarding body. Feedback from external examiners is recorded at Examination Boards and the formal reports are distributed to CEDU via the JBCE to be circulated and considered by the management and teaching staff. The formal response to external examiner reports is through the JBCE that has oversight of the use and application of externality. The reports are made available to staff and students on the VLE.

2.54   These processes are designed in a way that would allow the Expectation to be met as external examiners are actively involved as appropriate in CEDU's own processes and the University further requires active oversight.

2.55   The review team tested the Expectation by scrutinising external examiner reports. Analysis was also conducted of minutes from the JBCE, Examination Boards and other committees where external examiner reports are reviewed and actioned. The team also met students and staff.

2.56   The review team evaluated and tested the availability and use of external examiner reports in the enhancement of the student learning experience, and found that academic staff used the reports to inform practice and engage in discussion regarding module objectives and outcomes at Examination Boards. The review team scrutinised external examiner reports and processes and heard evidence that the new template for responding to external examiners' comments has been created by the awarding body as part of the updated Code of Practice for Validated Provision. The external examiner report template has recently been revised to allow for more discursive comment on good practice as well as to highlight areas for improvement.

2.57   The review team read the external examiner reports and heard and found positive evidence of the use and application of external examiner feedback by staff. The team heard that external examiners are not involved in any form of assessment, but are used in a rich and involved manner in curriculum change and the improvement of the student experience. Through meetings with senior staff and teaching staff, and by scrutinising documentation related to the external examining process and reading external examiners' reports, the review team tested the effectiveness in practice of the external examining process. The new external examiner template and the process for circulating and disseminating the formal reports are effective in enabling the University to be informed of the student experience at CEDU. The review team considered that the external examiners' reports provided were consistent and that the feedback from external examiners was positive.

2.58   In conclusion, the procedures, practices and strategic oversight of the external examining process by CEDU through the JBCE are effective. The team concludes that the Expectation is met with a low level of associated risk.

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

2.59   CEDU follows the requirements of the University with regard to monitoring and reviewing programmes. For annual monitoring this requires the submission of a single report to JBCE covering all of CEDU's provision. Periodic review, in accordance with University regulations, takes the form of a partnership review which provides for a reflection on the operation, management and development of the partnership and considers the future of the partnership. Where this results in re-approval, programmes are then revalidated.

2.60   Annual monitoring reports at programme level are produced and inform the single report to the JBCE. These programme-level reports use a University template and seek to monitor the quality of provision including a review of feedback from students, external lecturers and external examiners and state any actions required. They also review student performance using programme-level data. In addition, each support department provides a separate report which seeks to review the effectiveness of support provided to students, staff and programmes throughout the preceding year. A feature of the internal process is the Annual General Meeting where reports of programmes and departments are shared. The overarching annual report required by the University is then compiled and considered by the JBCE before submission to the ASC of the University.

2.61   Following the Annual General Meeting an Annual Conference takes place at CEDU which provides for reflection on the operation of provision especially in terms of the Quality Code and benchmark statements and enables the sharing of good practice. Actions arising from the conference have been considered subsequently by Academic Board and its subcommittees but in future the revised committee structure will mean that reports are considered initially by the QAEC.

2.62   Adherence to the University's requirements for annual monitoring and periodic review together with the implementation of CEDU's own local annual monitoring processes, which include the Annual General Meeting, would enable this Expectation to be met.

2.63   The review team considered a range of documentation which includes annual programme reports and the overarching report to JBCE, the minutes of meetings of the Annual General Meeting and evidence from the Annual Conferences. It also met staff, students and employers.

2.64   CEDU's approach to annual monitoring is generally satisfactory in terms of the reporting process. Annual monitoring reports for programmes, which use a standard University template, effectively provide an analytical and reflective summary of the programme over the preceding year. This includes reference to key achievements by staff and students, analysis of student feedback, external examiners' reports and student progression and achievement data. The reports have a prospective view in that they identify future development opportunities. They also include a review of changes and developments since the previous reports although there is no inclusion of any specific reference to how matters raised on the previous report have been addressed.

