



This review method
is ESG-compliant

International Quality Accreditation

International Business
University

Review Report

June 2026

Contents

About this review	1
Key findings	2
Executive summary.....	2
QAA's conclusions about International Business University.....	3
European Standards and Guidelines	3
Conditions	3
Good practice	3
Recommendations.....	3
Explanation of the findings about International Business University	4
Standard 1.1 Policy for quality assurance	5
Standard 1.2 Design and approval of programmes	8
Standard 1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment.....	11
Standard 1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification	14
Standard 1.5 Teaching staff.....	17
Standard 1.6 Learning resources and student support.....	20
Standard 1.7 Information management.....	23
Standard 1.8 Public information	25
Standard 1.9 Ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes	27
Standard 1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance	30
Glossary	32

About this review

This is a report of an International Quality Accreditation conducted by The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) at International Business University (IBU), Toronto, Canada. The review took place from 22 to 24 June 2026 and was conducted by a team of three reviewers, as follows:

- Professor John Byrom
- Dr Nadeem Khan
- Ms Chrystalle Margallo (student reviewer).

International Quality Accreditation (IQA) offers institutions outside the UK the opportunity to have a review by the UK's Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA). The review benchmarks the institution's quality assurance processes against international quality assurance standards set out in Part 1 of the [Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area \(ESG\)](#).

In International Quality Accreditation, the QAA review team:

- draws conclusion against each of the 10 standards set out in Part 1 of the ESG
- makes conditions (if relevant)
- makes recommendations
- identifies features of good practice
- comes to an overall conclusion as to whether the institution meets the standards for International Quality Accreditation.

A summary of the findings can be found in the section: [Key findings](#). The section [Explanations of the findings](#) provides the detailed commentary.

The QAA website gives more information [about QAA](#) and its mission. A dedicated section explains the method for [International Quality Accreditation](#) and has links to other informative documents. For an explanation of terms see the [Glossary](#) at the end of this report.

Key findings

Executive summary

IBU is the first not-for-profit private university in Canada. It was approved by Ontario's Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board (PEQAB) in 2020 and was awarded consent to operate by the Ontario Minister of Colleges and Universities in December 2020, in accordance with the Post-secondary Education Choice and Excellence Act, 2000. IBU accepted its first students in 2021.

IBU's mission is to educate 'the next generation of graduates who anticipate and drive change, and who make a difference at work and in their communities'. IBU's vision as a 'student-focused university' is to offer programmes 'that are career-relevant, accelerated, and integrate with work-connected projects'. This is outlined in IBU's Institutional Strategic Plan (2025-2028) and represented through five guiding pillars and goals.

IBU operates within a governance structure under the oversight of both a Board of Governors who have responsibility for academic affairs, and a Board of Directors who are responsible for the operational affairs of IBU. It applies for provincial Ministerial Consent via PEQAB, for new, amendments to, and renewal of programmes.

IBU's main campus is located in downtown Toronto, with a small campus in Ottawa offering two MBA programmes. Since it was established in 2020, its academic provision has expanded and IBU now offers three bachelor's degree programmes, seven MBA programmes and two MSc programmes, having received approval from Ontario's PEQAB, as well as Ministerial Consent. As of June 2026, 2,778 students were studying at the University, with over 93.99% studying on master's degree programmes.

In reaching conclusions about the extent to which IBU meets the 10 ESG Standards, the QAA review team followed the evidence-based review procedure as outlined in the handbook for International Quality Accreditation. The University provided the review team with a self-evaluation and supporting evidence. During the review visit, which took place 22 to 24 June 2026, the review team held a total of eight meetings with the President and Vice Chancellor, senior leadership team, students, academic teaching staff, teaching assistant support teams, professional support staff, alumni, and external stakeholders. The review team also had the opportunity to observe the University's facilities and learning resources at the Toronto campus.

In summary, the review team found **four** examples of good practice and made **five** recommendations for improvement/enhancement. The recommendations are of a desirable rather than essential nature and are proposed to enable the University to build on existing practice which is operating satisfactorily but which could be improved or enhanced. The review team did not set any conditions.

Overall, the review team concluded that IBU **meets** all standards for International Quality Accreditation.

QAA's conclusions about International Business University

The QAA review team reached the following conclusions about the higher education provision at IBU.

European Standards and Guidelines

IBU meets all of the 10 ESG Standards and Guidelines.

Conditions

The review team did not set any conditions.

Good practice

The QAA review team identified the following four features of **good practice** at IBU:

- Highly engaged and collaborative partnerships with industry stakeholders, whose contributions are embedded across governance, curriculum design and assessment, which significantly enhances the relevance of programmes and supports graduate employability and career readiness (ESG Standard 1.2).
- The implementation of IBU Signal, in particular the way in which external stakeholder feedback has been drawn upon to design a report card indicating the applied cognitive skills that students gain through their studies, which provides a comprehensive skills record for students and employers (ESG Standard 1.4).
- The wide range of data and information collected, analysed and used to inform operational practice and decision making (ESG Standard 1.7).
- Highly effective engagement with industry stakeholders to positively inform programme monitoring and enhancement processes (ESG Standard 1.9).

Recommendations

The QAA review team makes the following five **recommendations** to IBU:

- Ensure the Institutional Quality Assurance Policy (IQAP) is made more widely available by placing it alongside other policies on the [IBU website](#) (ESG Standard 1.1).
- Establish a more robust and structured approach to supporting staff specifically in the development of inclusive assessment practices, to ensure consistency across programmes and continue promoting an appropriate balance between theoretical and practical forms of assessment (ESG Standard 1.3).
- Establish a clear formal mechanism to identify the individual training and development needs of faculty and staff and use the outcomes to develop and periodically monitor targeted individual professional development plans to ensure continuous improvement and alignment with institutional priorities (ESG Standard 1.5).
- Establish a formalised and transparent process for the allocation of budget to learning resources and student support to continuously ensure resource planning is applied consistently and informed by student need, service demand and institutional priorities (ESG Standard 1.6).
- Strengthen feedback management processes by establishing a systematic mechanism for closing the feedback loop and communicating resulting actions and improvements to stakeholders, particularly students (ESG Standard 1.9).

Explanation of the findings about International Business University

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.

Standard 1.1 Policy for quality assurance

Institutions should have a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of their strategic management. Internal stakeholders should develop and implement this policy through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.

Findings

1.1 The first pillar in IBU's Institutional Strategic Plan for the current period (2025-2028) emphasises that the University will place 'academic excellence first', with the underpinning goal to 'uphold rigorous standards that build institutional credibility and student value'. This aim is realised in part through its approach to quality assurance, which is captured in the Institutional Quality Assurance Policy (IQAP) and the Institutional Quality Assurance Manual.

1.2 Both the Policy and the Manual are appropriately detailed, setting out a framework for quality assurance as well as accompanying guidance relating to a range of underpinning processes and structures which focus on the implementation of a quality assurance perspective. For instance, the IQAP emphasises the importance IBU places on academic rigour and stresses its alignment within the broader external quality assurance environment which involves the provincial regulator, the PEQAB (see Standard 1.10, below) and the Quality Assurance Framework of the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance. Responsibility for the IQAP lies with the Executive Dean and Vice-President, who is also authorised to liaise with PEQAB as the provincial regulator. Operationally, the Quality Assurance Office (QAO) is charged with quality assurance and enhancement and is led by an individual that reports to the Academic Director and works with a range of internal stakeholders.

1.3 In addition, the Institutional Quality Assurance Manual includes various clear and concise standard operating procedures (SOPs) for activities such as new programme development, major programme modifications, and cyclical programme reviews. While the IBU website has a section dedicated to various institutional policies (<https://ibu.ca/ibu-policies/>), the IQAP does not appear therein. Appropriate structures and processes are in place to enable the development and implementation of the IQAP, with the involvement of internal and external stakeholders, as confirmed across meetings with both institutional staff and external stakeholders. The review team considered the policy to be accessible and widely understood by key stakeholders, although the review team **recommends** that the Institutional Quality Assurance Policy is made more widely available by placing it alongside other policies on the [IBU website](#).

1.4 The Academic Council is IBU's 'primary authority' in respect of academic standards. The Council's terms of reference establish its purpose, responsibilities and composition, amongst other aspects. Under 'Academic planning, policy and standards', the Council's oversight of both internal and external quality assurance is stressed. Academic Council is chaired by the President and Vice-Chancellor, with representation from teaching staff (both full-time and adjunct). A student representative also sits on the Council and on one of its subcommittees, the Academic Standards and Integrity Subcommittee (see paragraph 1.6 below). During the review visit, the role of the student representative was explored in further detail. The review team noted that the inclusion of a representative on the Council was a relatively recent initiative, and that the position was not currently an elected one.

