QAA

Royal Academy of Music

November 2007

Preface

The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education's (QAA) mission is to safeguard the public interest in sound standards of higher education qualifications and to inform and encourage continuous improvement in the management of the quality of higher education. To this end, QAA carries out institutional audits of higher education institutions.

In England and Northern Ireland, QAA conducts institutional audits on behalf of the higher education sector, to provide public information about the maintenance of academic standards and assurance of the quality of learning opportunities provided for students. It also operates under contract to the Higher Education Funding Council in England and the Department for Employment and Learning in Northern Ireland to provide evidence to meet their statutory obligations to assure the quality and standards of academic programmes for which they disburse public funding. The audit method was developed in partnership with the funding councils and the higher education representative bodies and agreed following consultation with higher education institutions and other interested organisations. The method was endorsed by the Department for Education and Skills (now the Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills). It was revised in 2006 following recommendations from the Quality Assurance Framework Review Group, a representative group established to review the structures and processes of quality assurance in England and Northern Ireland, and evaluate the work of QAA.

Institutional audit is an evidence-based process carried out through peer review. It forms part of the Quality Assurance Framework established in 2002 following revisions to the United Kingdom's approach to external quality assurance. At the centre of the process is an emphasis on students and their learning.

The aim of the revised institutional audit process is to meet the public interest in knowing that universities and colleges of higher education in England and Northern Ireland have effective means of:

- ensuring that the awards and qualifications in higher education are of an academic standard at least consistent with those referred to in *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* and are, where relevant, exercising their powers as degree-awarding bodies in a proper manner

- providing learning opportunities of a quality that enables students, whether on taught or research programmes, to achieve those higher education awards and qualifications

- enhancing the quality of their educational provision, particularly by building on information gained through monitoring, internal and external reviews, and feedback from stakeholders.

Institutional audit results in judgements about the institutions being reviewed. Judgements are made about: the confidence that can reasonably be placed in the soundness of the institution's present and likely future management of the academic standards of awards the confidence that can reasonably be placed in the soundness of the institution's present and likely future management of the quality of the learning opportunities available to students.

Audit teams also comment specifically on:

- the institution's arrangements for maintaining appropriate academic standards and quality of provision of postgraduate research programmes

- the institution's approach to developing and implementing institutional strategies for enhancing the quality of its educational provision, both taught and by research

- the reliance that can reasonably be placed on the accuracy and completeness of the information that the institution publishes about the quality of its educational provision and the standards of its awards.

If the audit includes the institution's collaborative provision the judgements and comments also apply unless the audit team considers that any of its judgements or comments in respect of the collaborative provision differ from those in respect of the institution's 'home' provision. Any such differences will be reflected in the form of words used to express a judgement or comment on the reliance that can reasonably be placed on the accuracy, integrity, completeness and frankness of the information that the institution publishes, and about the quality of its programmes and the standards of its awards.

Explanatory note on the format for the Report and the Annex

The reports of quality audits have to be useful to several audiences. The revised institutional audit process makes a clear distinction between that part of the reporting process aimed at an external audience and that aimed at the institution. There are three elements to the reporting:

- the **Summary** of the findings of the report, including the judgements, is intended for the wider public, especially potential students

- the **Report** is an overview of the findings of the audit for both lay and external professional audiences

- a separate **Annex** provides the detail and explanations behind the findings of the audit and is intended to be of practical use to the institution.

The report is as concise as is consistent with providing enough detail for it to make sense to an external audience as a stand-alone document. The summary and the report, without the annex, are published in hard copy. The summary, the report and the annex are published on QAA's website. The institution will receive the summary, report and annex in hard copy (*Institutional audit handbook: England and Northern Ireland 2006* - Annexes B and C refer).

Summary

Introduction

A team of auditors from the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) visited the Royal Academy of Music (the Academy) from 5 to 9 November 2007 to carry out an institutional audit. The purpose of the audit was to provide public information on the quality of the learning opportunities available to students and on the academic standards of the awards that the Academy offers.

To arrive at its conclusions, the audit team spoke to members of staff throughout the Academy and to current students, and read a wide range of documents about the ways in which the Academy manages the academic aspects of its provision.

In institutional audit, the institution's management of both academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities are audited. The term 'academic standards' is used to describe the level of achievement that a student has to reach to gain an award (for example, a degree). It should be at a similar level across the United Kingdom (UK). The term 'quality of learning opportunities' is used to describe the support provided by an institution to enable students to achieve the awards. It is about the provision of appropriate teaching, support and assessment for the students.

