



Hult International Business School Ltd

Recognition Scheme for Educational Oversight

Review by the Quality Assurance Agency
for Higher Education

April 2014

About this report

This is a report of a review under the Recognition Scheme for Educational Oversight conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) at Hult International Business School Ltd. The review took place on 29 April 2014 and was conducted by a panel, as follows:

- Professor Alan Jago
- Professor Diane Meehan
- Mr Lee Smith

The main purpose of the review was to:

- make judgements about the provider's delegated responsibilities for the management of quality and enhancement of learning opportunities
- draw a conclusion about whether the provider's public information is reliable
- produce a commentary on how effectively the provider discharges its responsibilities for academic standards
- report on any features of good practice
- make recommendations for action.

A summary of the [key findings](#) can be found in the section starting on page 2. The [context](#) in which these findings should be interpreted is explained on page 3. [Explanations](#) of the findings are given in numbered paragraphs in the section starting on page 4.

The QAA website gives more information [about QAA](#) and its mission.¹ More information about this the review method can be found in the [published handbook](#)².

¹ www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus/pages/default.aspx

² www.qaa.ac.uk/en/ReviewsAndReports/Pages/Educational-Oversight-.aspx

Key findings

The QAA panel considered evidence relating to the educational provision at Hult International Business School Ltd, both information supplied in advance and evidence gathered during the review visit itself. The review has resulted in the key findings stated in this section.

Judgements

The QAA panel formed the following judgement about Hult International Business School Ltd:

- **confidence** can be placed in the School's management of its responsibilities for the quality of learning opportunities.

The QAA review panel also concluded that the School **satisfactorily** manages its responsibilities for academic standards as set out in its contractual arrangements with its academic partners.

Conclusion about public information

The QAA panel concluded that:

- **reliance can** be placed on the information that Hult International Business School Ltd produces for its intended audiences about the learning opportunities it offers.

Good practice

The QAA panel identified the following features of **good practice** at Hult International Business School Ltd.

- The effectiveness of communication across global campuses (paragraph 1.4).
- The mechanisms for gathering and responding to feedback from students (paragraph 2.2).
- The range of practical learning opportunities available to students (paragraph 2.5).
- The extensive and appropriate range of structures in place to support students (paragraph 2.7).

Recommendations

The QAA panel makes the following **recommendations** to Hult International Business School Ltd.

It is **advisable** for Hult International Business School Ltd to:

- develop and consistently apply a policy relating to penalties applied to the late submission of student work (paragraph 1.9).

It would be **desirable** for Hult International Business School Ltd to:

- update the date on the Faculty Handbook and Undergraduate Faculty Guidelines annually to align with the academic year (paragraph 1.8).
- revisit the relevant sections of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education to supplement the use of existing external reference points (paragraph 1.13).

Context

Hult International Business School Ltd (the School) is a not-for-profit institution based in Boston, USA. It awards US degrees accredited by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), one of the six regional accrediting bodies in the USA. In addition to its main campus in Boston, the School offers its programmes on branch campuses in San Francisco, London, Dubai and Shanghai.

The School has offered complete programmes of study, leading to its own awards, at its London campus since 1990. In 2011, it applied for QAA's educational oversight of its London operation as a US degree awarding institution operating in the UK.

NEASC accredits the School against its 11 standards, with self-assessment and inspection scheduled every five years, and additional self-study and inspection any time Hult informs NEASC of a 'substantive change' (such as a new campus location). This accreditation extends to the School's operation and provision in London and therefore all students graduating from Hult are awarded a NEASC accredited, American degree. NEASC's last full accreditation report on Hult London was published in 2009, with an interim response in 2012.

Because Hult International Business School is accredited by a regional accreditation body (NEASC), its degrees are recognised by UK NARIC as being equivalent in level to UK degrees.