2.65   A significant and effective aspect of CEDU's approach to annual monitoring is the Annual General Meeting. This meeting provides for the sharing of programme reports and

the identification of issues which may be common across programmes. In particular, the meeting enables the sharing of good practice. This meeting precedes an Annual Conference, which discusses, among other things, the outcomes of the annual monitoring process. One outcome of the 2014 process was a learning and teaching workshop facilitated by the University and the development of the Learning and Teaching Strategy.

2.66   CEDU uses its committee system to formally consider the matters arising from the annual monitoring process. Previously, Academic Board has provided the key focus for the consideration of reports prior to drafting the overarching report to the JBCE. There is, however, no sense that Academic Board has subsequently and systematically monitored actions arising from the reports. In the future, it is planned that the QAEC will initially receive and consider programme and support department reports. The key term of reference of this committee requires that it maintains strategic oversight of the annual monitoring process. QAEC will then report to Academic Board before the overarching report is prepared for consideration by the JBCE. This revised process has the potential to provide for an initial more in-depth consideration of reports and could be effectively used to agree specific actions required.

2.67   The overarching report to the JBCE effectively draws together a summary arising from the programme and support services reports. While it provides for a reflection on issues arising from previous years, it does not specify required actions going forward. The minutes of the JBCE meeting reflect on the annual report, but in doing so do not clarify actions that need to be addressed.

2.68   While CEDU's implementation of the annual monitoring process is generally satisfactory, the review team **recommends** that it takes a more systematic approach to action planning, to enhance oversight and evaluation of the outcomes of annual monitoring.

2.69   Partnership Review is preceded by a review of the Memorandum of Agreement. This review has recently taken place and CEDU and the University will move to partnership review during 2016.

2.70   CEDU is diligent in its implementation of the University's requirements for annual monitoring. Detailed and analytical reporting takes place at programme and department level and reports are considered at Academic Board and inform the production of an overarching report to the JBCE. The future involvement of the QAEC has the potential to enhance the process. The Annual General Meeting and the subsequent Annual Conference represent effective added inclusions to the overall annual monitoring process, particularly in the opportunity they provide for sharing issues and good practice. While reporting does provide for the identification of issues arising, there is no sense of action planning and the monitoring of required actions through the committee system. Despite this, CEDU's overall approach is sound. The team concludes that the Expectation is met with a low level of associated risk.

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

2.71   Complaints and appeals procedures are handled internally by CEDU. Students can approach the degree-awarding body if they are dissatisfied with the outcome. The academic appeals and complaints procedures are communicated to students and staff through the Regulations and Calendar and the VLE.

2.72   The policies and procedures adopted by CEDU for handling academic appeals and student complaints are aligned with Chapter B9 of the Quality Code and would allow the Expectation to be met.

2.73   The review team looked at the appeals and complaints procedures as well as evidence of their implementation and the resultant outcomes. Their accessibility to staff and students was analysed by looking at the VLE, handbooks and the Regulations and Calender documents. The team also met staff, students, support staff who take part in the appeal process and the International Marketing Director.

2.74   CEDU's current complaints and appeals procedure is based on the degree-awarding body's format and is not aligned with the ethos of CEDU. It is currently in the process of enhancing the complaints and appeals procedures for implementation in September 2016. New procedures have been drafted and are currently with the awarding body awaiting approval for implementation in 2016.

2.75   There have been no academic appeals lodged with the University within the last seven academic years. Two complaints were made during the last academic year; one was resolved informally, leading to satisfaction from all parties, and the other related to staff conduct and was addressed formally.

2.76   A new Appeals Committee and Student Conduct Committee have been created and implemented in line with the new procedures developed by CEDU.

2.77   CEDU's response to a formal complaint is detailed and was dealt with thoroughly and effectively.

2.78   Evidence shows that the complaints and appeals process is effective, well managed and fair. The formal complaint was dealt with using the process listed and resolved. Information on the procedure is provided to students in a variety of materials.

