



Recognition Scheme for Educational Oversight: report of the monitoring visit of Hult International Business School Ltd, April 2015

Section 1: Outcome of the monitoring visit

1 From the evidence provided in the annual return and at the monitoring visit, the review panel concludes that Hult International Business School Ltd (the School) has made acceptable progress with implementing the action plan from the April 2014 [Recognition Scheme for Educational Oversight](#).

Section 2: Changes since the last QAA review

2 Since the review in 2014, the School has moved its undergraduate provision to premises in Commercial Road, London. The move was a response to rapid increases in undergraduate student numbers over the last five years. There are 802 undergraduate students registered in 2014-15, a growth of 14 per cent on last year, and 644 postgraduate students, a small decrease on last year. The space in the new undergraduate campus can be configured in various ways and is fitted with the appropriate technology. Both staff and students confirmed that the new premises formed suitable space for teaching and learning and was an improvement on the previous facilities.

3 In July 2014, a strategic alliance between the School and Ashridge Business School was announced and at the time of the monitoring visit a legal agreement had been recently finalised.

Section 3: Findings from the monitoring visit

4 The action plan from the review has been implemented, with the majority of actions having been successfully completed. In the case of the recommendation for the School to revisit the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Quality Code), the School is scheduling its review to commence with publication of relevant Subject Benchmark Statements later in 2015.

5 The School continues to have effective communication across global campuses. Weekly or fortnightly calls take place between Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, Registrars and relevant Admissions Managers, as well as between Corporate Relations, Operations and Career Services departments. Differences in student satisfaction between campuses have been reduced and most programmes have improved satisfaction ratings.

6 At the London Campus, in addition to previously existing methods of gathering student feedback, wide-ranging one-to-one meetings with teams and over 100 individuals have allowed the School greater insight over and above 'townhall meetings' (that is, informal meetings between cohorts of students and the Academic and Operations Team) and surveys. The campus leadership and staff continue to be responsive to feedback and share best practice with counterparts globally.

7 A good range of practical learning opportunities is available to students. The action plan from the 2014 review indicated that these opportunities had already been implemented

for all students across all campuses. Student satisfaction surveys suggest that positive progress is being made with levels of student satisfaction rising in this area.

8 The School has developed and consistently applies a policy relating to penalties applied to the late submission of student work. At postgraduate level, the policy prohibits the late submission of assignments except in extenuating circumstances or if the professor responsible for the course explicitly states differently in the syllabus. At undergraduate level, professors set deadlines and also their own policies on late submission, which appear in the course syllabus. The systems are transparent. Consistency and compliance is monitored by Associate Deans through use of the virtual learning environment. Students confirm adherence to this.

9 The Faculty Handbook and Undergraduate Faculty Guidelines are updated annually to align with the academic year. The Associate Deans will continue to review resources for faculty to ensure they are updated each academic year. This process will occur when syllabi for the following academic year are requested, and by directing faculty to policies, regulations and norms.

10 Delay in publishing the final revised Subject Benchmark Statements has resulted in the School delaying its full review of the relevant sections of the Quality Code to supplement the use of existing external reference points. The School intends to work on this in anticipation of academic year 2015-16. The panel believes that the forthcoming merger with Ashridge Business School will further embed the School's understanding of the Quality Code and assist in this process now and in the future.

11 The School admissions process is managed globally but implemented at local level. A first enquiry is made through the School website or a recruitment fair, following which the potential student is contacted by a recruiter who continues to be in contact, assisting the student until matriculation. At this point, responsibility for the student passes to teams at campus level. The process is efficient and streamlined and students are appreciative of the assistance they gain.

12 Assessment is carried out efficiently and fairly. A combination of three assessments (none representing more than 50 per cent of the final mark) is usual for each course. These are written by the professor who teaches the course and approved by the relevant Associate Dean. Marking is carried out by the teaching professor and grades are overseen by Deans to ensure consistency. Teaching is observed regularly and module evaluations considered to further ensure this consistency. Grades are usually released to students within two weeks of submission of work with feedback which, despite variation in length and quality, is timely and useful for further assessment. Personal discussions with the relevant professor or other member of the team are available.

Section 4: Progress in working with the relevant external reference points relating to academic standards and quality for higher education

13 The School has made acceptable progress in working with external reference points, including the Quality Code. It also engages with the requirements of a number of national accreditation bodies. Given the global nature of School processes, the London campus plays its part in discussions but is bound by global policy. The School will review its processes in the light of the relevant reviews of QAA Subject Benchmark Statements to ensure continued relevance. The forthcoming merger with Ashridge Business School will increase the School's understanding of the Quality Code and further highlight its relevance (see also paragraph 10).

Section 5: Background to the monitoring visit

14 The monitoring visit serves as a short check on the provider's continuing management of academic standards and quality of provision. It focuses on progress since the previous review. In addition, it provides an opportunity for QAA to advise the provider of any matters that have the potential to be of particular interest in the next monitoring visit or review.

15 The monitoring visit was carried out by Dr David Gale (QAA Officer) and Professor Christopher Gale (review panel member), on 29 April 2015.

QAA1228 - R4525 - June 15

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2015
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB

Tel 01452 557000
Email enquiries@gaa.ac.uk
Web www.gaa.ac.uk

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786