1.5 A review of IQAP and the Academic Quality Assurance functions demonstrated that IBU's structures and processes actively harness the student voice. Students are surveyed at orientation, at the culmination of individual courses, and at other points during their

enrolment in the form of the student experience survey. During the review visit, students spoke positively of their experiences, noting that their opinions and evaluations were frequently sought, but that they were not always clear what actions had occurred in light of their feedback. Teaching staff also provided some examples of how they had implemented changes to courses following input from students. The review team therefore concluded that a more systematic mechanism for closing the feedback loop and communicating resulting actions and improvements to students would be beneficial, as shown in Standard 1.9 below.

1.6 IBU has subsidiary committees of Academic Council, namely the Program and Curriculum Committee (PCC), the Teaching and Learning and Scholarship Subcommittee (TLSS), and the Academic Standards and Integrity Subcommittee (ASI). Scrutiny of committee documentation, including agendas and minutes from recent meetings of Academic Council and the PCC; terms of reference for the TLSS; and terms of reference and minutes of the ASI afforded the review team with further insights relating to IBU's quality assurance structures and processes. Terms of references are clear and logical, while agendas and minutes revealed to the review team that committee business considers a range of issues relevant to quality assurance and enhancement, including issues such as academic integrity violations, proposed new programmes, and the approval of institutional policies.

1.7 In addition to teaching staff representation on a range of committees relevant to the maintenance and enhancement of quality and standards, IBU claims that it evokes a quality mindset among its internal stakeholders. Scrutiny of sample job descriptions confirmed to the review team that IBU emphasises the importance of a quality assurance culture when recruiting into both academic and professional services positions. This was further apparent in documentation relating to faculty onboarding and ongoing training, in which dedicated content relating to quality assurance and associated policy had been covered, as had been stipulated by the PCC.

1.8 With regards to the involvement of external stakeholders in quality assurance policy, the terms of reference for the TLSS refer to 'External teaching and learning experts or partners' potentially being invited as non-voting members to participate. Similarly, Academic Council agendas/minutes refer to 'invited guests' but the presence of external representatives on these decision-making bodies appeared to the review team to be limited. However, IBU also has in place both Program Advisory Committees (PACs) as well as an Industry Advisory Council (IAC). The terms of reference and details of committee membership confirm that IBU looks to draw on external expertise, from academia and industry. Both committees share members' strategic advice on the relevance of IBU's provision to wider business and society. Members also provide feedback on new programme design (for example, in relation to a specialist MBA) and the content of curricula.

1.9 During the review visit, the meeting with external stakeholders included several representatives who were members of the IAC (one of whom had previously served on a PAC). Participants confirmed that they were actively involved in supporting IBU across a range of relevant activities, including input into the development of new programmes and courses, offering opportunities for student involvement in capstone projects, and participation in the development of 'IBU Signal' – an innovative record of students' skill development upon completion of their programmes of study (see Standard 1.4 below).

1.10 The review team determined that IBU has appropriate policies and procedures relating to quality assurance which form part of their strategic management, although as noted above, these are not all currently accessible online. Considering IBU's information management processes are robust as seen in Standard 1.7 below, and appropriate internal and external stakeholders are involved in the development and implementation of the IQAP,

ensuring the IQAP is publicly available is a recommendation, rather than a condition. Based on the evidence, the review team concludes that Standard 1.1 Policy for quality assurance is **met**.

Standard 1.2 Design and approval of programmes

Institutions should have processes for the design and approval of their programmes. The programmes should be designed so that they meet the objectives set for them, including the intended learning outcomes. The qualification resulting from a programme should be clearly specified and communicated, and refer to the correct level of the national qualifications framework for higher education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area.

Findings

2.1 IBU has established a structured approach to programme design and approval that aligns academic provision with institutional priorities, labour market needs and external qualification frameworks. Programme development is informed by the Ontario Qualifications Framework and Degree Level Expectations (OQFDLE) from the earliest stages of programme conception, providing a clear foundation for defining qualification levels and academic expectations. Meetings with institutional representatives confirmed that programme proposals also take account of provincial priorities, employer requirements and emerging societal needs, ensuring that new programmes are developed within an appropriate strategic and external context.

2.2 Programme objectives are developed with reference to labour market intelligence and graduate employability. Programme approval documentation demonstrates that new programmes have been introduced in response to identified workforce demands and emerging sectors, including artificial intelligence (AI) and specialised MBA pathways. Senior leaders and industry stakeholders explained that employer consultation, future skills requirements, student demand and labour market analysis are considered during programme development and subsequent review, informing decisions on programme content and future provision.

2.3 The review team found that IBU has established a formal process for programme design and approval. New programme proposals begin with a New Program Concept Summary that requires consideration of strategic alignment, market demand and resource implications before detailed programme development proceeds. Documentary evidence and meetings with institutional representatives confirmed that proposals subsequently progress through institutional governance structures before external validation and approval, providing both internal and independent scrutiny of academic standards and programme viability.

2.4 Programme design is based on clearly defined intended learning outcomes and a structured approach to curriculum development. The New Program Proposal Template requires programme learning outcomes, course learning outcomes, curriculum mapping and teaching and learning approaches to be documented and reviewed as part of the programme approval process. Academic staff demonstrated a clear understanding of the relationship between programme outcomes, course outcomes and assessment design, while quality assurance arrangements provide oversight of this alignment throughout programme approval and review.

2.5 Programme learning outcomes are aligned with external academic expectations and embedded throughout curriculum and assessment design. Academic staff described how assessments are mapped against programme and course learning outcomes and explained the processes used to maintain consistency across different instructors and programme deliveries. Programme approval and modification procedures require formal mapping and review of learning outcomes, ensuring that curriculum design, assessment and intended

learning outcomes are considered together throughout programme development and approval.

2.6 Stakeholder engagement forms an integral component of programme design and review. Formal PAC structures provide opportunities for employers and industry representatives to contribute to curriculum development, programme competencies and graduate attributes. Documentary evidence and meetings with institutional and external representatives confirmed that stakeholder feedback informs programme development and enhancement activities, ensuring that programme content reflects current industry practice and evolving workforce requirements.

2.7 The review team found that IBU makes systematic use of external expertise and reference points during programme development and review. Industry representatives contribute perspectives on emerging technologies, professional expectations and future workforce requirements, while institutional representatives explained that labour market intelligence and stakeholder consultations are routinely considered when developing new programmes and reviewing existing provision. Industry stakeholders described their engagement in consultation activities and confirmed that their contributions are considered during curriculum development and programme enhancement.

2.8 Throughout the review, a consistent picture emerged of sustained and meaningful engagement between IBU and its industry partners. Industry stakeholders demonstrated a strong commitment to supporting the University through active participation in PACs, curriculum development, assessment activities, experiential learning, programme review and strategic discussions relating to future workforce needs. Students and graduates also described the value of these interactions in strengthening their professional development and preparedness for employment. The review team identifies IBU's highly engaged and collaborative partnerships with industry stakeholders, whose contributions are embedded across governance, curriculum design and assessment, which significantly enhances the relevance of programmes and supports graduate employability and career readiness, seen in paragraph 2.12 below, as a feature of **good practice**.

2.9 External academic scrutiny forms an established component of programme validation. Programme proposals are reviewed by external academic experts and peer reviewers against the PEQAB standards and provincial academic expectations before approval is granted. Documentary evidence demonstrated that these external review processes contribute to programme approval and consent amendment decisions, while institutional representatives described the role of external reviewers in providing independent academic scrutiny throughout programme development.

2.10 Qualifications awarded by IBU are specified with reference to recognised external academic frameworks. Programme development documentation demonstrates that qualifications are mapped against the Ontario Qualifications Framework and Degree Level Expectations, providing a clear basis for determining qualification levels and programme learning outcomes. Academic and quality assurance staff confirmed that programme learning outcomes, curriculum structures and programme approval processes are reviewed against these external expectations throughout programme development and approval.

2.11 Students contribute to programme development and enhancement through established feedback mechanisms and representation within academic governance structures. The University systematically collects student feedback through course evaluations and institutional feedback processes that inform programme review activities. Students confirmed that they are regularly invited to provide feedback on their learning experience and described examples where issues raised through evaluations had been considered by the University, as shown in Standard 1.3 below. Institutional representatives further explained how student

feedback is reviewed through quality assurance processes and contributes to programme review and enhancement activities.