2.79   The complaints and appeals procedures are detailed, clear and well documented for access by students and staff. CEDU has a positive approach to the improvement of the appeals and complaints procedure and is in the process of having amendments authorised by their awarding body. CEDU has an effective basis for the appeals and complaints procedure and has handled both formal and informal complaints. The team therefore concludes that the Expectation is met with a low level of associated risk.

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

2.80   The courses offered by CEDU in London are not offered in any other location. CEDU's students have a number of work experience opportunities to undertake non-credit-bearing internships of up to three weeks at any other location in the Christie's International PLC group in London or abroad. CEDU does not delegate responsibility for the delivery of learning opportunities, or the assessment of learning outcomes, to any external organisation. It offers three types of work experience opportunities: (a) a work experience internship of between two and three weeks offered as a value-added opportunity to develop employability skills; (b) paid internships for students who have graduated from CEDU or another provider's courses; and (c) a formal work placement embedded within the MSc in Art, Law and Business, which informs a credit-related work placement of one day per week over the duration of the course. The formal placements are arranged as internal opportunities within the Christie's group and enable students to experience a professional work environment.

2.81   The design and management of the placement opportunities and the separate internships would enable CEDU to meet the Expectation.

2.82   The review team tested and evaluated the arrangements for delivering learning opportunities within the Christie's group by meeting students and staff involved in the supervision and assessment of placements. The team further scrutinised the documentation underpinning the placement process, supervision arrangements and academic monitoring by CEDU.

2.83   The formal work placement in the MSc award was managed and overseen by the Head of CEDU, who follows set processes and guidelines for managing the placement and liaises with other Heads of Department within the Christie's group.

2.84   The review team evaluated the learning opportunities and supervision oversight of the placements, and concluded that these opportunities provide an organised and valuable work experience, with unique access to industry experts and art-world artifacts, which develop employability and fast-track students to the commercial art industry. The review team discovered that the work experience placements are individually tailored with expectations and outcomes mapped and agreed with the Heads of Department in the supervisors from the Christie's International PLC group who are the internal employers of the students. This allows students to be placed in a Department at Christie's where they are assigned research and other professional tasks in real working conditions.

2.85   The work undertaken by students on placement is contracted and approved by CEDU to ensure it fulfils the intended learning outcomes for the course. The team heard positive feedback from students and the internal employers.

2.86   The review team consider that the management, supervision and monitoring of the placements are effective from the evidence of the documented process and procedures and from feedback in meetings with staff and students. The review team considers that placements are effectively managed, monitored and described in the published documentation and student handbook.

2.87   The review team concludes that the arrangements for delivering learning opportunities within the work experience placements result in an effective and applied industry-focused experience, supporting student transition into art-world employment. 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*

Findings

2.88   CEDU does not offer research degrees, therefore this Expectation is not applicable.

The quality of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

2.89   In reaching its judgement the review team matched its finding against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook.

2.90   There are three areas of good practice, one recommendation and no affirmations in this section. The first area of good practice relates to Expectation B3 and the way in which the professional profile of the staff enables the learning and assessment to be placed within industrial contexts. The second feature of good practice relates to Expectation B4 (and is linked to Enhancement) and recognises the strategic and multi-dimensional approach used by CEDU to support student employability and their transition into work. The final feature of good practice is situated in Expectation B6 and identifies the way industry-focused assessments are used to engage students and enable them to achieve the learning outcomes.

2.91   There is one recommendation in this area relating to Expectation B8. The recommendation is that CEDU should take a more systematic approach to action planning, to enhance oversight and evaluation of the outcomes of annual monitoring.

2.92   The review team notes that of the 10 applicable Expectations, all 10 have been met with low risk attached. The review team therefore concludes that the quality of student learning opportunities at CEDU **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   CEDU publishes information for stakeholders in several different mediums including its website. New students are provided with a welcome pack that details elements of the programme, reading lists and useful information. A new template letter has been created to provide information to new students starting the Master's programme. Current students are provided with information in the form of a handbook, Regulations and Calendar, VLE and other materials.