The London campus is also accredited by a number of UK agencies. It underwent reaccreditation by the British Accreditation Council (BAC) in July 2013. Hult London's MBA programme is accredited by the Association of MBAs (AMBA) with the most recent accreditation report being published in 2011. Since the initial Recognition Scheme for Educational Oversight review, the undergraduate campus has also received accreditation from the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA) for its Accounting and Finance courses, has become an Associate University of the Tony Blair Faith Foundation for its Faith and Globalisation course, and is in the process of seeking accreditation during the next academic year with the Chartered Institute of Marketing (CIM).

In 2013-14, the London campus had a total of 1,405 students enrolled, of whom 721 were from outside the European Economic Area. Of the total number of students, 706 were undergraduates and 699 postgraduates. At the time of this review, the following programmes were offered with student numbers in brackets:

- Master of Business Administration (105)
- Executive Master of Business Administration (259)
- Master of International Business (200)
- Master of International Marketing (73)
- Master of Finance (62)
- Bachelor of Business Administration (706).

Detailed findings about Hult International Business School

1 Academic standards

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

1.1 The School awards degrees accredited by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC). The School is responsible for the design and content of all its programmes, wherever delivered, within the standards defined by NEASC. Its postgraduate programmes are designed to be consistent with accepted international standards in business education.

1.2 The School ensures consistency of standards across its campuses through global structures, roles and procedures. In line with this approach, the key global committees responsible for assuring the standards of the School's awards are the Academic Standards Committee and the Curriculum Committee. A local Academic Standards Committee and Curriculum Committee operate at the London campus, currently the only one to offer undergraduate programmes. The panel saw evidence of the global Academic Standards Committee's consideration of data relating to student attainment across campuses and, at local level, consideration of a range of issues including examination regulations, grades, academic integrity, appeals and student conduct. Both the global and local Curriculum Committees consider curriculum related issues including discussion of, and planning for, revisions to provision.

1.3 The (global) Admissions Committee is responsible for setting admissions standards, policies, and procedures and for administering the School's admissions processes in line with its Admissions Policy. The London campus Admissions Committee consists of the Dean, Associate Deans and an Admissions Manager, all of whom receive training. Students were generally satisfied with the admissions process which the panel found to be effective.

1.4 Responsibility for the oversight of standards also rests with key personnel. The Chief Academic Officer (based in London) oversees the recently created roles of Global Dean of Postgraduate programmes (based in Boston, USA) and Global Dean of Undergraduate programmes (based in London) and, together with the campus Deans, they provide strategic oversight of global academic standards and quality. At the campus level, the Deans, together with the Associate Deans, have oversight of all academic issues, supported by Discipline Leads. The Deans' Committee is the principal academic decision-making body of the School, which operates effectively, regularly bringing together key role holders across the global campuses to discuss cross-campus issues and share good practice. The effectiveness of communication across global campuses is **good practice**.

1.5 The School measures performance by programme, by campus and across campuses. It brings together information within the Academic Dashboard which incorporates a range of data including academic staff evaluations, grade point averages (GPAs), top grades and failing grades by campus and by programme. The School is utilising the Academic Dashboard effectively to support the oversight of standards and to provide a useful mechanism to report and compare key data sets across all campuses.

1.6 The School sets a global syllabus consistency requirement defined as '100/80/50', whereby the syllabus for the same course delivered on different campuses must have 100 per cent of the same course aims and assessed learning outcomes, 80 per cent of the same topics and 50 per cent of the same reading materials (including case studies). This requirement assures consistency while allowing for some local contextualisation. Associate Deans and Discipline Leads check syllabi for consistency.

1.7 The School outlines its procedures relating to global grade consistency in the Faculty Handbook and on the School's global staff web portal (myFaculty). The School's policy for grading of assessments includes elements of both criterion and norm referencing including, in relation to the latter, the setting of a maximum percentage of top grades which can be awarded and an average course GPA. Students were familiar, and generally content, with this approach.

1.8 All academic staff and relevant administrators have access to academic governance information through myFaculty, with key documents being the Faculty Handbook, the Undergraduate Faculty Guidelines and FAQs. Academic staff confirmed their understanding of the School's procedures including the mechanisms for reviewing and updating provision, consistency requirements and assessment processes. The School updates the Faculty Handbook and Undergraduate Faculty Guidelines only when changes to content are required, resulting in the current handbook and guidelines being dated 2012-13. To avoid any potential confusion, it would be **desirable** for the School to update the date on the Faculty Handbook and Undergraduate Faculty Guidelines annually to align with the academic year.