2.12 Employability and professional readiness are strongly embedded within programme design. Capstone experiences provide students with opportunities to apply knowledge and skills in authentic professional contexts while engaging directly with employers and industry projects. Employers and graduates confirmed the value of these experiences in developing workplace readiness, adaptability and transferable skills, while institutional evidence demonstrates ongoing review and enhancement of capstone arrangements. The review team considered that these arrangements support the achievement of programme objectives related to employability.

2.13 Programme structures support student progression and the achievement of intended learning outcomes. During the review visit, students described their workloads as manageable, assessment schedules as clearly communicated and learning activities as appropriately structured to support their academic development. These experiences are supported by institutional monitoring processes, including course audits and programme review activities that consider programme delivery, student progression and achievement of learning outcomes, as shown in Standard 1.9 below.

2.14 Work-integrated learning is incorporated into programme structures through consultancy projects, applied research activities and entrepreneurial initiatives. Academic support staff explained the processes used to match students with employers and projects that align with their academic background and career aspirations. Employers also provide feedback on student performance and programme effectiveness, which contributes to programme review and enhancement alongside other institutional quality assurance processes.

2.15 The evidence suggests that IBU has comprehensive and effective arrangements for the design, approval, monitoring and enhancement of programmes. Programme development is aligned with external qualification frameworks and institutional priorities, informed by stakeholder engagement and labour market intelligence, and supported by robust internal and external approval processes. The systematic use of monitoring, stakeholder feedback and enhancement activities provides assurance that programmes remain relevant, academically sound and responsive to student and employer needs. These arrangements ensure that programmes are designed to achieve their intended learning outcomes, meet their stated objectives and remain responsive to the needs of students, employers and wider society. The review team therefore concludes that Standard 1.2 Policy for design and approval of programmes is **met**.

Standard 1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment

Institutions should ensure that the programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in creating the learning process, and that the assessment of students reflects this approach.

Findings

3.1 IBU has established a clear institutional framework for student-centred learning and teaching through its Teaching and Learning Framework, which promotes active and experiential learning and sets an expectation that faculty act as facilitators of learning rather than solely as providers of content. The Faculty Handbook, faculty onboarding process, faculty training and ongoing professional development activities reinforce this approach, as confirmed by senior leaders during the review visit. Academic staff described how the Teaching and Learning Framework principles are applied through active learning, discussion-based teaching and practical application within the classroom. Collectively, these arrangements demonstrate a consistent institutional commitment to learner engagement, active participation and the ongoing enhancement of learning and teaching.

3.2 The University utilises a range of delivery methods, including synchronous, asynchronous and hybrid approaches, providing flexibility and supporting the diverse needs of its student body. During the campus tour, the review team observed technology-enhanced learning environments, including a dedicated media room designed to support online and blended learning. Students confirmed they are encouraged to engage actively in their learning through collaborative participation and discussion-based and reflective activities, while experiential and work-integrated learning opportunities enable them to apply knowledge and skills in authentic contexts. Academic staff further described how they adapt their teaching approaches to meet the needs of different student groups through active and practical learning activities.

3.3 The review team saw evidence that IBU has established a clear institutional approach to assessment design, with assessment practices intended to support the achievement of learning outcomes while recognising diverse learner needs and abilities. Assessment is designed to enable students to demonstrate their knowledge and skills through a range of approaches, including authentic and applied assessment activities that promote critical thinking, problem-solving and collaboration. Senior leaders explained that assessment design is guided by the Teaching and Learning Framework and the Evaluative Criteria for Academic Programs, supporting consistency across programmes and alignment with intended learning outcomes. Academic staff confirmed that programme learning outcomes inform the design of assessment activities and that a range of assessment methods are used to support different approaches to learning and student engagement. Students described that assessments provided opportunities to apply their learning in different ways and supported the development of practical knowledge and skills. Collectively, these arrangements support an inclusive and student-centred approach to assessment that enables students to demonstrate achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

3.4 Staff described opportunities to engage in mandatory training, professional development activities and collaborative discussions that support the continued development of teaching practice and the sharing of effective approaches. These arrangements support the ongoing development of staff knowledge and skills and contribute to the delivery of student-centred learning. However, the review team observed that there was limited evidence of training related to designing inclusive assessments. This was reinforced by academic teams and teaching support staff who shared a desire for more support around creating inclusive assessments. Therefore, the review team **recommends** that the University establish a more robust and structured approach to supporting staff specifically in

the development of inclusive assessment practices, to ensure consistency across programmes and continue promoting an appropriate balance between theoretical and practical forms of assessment.

3.5 Assessment expectations and academic standards are evidenced through clearly defined institutional policies and procedures. These arrangements promote consistency, transparency and the fair application of assessment practices across programmes, as confirmed by senior leaders. Academic staff further demonstrated that these policies inform assessment design, grading practices and the application of academic regulations within their programmes. Students acknowledged that they were aware of the University's grading arrangements and understood where to access guidance relating to assessment and academic regulations, as well as grading and appeals processes. Academic integrity expectations are embedded within institutional regulations, assessment processes and staff guidance, supporting students in understanding the principles of good academic practice.

3.6 Senior leaders and support staff explained that students are provided with guidance and support throughout the appeals process, with clear procedures in place to support the consistent application of assessment decisions. These arrangements support transparency in assessment processes and provide students with access to mechanisms that promote fairness, consistency and confidence in assessment decisions.

3.7 The TLSS provides institutional oversight of learning and teaching quality, while enhancement mechanisms such as reflective summaries, course audits and curriculum mapping activities support the ongoing evaluation and enhancement of programme delivery and learning outcomes, as confirmed by senior leaders during the review visit (see below Standard 1.9). Academic staff explained that the outcomes of these processes inform curriculum development, assessment and teaching practice at programme level. While these arrangements provide a structured framework for supporting and monitoring learning and teaching practices, evidence of how the University systematically evaluates the consistent implementation of the Teaching and Learning Framework across programmes was less explicit. Nevertheless, the arrangements in place support the ongoing review and enhancement of learning and teaching practices and contribute to the achievement of intended learning outcomes.

3.8 Senior leaders and the Quality team confirmed that students contribute to the University's quality assurance and enhancement processes through formal feedback mechanisms. These arrangements enable the University to incorporate the student voice into the ongoing review of learning, teaching and the wider student experience. Students confirmed that they are regularly invited to share feedback on their learning experience and were able to provide examples of changes made in response to their feedback. These arrangements support the systematic collection, review and use of student feedback, enabling the University to monitor programme quality and implement enhancements that contribute to the continuous improvement of learning, teaching and the overall student experience.

3.9 IBU has established oversight arrangements to monitor student achievement and progression, as shown in Standard 1.4. Student grades and progression outcomes enable the University to monitor academic standards, including consideration of assessment design, and identify areas requiring further programme review or enhancement. Staff described how institutional data are used to identify trends in student performance and inform discussions relating to learning, teaching and assessment. These arrangements support the systematic review of student outcomes and enable the University to use evidence to inform the ongoing enhancement of assessment practices and maintain academic standards across its programmes.

3.10 Senior leaders and the Quality team provided examples of how institutional monitoring processes have informed changes to learning, teaching and assessment practices, supporting the ongoing review of academic standards and the student learning experience. These arrangements enable the University to use longitudinal performance data to inform evidence-based enhancement and support the continuous improvement of programme delivery and student outcomes.

3.11 Overall, the evidence reviewed, together with discussions held during the review visit, demonstrated that the University has established effective arrangements to support student-centred learning, teaching and assessment. Students are engaged as partners through established feedback mechanisms and ongoing dialogue to inform the review and enhancement of learning, teaching and assessment. The review team found that these arrangements, together with institutional oversight, programme monitoring and external quality assurance processes, support the continuous enhancement of learning, teaching and assessment and the achievement of intended learning outcomes. While the review team noted scope to strengthen the consistency of assessment design across programmes and further enhance inclusive practice, the review team concludes overall that Standard 1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment is **met**.

Standard 1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification

Institutions should consistently apply pre-defined and published regulations covering all phases of the student "life cycle", e.g. student admission, progression, recognition and certification.