Outcomes of the institutional audit

As a result of its investigations, the audit team's view of the Academy is that:

- confidence can be placed in the soundness of the institution's current and likely future management of the academic standards of the awards that it delivers

- confidence can be placed in the soundness of the institution's current and likely future management of the quality of the learning opportunities available to students.

Institutional approach to quality enhancement

Overall, the audit team found that the institution was engaging in enhancement activities at institutional and departmental levels, but considered that there is scope for a more proactive and strategic approach at the institutional level.

Postgraduate research students

The audit team concluded that the institution's arrangements for its postgraduate research students met the expectations of the *Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education (Code of practice), Section 1: Postgraduate research programmes*, published by QAA, and secured appropriate academic standards and quality of provision for its postgraduate research programmes.

Published information

The audit team found that reliance could reasonably placed on the accuracy and completeness of the information that the institution published about its educational provision and the standards of its awards.

Features of good practice

The audit team identified the following areas of good practice:

- the work of the Open Academy/York Gate, including in particular the provision of community and industry-facing activities

- the inclusion of non-academic areas in annual monitoring

- the degree of monitoring of student progress and the interaction between academic and pastoral support.

Recommendations for action

The audit team recommends that the Academy considers further action in some areas.

Recommendations for action that the audit team considers advisable:

- streamlining the responsibilities and reporting lines of the formal committees and working groups with oversight of academic standards and quality, to ensure that each plays a necessary, specific and unambiguous role

- reviewing the Academy's internal procedures for the guarantee of academic standards to ensure they are fit for purpose and are properly observed

- identifying a reliable means of ensuring that action resulting from the Academy's quality assurance procedures is carried out in a timely and effective manner

- making more effective use of management information in monitoring and review procedures.

Recommendations for action that the audit team considers desirable:

- developing institutional-level mechanisms to ensure deliberate and systematic enhancement of the student learning experience.

Reference points

To provide further evidence to support its findings, the audit team investigated the use made by the Academy of the Academic Infrastructure, which provides a means of describing academic standards in UK higher education. It allows for diversity and innovation within academic programmes offered by higher education institutions. QAA work with the higher education sector to establish the various parts of the Academic Infrastructure, which are:

- the *Code of practice*

- the frameworks for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, and in Scotland

- subject benchmark statements

- programme specifications.

The audit team found that the Academy had begun to take account of the elements of the Academic Infrastructure in its management of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities available to students, although the team considered that it would benefit from a more systematic engagement.

Report

Preface

1   An institutional audit of the Royal Academy of Music (the Academy) was undertaken during the week commencing 5-9 November 2007. The purpose of the audit was to provide public information on the Academy's management of the academic standards of its awards and of the quality of the learning opportunities available to students.

2   The audit team comprised Dr Pam Harris, Ms Barbara Howell, Dr Jonathan Scott, Professor David Timms, and Dr Kath Hodgson, audit secretary. The audit was coordinated for QAA by Dr Julian Ellis, Assistant Director, Reviews Group.

Section 1: Introduction and background

3   The Academy was founded by Royal Charter in 1882 to offer a range of educational and training opportunities to prepare students for a successful career in music, according to the evolving demands of the profession.

4   Since 1999, the Academy has been a full member of the University of London and currently offers the following University of London awards: BMus, MMus, MPhil and PhD. In addition, under the terms of its Royal Charter, the Academy awards the Licentiate of the Royal Academy of Music (LRAM), postgraduate diplomas and a Foundation Programme for international students.

5   At the time of the audit, the Academy had 735 taught students, 310 of whom were studying on the BMus. There were 15 students registered on the MPhil/PhD research programmes. The Academy has 383 teaching staff, the majority of whom are professional musicians, composers or conductors. A large percentage of the teaching staff are appointed on part-time, hourly-paid contracts to provide one-to-one teaching to students in their specialist area of music.

6   The previous institutional audit took place in 2003 and resulted in judgements of broad confidence in the Royal Academy's management of the quality and standards of its academic programmes. The audit report contained a number of recommendations. The present audit team considered that, while there had been positive steps taken for all these recommendations, much of the activity was of recent origin and still ongoing.

7   In 2006, the Academy's research degree provision was reviewed by the QAA. The Academy's ability to secure and enhance the quality and standards of its research degree programmes was considered to be appropriate and satisfactory.

8   The Academy has recently taken steps to streamline its deliberative structures through the amalgamation of the responsibilities of some of the committees. However, the audit team came to the conclusion that the benefits gained were weakened by the progressive expansion in the numbers of working groups and the lack of clarity of some of the reporting lines. The team considered the Academy may want to streamline the responsibilities and reporting lines of the formal committees and working groups with oversight of academic standards and quality, to ensure that each plays a necessary, specific and unambiguous role.