1.9 The School's syllabus template incorporates a section for academic staff to define submission deadlines, penalties for late submission and assessment criteria. Academic staff have discretion to reduce the grades for work submitted after the stated deadline. Students confirmed that all syllabi contained clear information regarding assessment criteria and submission deadlines and associated penalties for late submission of work, but that the latter varied considerably from a percentage deduction to the award of a zero mark. To ensure a more equitable approach, it is **advisable** for the School to develop and consistently apply a policy relating to penalties applied to the late submission of student work.

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

1.10 The NEASC Standards for Accreditation provide the main benchmark for all the School's degrees. In 2012, NEASC confirmed its acceptance of the School's five-year interim report and that a full review would take place in 2017.

1.11 The London campus successfully underwent British Accreditation Council for Independent Further and Higher Education (BAC) reaccreditation in 2013 and has responded to the issues raised.

1.12 AMBA accredits the School's MBA provision. ACCA has recently accredited the London campus' undergraduate Accounting and Finance courses, and the School (through its undergraduate provision in London) has become an Associate University of the Tony Blair Faith Foundation. The process of accreditation of the relevant undergraduate provision with CIM will commence during 2014. UK NARIC has confirmed that the School's awards meet norms of UK equivalency at both undergraduate and master's levels.

1.13 The School stated in its submission that it has benchmarked its provision against *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* (FHEQ) and relevant benchmark statements but provided no supporting evidence. The panel explored this and were able to clarify that the exercise had been undertaken prior to the School's first QAA review visit in 2012 and had not been revisited. It would be **desirable** for the School to revisit the relevant sections of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education to supplement the use of existing external reference points.

How effectively does the School use external scrutiny of assessment processes to assure academic standards (where applicable)?

1.14 The School makes no formal or explicit use of external input to its assessment processes, and NEASC does not require it to do so.

The panel concludes that Hult International Business School **satisfactorily** manages its responsibilities for academic standards, as set out in its contractual arrangements with its academic partners.

2 Quality of learning opportunities

How effectively does the School fulfil its responsibilities for managing the quality of learning opportunities?

2.1 The Chief Academic Officer oversees the Global Deans of Postgraduate and Undergraduate Programmes and they, along with the campus Deans, provide effective oversight of the quality of learning opportunities including the provision of teaching and support staff, teaching accommodation and learning resources (see also paragraph 1.4). The management team in London has a clear vision for the development of the provision including the opening of a new campus for its undergraduate students to be opened later this year.

2.2 The senior managers at the London campus proactively monitor the quality of learning opportunities offered to students by making use of the results of student feedback. This includes Student Satisfaction Surveys, conducted twice a year, the Faculty Evaluations carried out at the end of each course, and the formal 'Townhall' meetings which take place in the first and third week of every course. In addition, there is a student representative system where the representatives regularly meet with the Deans to discuss any emerging issues. The review team found strong evidence that the mechanisms for gathering and responding to feedback from students are making a positive contribution to the management of the quality of learning opportunities. The mechanisms for gathering and responding to feedback from students is **good practice**.

How effectively are external reference points used in monitoring and evaluation processes?

2.3 The School makes appropriate use of various external reference points in its monitoring and evaluation processes, the main one being its NEASC accreditation (see paragraphs 1.10-1.13). The School has also used the QAA educational oversight reports and reviews as a mechanism for ongoing review of its processes and policies. The accreditation by BAC also covers the London campus (see paragraph 1.11).

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

2.4 The School uses a range of mechanisms to assure itself that the quality of teaching and learning are being maintained and enhanced. These include regular observations of teachers by both peers and Associate Deans. There are also regular evaluations of all faculty by students. Formal faculty meetings take place for each module, where there is sharing of good practice as well as general discussion of changes and plans. There are also meetings of all faculty each term teaching on a particular programme to ensure consistency

and a balanced workload for the students. Postgraduate faculty have an annual Global Faculty Summit, and all faculty receive a monthly newsletter.