3.2   CEDU has developed a programme specifically to provide students with information on completion of the course. There is a dedicated section of its website to provide information to alumni.

3.3   Information is provided to prospective and current students, staff and stakeholders through various academic and marketing materials which would allow the Expectation to be met.

3.4   The review team tested the Expectation using a variety of programme handbooks, the Regulations and Calendar, and the CEDU website. The team also met the International Managing Director, senior staff, students and support staff.

3.5   The processes developed by CEDU for producing and disseminating information are detailed and effective and all materials are ultimately signed off by the International Managing Director and the awarding body if the materials carry their logo. Feedback from students regarding the induction information and welcome pack is positive and the information is accurate. There are clear processes and documents to provide to people responsible for maintaining standards and assuring quality.

3.6   Information provided to staff, students and stakeholders is thorough. There is a clear and detailed marketing and information policy to ensure information is provided to prospective students. Information provided is fit for purpose and accessible. The Expectation is therefore met with a low level of associated risk.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

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

3.7   In reaching its judgement the review team matched its finding against the criteria specified in Annex 2 of the published handbook.

3.8   The Expectation in this section is met and the associated risk level is low. There are no areas of good practice, recommendations or affirmations recorded in this judgement area.

3.9   Given that the applicable Expectation is met with a low level of risk, the review team concludes that the quality of the information about learning opportunities at CEDU **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   CEDU states that its approach to enhancement is strategic and embedded throughout its provision. Reference to the enhancement of learning opportunities is contained within the priorities of its Institutional Strategy which includes four strategic objectives that are specifically aimed at enhancing the student experience. These are concerned with: the development of a student/staff relationship which promotes student engagement with learning and enhances student success; the embedding of and transparency within programmes of the skills and learning opportunities that encourage entrepreneurship and enhance employability and enterprise; the use of new and developing technologies and associated methods of delivery to enhance student learning and promote flexibility; and investment in improved facilities for students with a particular priority for teaching and social spaces.

4.2   CEDU has a management structure that comprises senior roles which manage and oversee the provision. CEDU's approach to enhancement is partly effected through its committee structure, which provides an opportunity for the identification and discussion of enhancement initiatives. Each of its committees includes a term of reference which requires them to 'discuss enhancement initiatives'.

4.3   CEDU has stated its strategic objectives for enhancing the quality of learning opportunities. The achievement of these objectives is facilitated through its management team and the committee structure. The approach to enhancement would enable this Expectation to be met.

4.4   The review team tested CEDU's strategic and operational approach to the enhancement of students' learning opportunities through a review of a range of documentation. This included minutes of key meetings and committees and its Institutional Strategy. It also met staff, students and employers.

4.5   The Institutional Strategy is well understood across CEDU and there is clear evidence of an ethos which strives for continual improvement of the quality of the student learning experience. At the same time, it takes care to seek the views of staff and students and to address matters arising which require action. In this sense the approach to enhancement is top-down as well as bottom-up.

4.6   There is an effective academic management structure which oversees the provision. Academic Board exercises specific oversight of standards and quality generally and the enhancement of quality specifically. Each of the other committees has a term of reference which is specifically related to enhancement and requires it to 'discuss initiatives for enhancement and dissemination of good practice'. Although some of the committees have yet to meet, it is clear from the early minutes of the QAEC that consideration of enhancement initiatives is taken seriously.

4.7   A number of specific enhancements have been effectively implemented. One key enhancement has been the attention paid to employability and to specifically enhancing students' employability skills. A key vehicle for this is the Professional Development Programme which makes a significant contribution to CEDU's declared priority of student employability and supports students in obtaining placements and internships within the art

world. This institution-wide programme is led by the Development Officer and is open to all students. It includes sessions on personal and industry-specific skills but, most importantly, enables students to meet with high-calibre members of the art world and to meet Christie's International PLC's staff to gain deeper insights into the roles available within the company. The combination of the development of skills with the networking with art-world practitioners, including CEDU's alumni, is developing and enhancing the employability skills essential for the targeted industry. The programme has been successful in enabling students to secure internships within the Christie's International Group and to secure post-course employment with prestigious organisations around the world. The Cataloguing examination is carried out with works of art supplied by Christie's International PLC, takes place at the auction house and is a central plank of the strategy for preparing students for this particular area of art expertise.