Section 2: Institutional management of academic standards

9   The audit team found the Academy's procedure for the approval of new programmes, new principal studies and related courses to be complicated and not well understood by academic staff. The requirements for agreement on resources and for external consultation were not always met in practice and the Standing Committee did not seem to enforce its requirements.

10   Monitoring, as it applies to standards, is based on the programme. The requirements of the procedure are sound, including consideration of a range of statistical information, action planning and reflection on success of actions taken. In practice, however, the documentary requirements were not wholly fulfilled, and the statistical information, action planning, and reflection limited. However, the Academy's management processes for annual planning appeared effective, and to deal with many of the matters that annual monitoring is intended to cover. The audit team considered it advisable for the Academy to review its internal procedures, and to ensure that the resultant procedures are fit for purpose and properly observed.

11   Periodic review too is based on the programme, and once again the procedure is sound in principle. However, the information assembled for the 2006 review of the BMus suggested that all the procedures were not followed through. On the other hand, there was extensive use of external reviewers, and there was also evidence that previous periodic programme reviews had been more satisfactory than the 2006 BMus review. The Academy has a procedure for periodic audit of departments, however, which uses statistical information more effectively than the periodic internal review of programmes, and is much more focused on action.

12   The Academy makes use of two kinds of independent external expertise in the maintenance of academic standards through assessment. External examiners in the conventional sense are engaged for all programmes. In addition, the Academy engages 'visiting specialists' to assist with the establishment of individual marks for the 'final recital'. It appeared that both external examiners and visiting specialists were rigorously appointed, and properly briefed. There were mechanisms for ensuring that their reports were thoroughly considered. It appeared that the Academy puts a significant amount of resource, effort and attention into the inclusion of external voices in the assessment of its students, and that this admirable openness to external informed opinion was the mark of the institution and its most important guarantee of academic standards. However, there was evidence that the multiplicity of committees, and lack of clarity in reporting lines and terms of reference, made taking action on the outcomes of external examiners' reports somewhat protracted, and the Academy should identify a reliable means of ensuring that action consequent on its quality assurance procedures is carried out in a timely and effective manner.

13   The audit found that the Academy considered the contents of the *Code of practice*, published by QAA, and revisions to its various sections. There are arrangements for taking FHEQ and subject benchmark statements into account in programme approval, but these need to be used more systematically. Evidence seen by the audit team suggested that the Academy has devoted some considerable attention to attempts at European level to define standards for degrees in music, and is actively involved in the European Association of Conservatoires. However, the team formed the view that the Academic Infrastructure is noted but does not have a prominent role in the setting and maintenance of academic standards, in part because many of the Academy's reference points are outside the world of higher education altogether, in the music industry at large.

14   The teaching, learning and assessment policy provides a significant forward step in making the standards achieved by the Academy's students explicit, although evidence was not yet available about how the policy was being used to define standards by individual departments in handbooks and other regulatory material, or by actual assessment panels and examination boards.

15   Although a range of statistical information is specified for inclusion in the procedures for annual monitoring and periodic review, in practice statistical information is not used routinely and extensively in quality assurance procedures. This omission is more marked in the case of the undergraduate programmes than the postgraduate programmes.

16   The audit team found that the current procedures for approval, annual monitoring, and periodic review based upon programmes seemed cumbersome, were rarely carried out in the manner intended, and made little use of extant management information. On the other hand, the departmental processes for planning and internal audit were reflective, based on substantial management information, and action-orientated. The extensive and rigorous monitoring of individual student progress in the context of a highly selective intake, and the extent of, and commitment to, engagement with external expert opinion were the real foundations for academic standards at the Academy. On this basis, the team found that confidence can reasonably be placed in the soundness of the institution's present and likely future management of the academic standards of its awards.

Section 3: Institutional management of learning opportunities

17   Assurance that the educational provision is delivered effectively is discharged through annual monitoring of programmes and departments. The annual monitoring report is considered by the Standing Committee. From the evidence, the audit team was not clear how action plans were considered or monitored. The most recent annual monitoring reports for programmes were variable in their consideration of statistical information, feedback from students or the findings from the survey of alumni conducted by the Registry. Conversely, the departmental reports (York Gate and Open Academy) included quite detailed information.

18   The Academy is seeking to place more emphasis on referencing to external benchmarks through the development of its teaching, learning and assessment policy. The Academy is also taking steps to strengthen external relationships through the introduction of a new programme coordinator and the responsibilities of the Research Strategy Committee.