2.5 The School has a clear commitment to giving students both professional training and practical experience. The School achieves this by providing a number of action projects, internships and drawing on experienced and eminent staff from other Business Schools. Students described the range of practical opportunities available to them and the positive contribution it had made to them. The range of practical learning opportunities available to students is **good practice**.

2.6 The School has a policy of recruiting well qualified and experienced staff. Students commended the practical and academic experience of teaching staff. The teaching staff felt they were well supported in their roles.

How effectively does the School assure itself that students are appropriately supported?

2.7 Students regard the quality and range of student support offered by the School as being a significant strength. This included the support available prior to entry and arrival, the induction programme and the quality of information provided to support the teaching programmes. Students were also appreciative of the provision for those with particular needs, including additional English language tuition, and additional academic support in some quantitative subjects. Students have regular meetings with Assistant and Associate Deans for one-to-one discussions of academic progress, and all students have access to the Deans for tutorial support. There is effective support available for careers advice and guidance with optional Professional Career Development classes. The School also offers effective support for students with disabilities as outlined in the Graduate Student Handbook. The extensive and appropriate range of structures in place to support students is **good practice**.

How effective are the School's arrangements for staff development in relation to maintaining and/or enhancing the quality of learning opportunities?

2.8 The School provides suitable and comprehensive development opportunities for teaching staff through a staff development programme which develops skills and knowledge enhancement. The School encourages staff to attend conferences, undertake additional study, and engage in research related activities. The School conducts an annual review of teaching staff including the use of the student evaluations, and has a system for identifying areas for future development. Teaching staff participate in both teaching observation by peers and by Associate Deans. Staff have access to an online portal, myFaculty, where they can gain access to all policies and procedures, including a range of teaching resources.

How effectively does the School ensure that students have access to learning resources that are sufficient to enable them to achieve the intended learning outcomes of their programmes?

2.9 The School provides excellent learning infrastructures and resources for its students. The student population is growing and the School has decided to open a new campus for its undergraduate programmes. The current campuses provide appropriate physical resources for the teaching programmes. This includes high quality study space, library facilities, social space and classrooms. Students were complimentary about the learning resources available to support their studies.

The panel has **confidence** that the School is fulfilling its responsibilities for managing and enhancing the quality of the learning opportunities it provides for students.

3 Public information

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

3.1 The relevant manager signs off marketing and externally facing materials, including the website, and the processes in place are working effectively. Each campus has responsibility for providing local content. The Chief Academic Officer has overall responsibility for the academic information on the website and in the programme brochures. Ultimately, the President oversees all global marketing materials.

3.2 The School's website provides a range of information for prospective students, including in relation to each of its global campuses. The website for the London campus covers information about programmes, admissions requirements and procedures, accommodation and living in London. Extensive pre-arrival materials are made available to students and they also have access to student handbooks through the student portal (myHult). The student submission noted that pre-arrival information and material could be improved, although students who met the panel indicated that the information they received prior to coming to London accurately reflected their experiences. The outcome of recent student evaluations also demonstrated that student satisfaction with pre-arrival information has improved. A global working party is looking at pre-arrival information with the aim of further enhancing its quality and accuracy.

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

Action plan³

Hult International Business School Ltd action plan relating to the Recognition Scheme for Educational Oversight April 2014						
Good practice	Intended outcomes	Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes	Target date(s)	Action by	Reported to	Evaluation (process or evidence)
The review team identified the following areas of good practice that are worthy of wider dissemination within the School:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the effectiveness of communication across global campuses (paragraph 1.4) 	Effective communication across global campuses achieved at all levels of the organisation and in all functions to ensure good practice is disseminated, knowledge shared and potential issues and risks are identified early and solutions found to mitigate the outcomes	<p>Continue the weekly or fortnightly global calls for Deans, Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, Registrars, Admissions Managers (on the Academic Team) as well as among Corporate Relations, Operations, Careers Services departments</p> <p>Agendas are posted and updated on the Academic Team page of myCourses</p>	<p>December 2014 and August 2015 (and every December/ August thereafter) when Student Satisfaction Surveys are completed</p> <p>Agendas updated weekly</p>	People within each function (Deans, Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, Registrars)	Campus Dean	<p>Student Satisfaction Surveys indicate differences across campuses</p> <p>Improved communication over time should reduce differences between campuses and achieve an overall improved experience for the students</p>