Findings

4.1 IBU's approach to admissions is captured in relevant policy concerned with both undergraduate and graduate entry points. These documents specify what is required of applicants to enable entry to the respective levels of study, delineated by student profile (for example mature student, Ontario school leaver, international applicant, and so on). Entry requirements are also published on IBU's webpages (<https://ibu.ca/>) and are differentiated by programme type. A structured approach is adopted when applicants are not successful, in the form of a standard email template which enables contextualisation relating to the reason(s) for rejection. Mechanisms exist for those that wish to challenge admission decisions, in the form of the Student Complaint Procedure which is published online alongside other policy documents (<https://ibu.ca/ibu-policies/>) and which applies to prospective students as well as those currently enrolled.

4.2 In terms of English language proficiency, IBU stipulates that for those with less than four years of consecutive secondary education in Canada, an English test must be taken no more than two years prior to admission to the programme. Numerous tests are accepted by IBU, with the minimum benchmark (equivalent to International English Language Testing System (IELTS) to be an overall score of 6 with no band below 6 appropriate for tertiary study. This is widely adopted in other institutions and national contexts. IBU's formal arrangement with the International Language Academy of Canada (ILAC) enables recognition by IBU of students that have completed specific English language programmes of instruction through the partner organisation.

4.3 IBU notes that it has 'a fully articulated, externally validated, and consistently applied student lifecycle framework governing admission, progression, recognition, and certification', with some of these elements represented visually in two student journey maps. These schematics set out the student lifecycle journey, with one focused primarily on pre-enrolment from first contact as a 'prospect', while the other consisting of more detail and contrasting the pathways of international and domestic applicants and students. Both documents are more relevant to the recruitment of students, as opposed to their progression through a degree programme, but the Student Lifecycle Framework sets out in tabular form various elements of student engagement and associated institutional responses at different stages of the student journey. This Framework contains various processes and mechanisms, illustrating which of IBU's organisational units are responsible for the associated activity. For example, the Marketing team is involved at the recruitment stage. Both Marketing and the Registrar's Office are also involved at the admission stage, followed by academic staff being charged with responsibility for learning, alongside professional services colleagues who are responsible amongst other activities for monitoring student progression. The review team formed the view that the Framework was likely to be a useful guide which would assist IBU in the management and enablement of student progression.

4.4 Students go through a process of formal orientation, whether studying in-person or online, as evidenced by registration guidelines for staff members and students. During the meeting with students, examples of topics covered during the sessions were raised by participants. Teaching and other staff also highlighted different aspects of orientation that they covered, including academic matters (for example academic integrity and the role of generative AI, the nature of student support, and financial considerations). Staff emphasised

the importance of ensuring a comparable experience across different campuses. The review team also noted that IBU surveyed students on the effectiveness of orientation but was less clear how insights from this activity resulted in subsequent changes by IBU.

4.5 Once enrolled, the Student Handbook highlights advice to students regarding their progression. Students are also signposted from the Student Handbook to the Academic Calendar: while the former is relatively light on detail, the latter is a useful resource which amongst other things consists of key dates, programme and course details, sources of support, as well as a series of hyperlinks to a comprehensive list of institutional policies. Students were able to cite knowledge of it during the visit, also referring to how they accessed information they required via the online student portal.

4.6 During their studies, students are supported appropriately via a range of mechanisms employed by IBU. Academic advising is in place, with students citing their advisers as sources of support relating to academic matters. IBU's non-academic support covers various relevant aspects, including immigration, housing and language support; wellness support; peer tutoring; and mental health support via a third-party organisation. A dedicated Career Services team is in place which focuses on working with students from the commencement of their studies in order to set clear career goals, provide support in career development activities such as résumé writing, and enable exposure to industry representatives. This holistic range of services indicates that IBU provides appropriate support to students for their academic, personal and professional development and progression.

4.7 In respect of students that have studied elsewhere previously, IBU has published processes relating to the recognition of prior learning (RPL), as contained in the SOP for Transfer Credits, the policy on Undergraduate Admissions, Promotion and Graduation Requirements, and briefly in the Admission Policy to Graduate Studies. During the visit, it was confirmed that students are not able to transfer in more than half of the total credits from previous study, and that any transfer must be for study at the equivalent level (that is bachelor's degree or master's degree). The review team was also apprised that, due to the nature of the student body, in which international students form the vast majority, very few had utilised the RPL process due to the implications for their subsequent eligibility for work permits.

4.8 IBU also maintains articulation arrangements in respect of credit transfer and advanced standing with six institutions: Centennial College; Conestoga College; GD Goenka University; Sault College; La Cite College; and Sheridan College. Students that have completed specified programmes of study at these institutions are eligible to achieve advanced standing into IBU's undergraduate commerce programme, with the associated agreements clearly establishing the nature of the relationship between IBU and the six institutions.

4.9 With regards to certification, the review team scrutinised an exemplar transcript and a final certificate issued by IBU. Students can also request that official transcripts are issued to them during their studies, as indicated in the SOP for Grading. Transcripts indicate the courses studied, dates enrolled and the grades achieved, alongside an explanation of the grading system. During the review visit, the review team considered in further detail IBU's processes which relate to the completion of study, noting that students need to meet academic requirements and financial obligations in order to graduate. IBU also ensures that students receive a letter confirming completion within a three-week period following the end of the final semester.

4.10 As mentioned above in Standard 1.1, IBU has developed a specific record of student achievement, termed 'IBU Signal' which captures the cognitive skills that students have developed during their studies. This transcript and the rationale and methodology

surrounding its development were explored further during the review visit in meetings with senior leaders and stakeholders. The review team considered that the range of information presented in the two-page document, including the industry applied experience, the visual presentation of leadership abilities, and mention of the higher cognitive skills achieved by the bearer as insightful. The implementation of IBU Signal, in particular the way in which external stakeholder feedback has been drawn upon to design a report card indicating the applied cognitive skills that students gain through their studies, which provides a comprehensive skills record for students and employers, represented a feature of **good practice**.

4.11 The review team concludes that IBU's processes for admission, progression, recognition and certification are suitably robust and that Standard 1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification is **met**.

Standard 1.5 Teaching staff

Institutions should assure themselves of the competence of their teachers. They should apply fair and transparent processes for the recruitment and development of the staff.

Findings

5.1 IBU has established a coherent framework for assuring the competence of its teaching staff throughout the employment lifecycle. Recruitment, appointment, evaluation, professional development and progression are governed through formally approved institutional policies that define qualification requirements, governance arrangements and accountability mechanisms. Meetings with institutional representatives confirmed that teaching competence is supported through ongoing oversight, faculty evaluation and professional development activities rather than being considered solely at the point of appointment.

5.2 Faculty appointments are undertaken through committee-based procedures incorporating qualification requirements, credential verification, interviews, teaching demonstrations and conflict-of-interest safeguards. Institutional representatives explained that recruitment decisions seek an appropriate balance between academic expertise, industry experience and institutional priorities while ensuring consistency and fairness throughout the appointment process.

5.3 The University has established robust arrangements for monitoring faculty qualifications and instructional capacity. Centralised records of qualifications, professional experience, scholarly activity and teaching assignments enable academic leadership to monitor alignment between faculty expertise, programme learning outcomes and regulatory requirements. These records also support workforce planning and the identification of staffing needs. Discussions during the review visit confirmed that the University continues to refine the balance between full-time faculty, adjunct faculty and industry practitioners in support of its strategic objectives.

5.4 The review team identified that teaching performance is monitored through a structured and multi-layered evaluation framework. Formal academic staff evaluations consider teaching effectiveness, professional conduct and contribution to institutional objectives. These arrangements are complemented by teaching observations, class visits, course audits, student evaluations and academic leadership oversight, providing multiple sources of evidence to monitor teaching quality and identify areas for improvement. Meetings confirmed that evaluation outcomes are used to inform faculty development needs and targeted support for individual staff members.

5.5 Professional development is embedded within institutional practice through formally approved policies that establish expectations for continuous professional development and define institutional responsibilities for supporting staff development. Faculty readiness is further supported through structured onboarding, mandatory training and ongoing workshops covering learning outcomes, assessment design, academic skills and teaching practice.

5.6 Discussions during the review visit confirmed that teaching quality is regarded as a central institutional priority. Academic staff described regular engagement with academic leadership regarding teaching effectiveness, assessment quality and student engagement, alongside opportunities to share good practice and participate in professional development activities. Students consistently reported that teaching approaches combine theoretical understanding with experiential learning, practical application and real-world problem-solving, reflecting the institution's emphasis on applied learning.