4.8   CEDU has taken deliberate steps to enhance the extent and nature of learning resources provided for students and the general learning environment. The current premises have been renovated which has resulted in improved and enlarged spaces for students and staff. A planned relocation in 2017 to completely refurbished premises specifically designed for educational use will represent a significant enhancement. The five-year digital strategy is currently being implemented which will enhance the availability of hardware and software for students. A key enhancement is the access students have to the digital resources of Christie's International PLC, which are not available externally.

4.9   The calibre of staff at CEDU is a key strength of the provision. Steps have been taken to further enhance the quality of staff through the provision of a dedicated budget for staff development which includes provision of two weeks' paid research time for all academic staff and financial support to enable staff to gain further and higher qualifications. This is augmented by support for membership of professional bodies.

4.10   There is effective use made of data to inform decisions about enhancement. This includes analysis of student performance data and student feedback through the annual monitoring process. In addition, the JBCE systematically evaluates data to support its oversight of standards and quality.

4.11   CEDU has taken a deliberate and strategic approach to the enhancement of learning opportunities through the articulation of enhancement-specific strategic objectives. These are brought to life through an effective management system and a committee structure through which all committees are required to discuss initiatives for enhancement. There is an ethos throughout CEDU which seeks to improve and enhance the quality of the student experience. There are examples of a number of enhancement initiatives and those related to employability have had demonstrable outcomes in terms of the employability skills of CEDU students and the success they have in securing internships and employment. Student and staff feedback informs decisions about enhancement. The review team concludes that CEDU's strategies for enhancing students' learning opportunities have resulted in a wide range of enhancement measures. It takes deliberate steps to enhance the quality of students' learning opportunities and therefore the Expectation is met with a low level of associated risk.

Expectation: Met
Level of risk: Low

The enhancement of student learning opportunities: Summary of findings

4.12   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.

4.13   There are no areas of good practice, affirmations or recommendations identified.

4.14   There is one Expectation within this judgement area, which is met with a low level of risk. The review team concludes, therefore, that the enhancement of student learning opportunities at CEDU **meets** UK expectations.

5 Commentary on the Theme: Student Employability

Findings

5.1 There was clear evidence from scrutinising documentation and in the discussions with staff and students that employability skills are actively incorporated into the curriculum and offered as value-added opportunities to support the transition to work. The courses offered by CEDU are seen as a talent pipeline into the Christie's group and the commercial art world.

5.2 The review team found the detail, scope and management of professional development programmes and events to be highly effective in supporting students through to work and found these to be clearly focused in supporting student employability, with clear evidence of student employability outcomes being mapped and monitored.

5.3 CEDU offers a variety and breadth of professional development programmes and activities focused around promoting and encouraging professional development and career networking. The review team heard and read evidence that the appointment of the Development Officer has resulted in a systematic establishment of a series of professional presentations, workshops, external opportunities and tailored professional development opportunities, which has increased the number of internships and work experience opportunities for students to support the transition into the professional and commercial art world. Students receive unique and exclusive access to art-world experts and are able to access, handle and catalogue a wide collection of private records and art-world artifacts.

5.4 The professional development programme (PDP) is extensive, organised and culminates in one-to-one interviews with a Christie's International PLC HR Recruitment Officer, where students are given individual feedback and guidance on how to improve their employability skills.

5.5 The review team heard that annually around 100 of Christie's International PLC full-time employees are alumni of CEDU and many have gone on to become clients and industry experts in academic, museum and commercial institutions. CEDU offers a unique set of courses focused around the commercial art world and uses wider aspects of the Christie's International Group to richly develop the employability skills of its students and support the transition into work.

5.6 The review team concludes that CEDU places student employability at the heart of its student learning experience and it is a key strategic focus.

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 22-25 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.