³ Hult International Business School Ltd has been required to develop this action plan to follow up on good practice and address any recommendations arising from the review. QAA monitors progress against the action plan.

		<p>Frequency and method of communications reviewed and updated</p> <p>The new roles of Communications Managers on each campus will ensure communications across campuses and to students are homogenised and improved</p>	<p>Communications reviewed monthly</p> <p>December 2014 and August 2015</p>			
<p>10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the mechanisms for gathering and responding to feedback from students (paragraph 2.2) 	<p>Consolidation of methods for gathering student feedback to ensure students do not get 'survey fatigue'</p> <p>Assurance that feedback is acted upon and responded to</p> <p>Consistency in how feedback is sought and responded to across all campuses</p>	<p>Review globally the methods for gathering student feedback and see how improvements can be made</p> <p>Slides to show in Townhalls at the start of each module highlighting actions taken in response to feedback received from previous module</p> <p>Best practice to be discussed and agreed upon at Global Faculty Summit (and reviewed at other global meetings of the Academic Team)</p>	<p>June 2014 (Global Faculty Summit)</p> <p>January 2015 – start of module B to show responses from module A</p> <p>June 2014 (Global Faculty Summit)</p>	Associate Deans	Deans	<p>Student Satisfaction Surveys (December and August every year) indicate the following measures which will indicate success of these actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> responsiveness of Registry to student concerns/ requests; Deans' responsiveness to student concerns/ requests; responsiveness to student concerns

						(Student Facilities); students feeling informed about what's happening on campus (policies, changes, events, and decisions)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the range of practical learning opportunities available to students (paragraph 2.5) 	<p>Adoption by all campuses</p> <p>Increased opportunities for students to gain practical experience outside the curriculum</p>	<p>This is already implemented by all campuses and is a fundamental part of the Hult culture and programme creation through Action Projects and the Hult Impact Challenge</p> <p>Speakers from industry and workshops on specific areas, such as Google Analytics, to be scheduled as optional extra sessions for students</p> <p>Sharing best practice across campuses (through regular calls and at global meetings such as the Faculty Summit) to ensure successful projects and extra-curricular activities are adopted globally</p>	31 August 2014 (in time for the 2014-15 academic year)	Associate Deans	Deans	<p>Student Satisfaction Surveys, specifically the measures:</p> <p>Level of satisfaction with the PROGRAM</p> <p>On-campus speakers and career industry panels</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the extensive and appropriate range of structures in place to support students (paragraph 2.7). 	<p>Adoption by all campuses to ensure consistency</p>	<p>Review globally the methods for supporting students through extra tuition and pastoral care to ensure current levels are maintained or increased and there is global consistency</p>	<p>June 2014 (Global Faculty Summit)</p>	<p>Associate Deans</p>	<p>Deans</p>	<p>Student Satisfaction surveys (there is a metric for 'Accessibility of the Deans')</p> <p>Scheduler on myCourses for each programme and module to show opportunities for extra tuition in English, maths, and so on</p>
<p>Advisable</p>	<p>Intended outcomes</p>	<p>Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes</p>	<p>Target date(s)</p>	<p>Action by</p>	<p>Reported to</p>	<p>Evaluation (process or evidence)</p>
<p>The team considers that it is advisable for the School to:</p>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop and consistently apply a policy relating to penalties applied to the late submission of student work (paragraph 1.9). 	<p>All faculty to apply the same penalty/ies to late submission of assignments</p> <p>Students to know the policy at the start of the year and throughout the year</p>	<p>Policy to be devised and approved by academic leadership</p> <p>Policy to be disseminated to all faculty through printed materials, through the online portal myFaculty, in periodic Faculty Meetings and by Associate Deans when onboarding faculty</p>	<p>Policy to be defined and published by 31 August 2014 (that is, ready for the new academic year)</p>	<p>Associate Deans of London post-graduate and under-graduate campuses</p>	<p>Deans of London post-graduate and under-graduate campuses</p>	<p>Fully embedded formal policy on late submissions</p> <p>Review by Associate Deans throughout the year that policy is being adhered to when reviewing and approving all grades from</p>