5.7 Scholarly activity is recognised as an important aspect of academic practice. Institutional records demonstrate engagement in publications, conference participation, applied research and professional activities that contribute to academic quality and curriculum relevance. Senior leaders highlighted plans to further strengthen the scholarship of teaching and learning and practice-based research, while academic staff provided examples of research-informed teaching and the dissemination of scholarly work relating to emerging technologies and pedagogical innovation.

5.8 Innovation in teaching and the use of contemporary technologies are actively promoted across the institution. Institutional evidence demonstrates engagement in curriculum enhancement, teaching innovation and technology-focused professional development. Academic staff provided examples of integrating AI, simulation technologies, data analytics platforms and other industry-relevant technologies into teaching and assessment practices, while senior leaders described innovation and industry relevance as strategic priorities. Students also confirmed that learning activities frequently reflect contemporary workplace practices and technologies.

5.9 Student feedback contributes to the enhancement of teaching practice through established institutional processes. Student evaluations, course reviews and teaching audits form part of the institution's approach to monitoring teaching effectiveness. Quality assurance staff explained how evidence from student feedback is considered alongside class observations and course audits to identify institution-wide development priorities and targeted support for individual faculty members. Students also reported that faculty are approachable, responsive and supportive of their learning.

5.10 Industry stakeholders and graduates highlighted several strengths associated with the institution's teaching and learning environment. They identified graduates' communication skills, critical thinking, practical preparation and readiness to engage with industry challenges as indicators of effective teaching and learning. External stakeholders also emphasised the value of industry engagement, guest speakers and applied learning opportunities, which align closely with the institution's emphasis on experiential learning, faculty development and curriculum enhancement.

5.11 IBU has established a comprehensive programme of professional development that provides faculty and staff with access to a broad range of institutional training, mandatory induction activities and development opportunities aligned with institutional priorities. During the review, the review team saw evidence that participation in these activities is supported through performance evaluations, teaching observations, course audits and student feedback, which inform professional development discussions and enhancement activities.

5.12 The review team found that while these arrangements provide valuable information on staff performance and institutional development priorities, there is limited evidence of a formal and systematic mechanism for identifying the individual training and development needs of faculty and staff and using these to develop targeted individual professional development plans. Similarly, the University has yet to establish a structured process for periodically monitoring, evaluating and enhancing the effectiveness of individual staff development plans to ensure that professional development activities continue to respond to evolving institutional priorities and individual development needs. The review team therefore **recommends** that IBU establish a clear formal mechanism to identify the individual training and development needs of faculty and staff and use the outcomes to develop and periodically monitor targeted individual professional development plans to ensure continuous improvement and alignment with institutional priorities.

5.13 IBU has established comprehensive and effective arrangements to assure the competence of its teaching staff throughout the employment lifecycle. Recruitment and

appointment processes are fair and transparent, faculty qualifications and teaching performance are systematically monitored, and professional development is embedded within institutional practice and actively supported. The University promotes scholarly activity, innovation in teaching and the effective use of contemporary technologies to enhance learning and teaching. While the review team identified an opportunity to strengthen the systematic identification, planning, monitoring and evaluation of individual staff development needs, it found that appropriate mechanisms are in place to recruit, support, evaluate and continuously develop the competence of teaching staff. These arrangements provide confidence that teaching staff are appropriately qualified, supported in their professional development and equipped to deliver high-quality learning and teaching in accordance with the requirements of Standard 1.5. The review team therefore concludes that Standard 1.5 Teaching staff is **met**.

Standard 1.6 Learning resources and student support

Institutions should have appropriate funding for learning and teaching activities and ensure that adequate and readily accessible learning resources and student support are provided.

Findings

6.1 Student support at IBU is coordinated through a dedicated Student Success Division, providing a range of services that support students throughout their studies and contribute to a coordinated approach to the student experience. Institutional staff explained that academic, personal, immigration and employability support is delivered through an integrated model, enabling services to work collaboratively and reducing the risk of fragmented support across the student journey. Students confirmed that they knew how to access academic, personal and employability support and described the support services as accessible and responsive. This coordinated approach enables students to be referred between services where appropriate, ensuring they receive timely and holistic support.

6.2 A centralised one-stop shop service provides students with access to support across a range of areas, including admissions, wellbeing and the wider student experience. Private meeting rooms are also available to facilitate confidential discussions where required, supporting a coordinated and student-focused approach to support provision. The review team further observed "The Hub", a multi-purpose space used for student social activities, industry engagement and community events, providing opportunities for students to engage with employers and the wider university community. Students have access to key institutional information through student handbooks and policies, which are made readily available via QR codes displayed across the campus, supporting easy access to information and student guidance.

6.3 IBU provides student support through both in-person services and digital channels, enabling students to access support in ways that reflect their individual circumstances and needs. Students described that they were able to access support both in-person and online and considered both routes to be accessible, allowing them to engage with services in a way that best suited their needs. During the campus tour, the review team observed study spaces and subject-specific learning facilities, including the dedicated media room that supports different modes of online and blended delivery, and the Bloomberg Room, which support independent learning and the practical application of knowledge. These arrangements enable students to access appropriate academic resources and develop the skills needed to engage successfully with their studies.

6.4 The review team observed that in-person IT support is readily accessible to students. The University operates a dedicated IT and Information team responsible for managing student support requests through an online query ticketing system and monitoring student attendance and engagement through institutional dashboards. Senior leaders confirmed that the ticketing system is used to manage and monitor student support enquiries, providing oversight of the types of queries received, service demand, response times and resolution rates to inform operational planning and service delivery. While the ticketing system provides valuable operational data to support the monitoring of student support services, evidence of how qualitative student feedback is systematically captured through the system to inform service enhancement was less explicit. Nevertheless, the arrangements in place support accessible, responsive and flexible student support, aligning with the expectations of Standard 1.6.

6.5 IBU has established a peer tutoring scheme to provide additional academic support to students and promote equitable access to learning support services. The review team

found that tutoring is delivered through a structured process, with defined expectations regarding access, allocation and delivery, supporting consistency and transparency in the provision of academic support. Institutional staff described how tutoring requests are managed, allocated and monitored to respond to student need. Students who had accessed the service confirmed that peer tutoring provided accessible and timely academic support to complement their learning. Collectively, these arrangements provide students with equitable access to academic support and enable the University to monitor and enhance the effectiveness of the peer tutoring scheme.

6.6 The review team observed that IBU provides career development and employability support as part of its wider student support framework, which students described as accessible and beneficial in preparing for employment and career planning. Institutional staff described that employability support is embedded throughout the student lifecycle through one-to-one careers advice, simulation activities that support employability, workshops, employer engagement activities and graduation planning, enabling students to develop the knowledge, skills and confidence required for employment and further study. They further explained that student engagement and participation data, together with student feedback, are used to review careers provision and inform the ongoing enhancement of employability activities and services.

6.7 The University has established arrangements to support student health and wellbeing through a combination of institutional provision and external partnerships. International students have access to healthcare and wellbeing support through a health insurance programme, while domestic students are supported through provincial healthcare provision. Senior leaders and professional services staff confirmed that the programme for international students complements the University's internal student support services, with referral arrangements enabling students to access appropriate wellbeing support where required. Students requiring additional academic or wellbeing support are identified through ongoing engagement, staff referrals and established student support processes, enabling timely intervention where appropriate. Collectively, these arrangements ensure students have access to appropriate health and wellbeing support throughout their studies and enable the University to respond to students' individual support needs.

6.8 IBU has developed partnerships with external providers to support students beyond the academic environment, including housing, fitness and community-based initiatives. Professional services staff described how these external partnerships are coordinated alongside institutional support services to respond to the needs of a diverse, predominately international student body. Students confirmed that these activities and partnerships provided opportunities to engage with the wider university community and supported their transition into student life. Collectively, these arrangements contribute to a supportive learning environment by promoting student engagement, wellbeing and a sense of belonging throughout the student journey.

6.9 The review team observed that the University provides a range of extracurricular activities, events and community engagement opportunities that complement the academic experience. These opportunities are delivered through a combination of institution-led activities and external partnerships, broadening the range of experiences available to students throughout their studies. Students explained that they were aware of extracurricular opportunities and understood how to become involved in activities across the University. These provisions enhance opportunities for students to connect with the University community and engage in activities that enrich their overall experience.

6.10 IBU has established a range of academic support mechanisms to provide students with additional support alongside their formal learning activities. Dedicated programme advisory support is available across undergraduate and graduate provision, helping to

ensure that students have access to timely guidance throughout their studies. Professional services staff described how teaching assistants work collaboratively with academic staff and other student support services to ensure academic support is aligned with programme delivery and responsive to student needs. Institutional staff provided examples of teaching assistants helping students develop their understanding of course content, academic writing, research skills and academic integrity through individual and group-based support. Students confirmed that teaching assistants were accessible and provided valuable academic support throughout their studies. These arrangements enhance students' learning experience and help them achieve their intended learning outcomes.

6.11 The University has established a range of mechanisms to gather and respond to student feedback, as shown in Standard 1.9. Senior leaders confirmed that student feedback is reviewed to identify emerging priorities and inform the enhancement of support services and resource planning. Students confirmed that they are regularly invited to provide feedback and were able to describe examples where their feedback had resulted in improvements to services and the overall student experience. Institutional staff described that the University has established a range of mechanisms to ensure that learning resources and student support services are appropriately monitored and reviewed, leading to enhancement of student support services. Service usage data, including ticket reporting, supports the monitoring of student demand and informs the ongoing review of support provision.

6.12 The review team observed that IBU utilises service usage data, student feedback and periodic reviews of learning resources and student support services to inform operational planning and the ongoing enhancement of provision. The University has invested in a range of learning resources and student-facing platforms to support student learning, engagement and academic success. While these arrangements demonstrate a proactive approach to monitoring and responding to service demand, senior leaders confirmed that there is no formal institutional policy or framework governing the allocation and review of staffing, budget and learning resources. This presented an opportunity for the University to strengthen the consistency and transparency of resource planning across the institution. Therefore, the review team **recommends** that the University establish a formalised and transparent process for the allocation of budget to learning resources and student support to continuously ensure resource planning is applied consistently and informed by student need, service demand and institutional priorities.

6.13 The review team found that the University provides an appropriate range of learning resources and student support services, which students confirmed were accessible and met their needs throughout their studies. There are effective arrangements to provide and monitor learning resources and student support services. Students have access to appropriate learning resources, integrated support services and a learning environment that supports their engagement and success. Overall, the review team concludes that Standard 1.6 Learning resources and student support is **met**.

Standard 1.7 Information management

Institutions should ensure that they collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management of their programmes and other activities.

Findings

7.1 IBU articulates how its approach to information management at the institutional level is governed through a suite of relevant policies concerned with institutional data and their management, privacy, and information and cyber security. IBU's policies outline key definitions, are suitably detailed, and establish how IBU manages and processes key data sources. Through its information and cyber security policy, IBU ensures that its data assets are not compromised. The accompanying guidelines mandate key aspects of information security relevant to employees and students of IBU. Taken together, these policy documents indicated to the review team that the information management policy framework established at IBU is managed strategically and is appropriately rigorous.

7.2 Various information and data sources are utilised by IBU to manage their programmes and other activities. An annual data pack is produced which covers various key information sources, including those relating to student enrolment, progression, withdrawals, graduation and other aspects. During the review visit, the review team was informed that the annual data pack is segmented according to the specific needs of internal stakeholders, so that they can access information sources which are most relevant to their needs; an action which is consistent with IBU being a 'data-driven' university. This was further evidenced in the Institutional Data and Information Management Policy which establishes the importance of data as a strategic asset and defines key data types: student data, academic data, operational and administrative data, quality assurance and performance data, research administration and capstone project data, and IT, cybersecurity, system and audit log data.

7.3 Profile data relating to the student (and recent graduate) body are gathered by IBU. Amongst other things, these sources include detail relating to credit transfer status, fee type (domestic/international), and citizenship, which is linked to other personal data such as student name and email address. IBU tracks student enrolments and progression data through spreadsheets, and the review team scrutinised a sample of these from recent years. These indicated to the review team that progression, withdrawal and award statistics are gathered by IBU, and during the visit, the issue of how data are utilised was explored in further detail. The meeting with senior leaders provided further evidence of how information relating to various operational activities were drawn upon. Examples from across the student lifecycle were referred to by participants as they articulated how information on the student profile and employability, amongst other elements, was viewed as fundamental key performance indicators (KPIs).

7.4 The meeting with teaching staff revealed how their main sources of information were accessed via a proprietary platform, as the Learning Management System (LMS) and the IBU intranet, as opposed to other student data systems to which teaching staff may have access in other contexts. The review team considered that this level of access to information was appropriate given governmental restrictions relating to privacy and the use of personal data that were outlined during the review visit. IBU's Staff Recruitment and Selection Policy refers to an introduction to key systems as one of the four elements of onboarding, while the Faculty Readiness and Development Policy mandates 'verified LMS competency' as an outcome which all new faculty must achieve when they commence teaching at IBU. This suggests that teaching staff are provided with training that is relevant to their primary roles as educators.

7.5 Student experience and student satisfaction data are said to be 'core evidence', and the associated evidence provides insight into what is collected at orientation and via the student experience survey. In both cases, very respectable response rates (c. 50%) have been achieved, and the review team noted the detailed and insightful outputs that have been generated from these activities. These outputs included information gathered on various elements of the student experience, such as aspects of onboarding, student support, evaluations of programme quality and student engagement; although the review team felt there was scope to further improve how some sources of information are analysed and acted upon.

7.6 IBU also collects a range of course evaluation and teaching quality data and is in the process of moving to a new platform to manage such sources. The review team considered sample outputs which relate to the piloting of this system and discussed the issue further during the review visit. The reports that are generated via the new platform are structured and presented clearly and are likely to be of greater analytical utility than the current approach to student evaluations which relies on the use of forms and spreadsheets. Indeed, it was difficult for the review team to establish how current approaches to information management enable students to be effectively apprised of how their feedback has been responded to effectively.

7.7 The review team recognised the improvements that are currently being made in terms of information management, as was recounted during the review visit, which may represent a potential enhancement going forward. However, they formed the view that there was scope to further improve how data and information are utilised to inform internal quality assurance and enhancement, specifically in relation to the closing of the feedback loop as it relates to students, as shown in Standard 1.9 below. That being said, the wide range of data and information collected, analysed and used to inform operational practice and decision making is recognised as a feature of **good practice**.

7.8 Notwithstanding the potential for further improvements, the review team determined that IBU has clear processes and procedures relating to the collection, management and utilisation of relevant information sources. Based on the evidence, the review team concludes that Standard 1.7 Information management is **met**.

Standard 1.8 Public information

Institutions should publish information about their activities, including programmes, which is clear, accurate, objective, up-to date and readily accessible.

Findings

8.1 IBU provides public information through a range of channels, including its website, social media platforms, institutional events and press communications. The University maintains a Communications Policy and Corporate Brand Guidelines which provide a framework for the creation, management and dissemination of information to internal and external stakeholders. These arrangements support a consistent approach to the communication of information across the institution, helping to ensure information is accurate, consistent and accessible to prospective students, current students and other stakeholders.

8.2 The University has established clear responsibility for the coordination and oversight of public information through its Marketing department. The department is responsible for managing website content, social media activity, marketing communications and institutional publications, working collaboratively with academic and professional services teams to ensure information remains current and aligned with institutional requirements. Senior leaders confirmed that the Marketing department operates within Vega Academic Services, which provides administrative and operational support to the University, while responsibility for the accuracy, approval and oversight of institutional information remains with IBU through its senior leadership and governance arrangements. These arrangements provide clear accountability for the management of public information and support the accuracy, consistency and accessibility of information for prospective students, current students and other stakeholders.

8.3 IBU has established mechanisms to support the accuracy, consistency and ongoing maintenance of public information through its Communications Policy, Corporate Brand Guidelines and formal change management processes. The review team saw evidence that the University utilises documented approval and update procedures, including website change logs and a Marketing Communications Request Brief, to manage amendments to public information and support oversight of communications activity. These arrangements help ensure that information published by the University remains current, accurate and aligned with institutional requirements, supporting a consistent and transparent approach to the management of public information.

8.4 The University website serves as the primary source of public information for prospective students, current students and external stakeholders. The website provides access to information relating to academic programmes, admissions, fees, student support services, governance, quality assurance and student-facing policies. During the review visit, senior leaders explained that the website is the University's principal platform for communicating institutional information, while students shared that they regularly access the website to obtain information relating to their studies and student support. Professional services staff further confirmed that website content is reviewed and updated through established institutional processes to ensure information remains current and accurate. These arrangements support the expectations of Standard 1.8 by ensuring that accurate, reliable and accessible information relating to the University's activities, programmes and quality assurance arrangements is made publicly available to prospective students, current students and other stakeholders.