		and preparing courses Policy to be added to the Student Handbooks and explained to students during orientation, along with grading system				professors prior to publication to the students
Desirable	Intended outcomes	Actions to be taken to achieve intended outcomes	Target date(s)	Action by	Reported to	Evaluation (process or evidence)
The team considers that it would be desirable for the School to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> update the date on the Faculty Handbook and Undergraduate Faculty Guidelines annually to align with the academic year (paragraph 1.8) 	Documents to show current year(s) every year	Owners of Faculty Guidelines and Undergraduate Faculty Guidelines to update dates in documents and post latest versions on myFaculty	31 August 2014 (in time for start of next Academic Year); and then 31 August every year thereafter Current version has already been updated	Associate Deans of London post-graduate and under-graduate campuses	Deans of post-graduate and under-graduate campuses	Associate Deans to review all global materials and resources on myFaculty in August of each year to ensure they are current, prior to onboarding new faculty (old materials to be flagged for updating with immediate effect by Associate Deans)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> revisit the relevant sections of the 	Hult curriculum benchmarked against updated subject	Hult will conduct a comparative review of the curriculum against the new	31 May 2015 (within four months of	Associate Deans in London	Deans of post-graduate	Benchmarking processes against both the

<p>UK Quality Code for Higher Education to supplement the use of existing external reference points (paragraph 1.13).</p>	<p>benchmark statements</p> <p>Hult curriculum benchmarked against <i>Part B: Assuring and enhancing academic quality</i> and <i>Part C: Information about higher education provision</i> of the Quality Code</p>	<p>subject benchmark statements when they are published. Estimated publication date: 'May 2014 and January 2015' (www.qaa.ac.uk/AssuringStandardsAndQuality/subject-guidance/sb-review-13-15/Pages/Phases-of-Review.aspx)</p> <p>Hult will also conduct and document an internal review of <i>Part B: Assuring and enhancing academic quality</i> and <i>Part C: Information about higher education provision</i> of the Quality Code and include the documentation in future accreditation monitoring reviews</p> <p>Following the review, areas identified for improvement to meet the Quality Code will be actioned prior to the start of the following academic year (2015-16)</p>	<p>publication of new benchmarks and in time for any changes necessary before start of 2015-16 academic year)</p> <p>Process to be repeated when benchmarks next updated or there are changes to the curriculum, whichever is the sooner</p> <p>Curriculum to be reviewed against the Quality Code also by 31 May 2015, ready for the start of the 2015-16 academic year</p> <p>Process to be done in parallel with the benchmarking against the subject benchmark statements</p>	<p>post-graduate and under-graduate campuses</p>	<p>and under-graduate campus.</p>	<p>subject benchmark statements from QAA and against <i>Part B: Assuring and enhancing academic quality</i> and <i>Part C: Information about higher education provision</i> of the Quality Code to be documented</p> <p>Documents to be included in future accreditation monitoring reviews</p>
---	---	--	---	--	-----------------------------------	---

Glossary

This glossary explains terms used in this report. You can find a fuller glossary at: www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus/glossary. More details and formal definitions of key terms can be found in the [handbook](#)⁴ for this review method.

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

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

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.

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 QAA's review processes.

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

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

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

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

QAA846 - R3987 - Jul 14

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2014
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB

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

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786

⁴ www.qaa.ac.uk/en/ReviewsAndReports/Pages/Educational-Oversight.aspx