8.5 The University website provides prospective and current students with access to comprehensive information relating to admissions, programmes and graduate outcomes, supporting informed decision-making before and during enrolment. Student-facing information relating to academic advising, health and wellbeing, accommodation, accessibility and career development is also publicly available, alongside a clear and accessible admissions policy. Students confirmed that the website was a useful source of information when researching programmes and understanding the admissions process, and that key information was easy to locate prior to enrolment. These arrangements support transparency by ensuring that prospective and current students have access to accurate, comprehensive and accessible information to inform their decisions throughout the student lifecycle, consistent with the expectations of Standard 1.8.

8.6 IBU utilises a range of digital and social media channels to communicate with prospective students, current students and external stakeholders, supported by planned communications activity and regular monitoring of engagement and performance. The University maintains oversight of its digital communications through content planning, performance reporting and audience engagement data, enabling it to evaluate the reach and effectiveness of information shared across different platforms. Supporting materials demonstrate a consistent and coordinated approach to communicating institutional information across multiple channels. Students described that they regularly access university information through digital communication channels and social media, with these platforms providing an accessible means of receiving institutional updates and information. Collectively, these arrangements enable the University to communicate timely, accurate and accessible information through a range of channels, supporting prospective students, current students and other stakeholders in making informed decisions.

8.7 Supporting materials, including brochures, advertising campaigns, digital assets and press releases, demonstrate a coordinated approach to communicating institutional information across multiple channels. Senior leaders confirmed that communications performance, audience engagement and media analytics are routinely reviewed to evaluate the effectiveness of communications activity and inform the ongoing development of communication strategies. These arrangements enable the University to evaluate the reach and effectiveness of its communications, supporting the continuous improvement of public information and ensuring that information remains accessible, relevant and responsive to the needs of different stakeholder groups.

8.8 Overall, the review team found that the University has established effective arrangements for the management and publication of public information. Clear governance and oversight of public information is in place, supported by institutional policies, quality assurance processes and a coordinated approach to communications across a range of digital and print channels. Students are able to access the information they required throughout the student lifecycle, including information relating to admissions, programmes and student support. Collectively, these arrangements support the provision of accurate, reliable and accessible public information, enabling prospective students, current students and other stakeholders to make informed decisions. Therefore, the review team concludes that Standard 1.8 Public information is **met**.

Standard 1.9 Ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes

Institutions should monitor and periodically review their programmes to ensure that they achieve the objectives set for them and respond to the needs of students and society. These reviews should lead to continuous improvement of the programme. Any action planned or taken as a result should be communicated to all those concerned.

Findings

9.1 IBU has established a comprehensive framework for the ongoing monitoring and periodic review of academic programmes through its IQAP. The IQAP defines the scope, frequency, governance responsibilities, documentation requirements and external engagement arrangements for programme review, providing a structured basis for programme evaluation and enhancement. The framework is aligned with provincial quality assurance requirements and institutional objectives, ensuring that programme review activities operate within a consistent and evidence-based quality assurance system.

9.2 The programme monitoring arrangements are designed to ensure that programmes continue to achieve their intended objectives and remain responsive to the needs of students, employers and society. New programmes are subject to enhanced monitoring during their first three academic years through annual reporting processes that evaluate programme design, delivery, admissions, resourcing and emerging outcomes. Senior leaders confirmed that employability outcomes, labour market intelligence, student demand and societal developments are key considerations when evaluating programme effectiveness and future development.

9.3 At IBU, programme review processes incorporate both internal evaluation and external scrutiny. The IQAP requires cyclical review of programmes at least every seven years and includes self-study, student and faculty participation, independent external review and formal implementation planning. Documentation reviewed by the review team confirms that programme review outcomes are subsequently monitored through implementation plans, status reports and Academic Council oversight to support the implementation of programme review recommendations and enhancement actions.

9.4 Ongoing monitoring is further strengthened through embedded quality assurance mechanisms that operate between formal programme review cycles. Course evaluations, course audits and targeted programme reviews are used to assess programme effectiveness, curriculum coherence and alignment with institutional objectives and external expectations. The review team saw evidence that these processes have resulted in curriculum enhancements, including the resolution of curriculum overlap within the BCom programme and the redesign of the MBA capstone experience.

9.5 Programme monitoring arrangements consider the continuing relevance of programme content and changing societal needs. Senior leaders described employability, labour market trends and industry developments as key indicators used when assessing programme effectiveness and future viability. Quality assurance staff confirmed that employer feedback, market analysis and PAC discussions are routinely reviewed to identify emerging industry requirements and inform programme modifications where appropriate.

9.6 Student feedback forms an integral component of programme monitoring and review activities. Course evaluation reports, raw evaluation data and institution-wide student experience surveys provide evidence relating to programme quality, assessment practices, teaching effectiveness and student satisfaction. Students confirmed that feedback

mechanisms are accessible and concerns raised through institutional channels are considered and addressed, including improvements in communication and student support arrangements.

9.7 Discussions during the review visit confirmed that programme review processes consider student progression, achievement and the effectiveness of assessment practices. Academic staff described the use of student feedback, pass rates and assessment outcomes to evaluate whether students are achieving the intended learning outcomes and whether assessment methods remain appropriate and effective. These activities are supported by course audits, curriculum reviews and programme monitoring processes that provide additional evidence regarding progression and achievement trends.

9.8 The review team observed that programme review activities extend beyond academic performance indicators and take account of the broader student experience. Student experience surveys provide evidence on programme quality, teaching effectiveness, career relevance and overall satisfaction while identifying opportunities for improvement across programmes and specialisations. Students described a range of support mechanisms, including digital and direct communication channels, through which concerns can be raised and addressed in a timely manner.

9.9 External stakeholders contribute actively to programme monitoring and enhancement processes. The University engages employers, PACs and external reviewers in evaluating programme effectiveness and future relevance. Industry stakeholders confirmed that they are regularly consulted, that feedback is discussed openly and that the University considers their recommendations when reviewing and enhancing programmes. The review team noted the institution's highly effective engagement with industry stakeholders to positively inform programme monitoring and enhancement processes as a feature of **good practice**.

9.10 Documentary evidence demonstrates that monitoring and review processes have informed curriculum refinements, addressed programme-level issues and supported substantive redesign of the MBA capstone experience. Academic staff described the use of student feedback and assessment data to identify areas for improvement, while external stakeholders characterised the University as responsive and adaptable in responding to changing industry expectations.

9.11 Governance arrangements provide effective oversight of programme modification and change. Academic Council formally reviews and approves programme modifications arising from monitoring and review activities, while major changes are subject to external approval requirements where appropriate. Documentary evidence and meetings confirmed clear oversight arrangements that support traceability between review evidence, academic judgement and approved actions.

9.12 Students, staff and external stakeholders described opportunities to provide informal feedback and reported that the University communicates actions, seeks clarification where required and explains how recommendations have been incorporated into programme developments. While these arrangements demonstrate the institution's commitment to stakeholder engagement, the review team found limited evidence of a systematic institution-wide approach for consistently closing the feedback loop by communicating completed actions and resulting improvements to all stakeholder groups, particularly students. Discussions during the review indicated that stakeholder feedback is considered and informs enhancement activities; however, the communication of resulting improvements is not yet consistently embedded across all programmes and institutional feedback mechanisms. A more systematic approach would further strengthen transparency, stakeholder engagement and confidence in the institution's continuous quality enhancement processes. The review team therefore **recommends** that IBU strengthen feedback management processes by

establishing a systematic mechanism for closing the feedback loop and communicating resulting actions taken and improvements to stakeholders, particularly students.

9.13 Overall, the review team concludes that IBU has established comprehensive and effective arrangements for the ongoing monitoring and periodic review of its academic programmes. Programme performance is evaluated through formal cyclical review, annual monitoring, embedded quality assurance processes, stakeholder engagement and evidence-informed decision-making. Programme review activities consider programme content, student progression, assessment effectiveness, student satisfaction, employability and the changing needs of society, while enhancement actions are monitored through established governance arrangements and continuous improvement processes. Although opportunities exist to strengthen the systematic communication of enhancement outcomes to stakeholders, the review team found that programme monitoring and periodic review arrangements operate effectively to ensure that programmes continue to achieve their intended objectives, remain responsive to the needs of students, employers and wider society, and support evidence-informed continuous improvement in accordance with Standard 1.9. The review team therefore concludes that Standard 1.9 Ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes is **met**.

Standard 1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance

Institutions should undergo external quality assurance in line with the ESG on a cyclical basis.

Findings

10.1 As referred to in Standard 1.1 above, IBU operates under the auspices of PEQAB. PEQAB undertakes approvals of private and out-of-province institutions and their programmes and is guided by the need to ensure that approved degrees meet four purposes relating to 1) critical skills, 2) employment skills, 3) foundation for further study, and 4) personal and social development. PEQAB's Manual for Private, Out of Province and Other Organizations stresses that ministerial consent is required for any entity seeking to operate a university or offer degree programmes within the province. IBU confirmed the initial permissions it currently has in place, which necessitated external review via PEQAB as the regulator, as further evidenced by copies of the relevant programme approvals.

10.2 Sample documentation relating to these initial permissions was scrutinised by the review team. This confirmed that external expertise forms part of the regulatory approval process, in the form of expert reviewers from institutions elsewhere in Canada and, in one case from industry, which sit on programme review panels. The 2022 PEQAB review of the MBA, for instance, involved two expert panel members considering the proposed programme and meeting a range of individuals from within IBU. While the panel did not appear to have met with students on this occasion, the review team was informed during the review visit that PEQAB routinely consults students when visiting institutions for the purposes of approval.

10.3 Given that it commenced operations relatively recently, IBU is currently awaiting 'consent renewal' by PEQAB - a process that in other contexts is termed revalidation or reaccreditation. PEQAB specifies that consent renewal must take place within seven years of initial approval, which is reiterated in IBU's IQAP. Preparations for this are underway at IBU currently, as evidenced through the establishment of a Consent Renewal Task Force, which is composed of representatives from IBU's compliance team, faculty, and senior leadership team. The Task Force's terms of reference outline the mandates and responsibilities of the body, and also set out timelines from August 2025, when the Task Force was formed, up to submission of the documentation to PEQAB in December 2026. These timelines are delineated in terms of both organisation (that is institutional) review and programme review, which will form part of the consent renewal activity.

10.4 Minutes of the Consent Renewal Task Force meetings further confirmed to the review team that IBU is actively engaged in preparing for this ongoing regulatory activity. A series of detailed actions, including those relating to risk management, policy development, and 'self-review,' is referred to in the minutes that were consulted. This indicated that IBU was actively working to progress since its initial approval through the process of preparation for the upcoming consent renewal.

10.5 The review team considered evidence relating to the redesign of the capstone project on the MBA. This had been referred to in the PEQAB Final Report to the Minister when the MBA had initially been approved and had resulted in changes by IBU to the final course in the programme. As shown in notes from three Capstone Redesign Strategy Sessions, this had involved teaching staff and other committee members considering how to effect changes in the design of the course, which ultimately resulted in three pathway options which all emphasise business problem-solving. This was explored further during the review visit with participants in the meeting with external stakeholders highlighting in particular the value of the work-based option on the capstone. The review team formed the view that this

example of change to the course represented an enhancement that IBU had undertaken.

10.6 The meetings with teaching staff and academic support teams revealed that external accreditation processes represent a form of continuous improvement which enable external benchmarking and the enhancement of standards. During the meeting with external stakeholders, participants were able to articulate the role of regulatory requirements and how these are responded to effectively by IBU. Members of the IAC and other participants outlined the value of external accreditation - both for them as employers and key external stakeholders of IBU as well as students - thereby highlighting the importance of cyclical external quality assurance in building trust, credibility, and reputation.

10.7 IBU's involvement in the QAA's IQA process represents further evidence of their willingness to undergo external quality assurance. As revealed during the meeting with senior leaders, achieving this accreditation would enable IBU to receive international recognition, complementing their existing provincial approval. If successful, this would involve an additional process of cyclical review, with a mid-cycle review expected in the third year of the maximum five-year approval period.

10.8 The review team determined that IBU is subject to the requirements of the local regulator, PEQAB, and that it is actively working to prepare for the first consent renewal. Based on the evidence, the review team concludes that Standard 1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance is **met**.

Glossary

Action plan

A plan developed by the institution after the QAA review report has been published, which is signed off by the head of the institution. It responds to the recommendations in the report and gives any plans to capitalise on the identified good practice.

Annual monitoring

Checking a process or activity every year to see whether it meets expectations for standards and quality. Annual reports normally include information about student achievements and may comment on the evaluation of courses and modules.

Collaborative arrangement

A formal arrangement between a degree-awarding body and another higher education provider. These may be degree-awarding bodies with which the institution collaborates to deliver higher education qualifications on behalf of the degree-awarding bodies. Alternatively, they may be other delivery organisations who deliver part or all of a proportion of the institution's higher education programmes.

Condition

Conditions set out action that is required. Conditions are only used with unsatisfactory judgements where the quality cannot be approved. Conditions may be used where quality or standards are at risk/continuing risk if action is not taken or if a required standard is not met and action is needed for it to be met.

Degree-awarding body

Institutions that have authority, for example from a national agency, to issue their own awards. Institutions applying to IQA may be degree-awarding bodies themselves or may collaborate to deliver higher education qualifications on behalf of degree-awarding bodies.

Desk-based analysis

An analysis by the review team of evidence, submitted by the institution, that enables the review team to identify its initial findings and subsequently supports the review team as it develops its review findings.

Enhancement

See **quality enhancement**.

European Standards and Guidelines

For details, including the full text on each standard, see www.engq.eu/index.php/home/esg.

Examples of practice

A list of policies and practices that a review team may use when considering the extent to which an institution meets the standards for review. The examples should be considered as a guide only, in acknowledgment that not all of them will be appropriate for all institutions.

Externality

The use of experts from outside a higher education provider, such as external examiners or external advisers, to assist in quality assurance procedures.

Facilitator

The member of staff identified by the institution to act as the principal point of contact for the QAA officer and who will be available during the review visit, to assist with any questions or requests for additional documentation.

Good practice

A feature of good practice is a process or way of working that, in the view of a QAA review team, makes a particularly positive contribution to the institution's higher education provision.

Lead student representative

An optional voluntary role that is designed to allow students at the institution applying for IQA to play a central part in the organisation of the review.

Oversight

Objective scrutiny, monitoring and quality assurance of educational provision.

Peer reviewers

Members of the review team who make the decisions in relation to the review of the institution. Peer reviewers have experience of managing quality and academic standards in higher education or have recent experience of being a student in higher education.

Periodic review

An internal review of one or more programmes of study, undertaken by institutions periodically (typically once every five years), using nationally agreed reference points, to confirm that the programmes are of an appropriate academic standard and quality. The process typically involves experts from other higher education providers. It covers areas such as the continuing relevance of the programme, the currency of the curriculum and reference materials, the employability of graduates and the overall performance of students. Periodic review is one of the main processes whereby institutions can continue to assure themselves about the academic quality and standards of their awards.

Programme of study

An approved course of study that provides a coherent learning experience and normally leads to a qualification. UK higher education programmes must be approved and validated by UK degree-awarding bodies.

Quality enhancement

The process by which higher education providers systematically improve the quality of provision and the ways in which students' learning is supported.

QAA officer

The person appointed by QAA to manage the review programme and to act as the liaison between the review team and the institution.

Quality assurance

The systematic monitoring and evaluation of learning and teaching, and the processes that support them, to make sure that the standards of academic awards meet the necessary standards, and that the quality of the student learning experience is being safeguarded and improved.

Recognition of prior learning

Assessing previous learning that has occurred in any of a range of contexts including school, college and university, and/or through life and work experiences.

Recommendation

Review teams make recommendations where they agree that an institution should consider developing or changing a process or a procedure in order to improve the institution's higher education provision.

Reference points

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

Self-evaluation document

A self-evaluation report by an institution. The submission should include information about the institution as well as an assessment of the effectiveness of its quality systems.

Student submission

A document representing student views that describes what it is like to be a student at the institution, and how students' views are considered in the institution's decision-making and quality assurance processes.

Validation

The process by which an institution ensures that its academic programmes meet expected academic standards and that students will be provided with appropriate learning opportunities. It may also be applied to circumstances where a degree-awarding institution gives approval for its awards to be offered by a partner institution or organisation.

QAA3128 - R15073 - September 26

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2026
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB
Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786

Email: accreditation@gaa.ac.uk
Website: www.gaa.ac.uk