19   Links between research activity and learning opportunity are achieved through the use made of research fellows, who engage with the taught areas (undergraduate and postgraduate) based on their research interests. The Academy has also recently introduced a research coordinator to cross-fertilise between programmes and research. However, at the time of the audit it was not possible to confirm the extent to which this role will work in practice. The Academy further draws on the University of London's new Institute for Musical Research.

20   The Academy provides a wide range of resources, including: master classes; well-stocked library; the Open Academy; York Gate; the Creative Technology Lab; and a website with an expanding information base to a full calendar of events. The Academy also has a stock of more than 100 rooms available for teaching, rehearsals and practice. It is recognised and appreciated by both staff and students that there is always significant pressure on space. However, the audit team concluded that the Academy had effective systems in place to try to optimise the use of its learning resources in supporting the educational experience of the students.

21   The Academy is extensively engaged in outreach and widening participation activities. The audit team considered the work of the Open Academy/York Gate, including, in particular, the provision of community and industry-facing activities, to be a feature of good practice. There is an extensive system of student support that begins with applications procedures through to the careers advice service. There is a close link between the teaching staff and the students, in particular through the one-to-one principal study classes. Students also have access to tutorial and pastoral support and student progress is discussed on a weekly basis between tutors. The Academy also provides welfare support systems comprising counselling, chaplaincy and guidance for disability. Students can also gain advice from a specific Dyslexia Tutor, International Student Liaison Officer, support related to music (for example, psychology-based performance classes and tuition in the Alexander Technique) and access to Paddington Green Health Centre which has expertise in treating musicians' injuries. The Academy has a range of professional placements and also offers institutional exchanges with the Juilliard School in New York and Central Conservatory of Music in Beijing.

22   The Academy's Human Resources (HR) Strategy sets out the policy for attracting, retaining and developing staff. As part of its HR Strategy, the Academy operates an annual process of appraisal to set performance objectives and identify training needs. There are proposals to introduce a voluntary scheme of peer observation of teaching, set out an enhanced structure for continuing professional development, pilot a Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education. Consolidation days were identified as a further mechanism for staff development and dissemination of current practice in relation to assessment and admissions.

23   The audit team concluded that the Academy provides comprehensive procedures for approval and amendment of programmes, courses and principal study; however, in practice they appear overcomplicated and subtle differences between the processes and templates may cause confusion. Similarly, the procedures for monitoring and review as set out in the Quality Assurance Procedures appeared rigorous. However, the audit team considered both the Periodic Programme Review and the annual monitoring exercise to be less thorough in their execution. Conversely, the team considered the annual monitoring of non-academic areas as comprehensive and their inclusion to be an area of good practice.

24   Student representation on committees works well, students' views were considered seriously and the Academy demonstrated a high level of responsiveness to feedback. The audit team was of the opinion that the Academy provides an active and developing research environment, with opportunities for staff to link their research and teaching interests. The team also considered that the degree of monitoring of student progress and the interaction between academic and pastoral support to be a feature of good practice.

25   Overall, the audit team considered that confidence could reasonably be placed in the soundness of the institution's present and likely future management of the quality of the learning opportunity available to students.

Section 4: Institutional approach to quality enhancement

26   The audit team saw evidence of an increase in the focus on enhancement activities at the Academy and the need for a corporate approach to enhancement was recognised by the Academy.

27   One aspect of the Academy's approach to enhancement is the Open Academy. The Open Academy had an overarching role in the Academy as a whole, including becoming involved in curriculum-related activity, research and outreach activities, as well as providing enhanced opportunities to students to engage in community activity, to interact with renowned music professionals and to enhance the links between research and teaching.

28   The Open Academy has made productive use of student feedback to enhance students' opportunities for professional development, and in the Academy as a whole, the audit team found evidence that the findings of the National Students Survey were taken seriously, particularly in terms of enhancing the facilities and booking arrangements for students in their individual practice activities.

29   The audit team learnt that Consolidation Days are viewed as another key aspect of enhancement at the Academy. Consolidation Days are well attended; however, notes of meetings indicate that the emphasis of discussion is primarily on regulatory matters. The team considered that enhancement activities arising from Consolidation Days are therefore limited in scope.

30   The use of management information to inform enhancement activities was found to be limited at the time of audit, particularly in relation to annual monitoring and review, although the audit team was informed of planned initiatives to improve the availability and analysis of such information. The team noted examples of staff development support, strategy and activities designed to enhance student learning opportunities, and a number of other examples of good practice were noted, particularly in relation to developments in the Open Academy and York Gate events.

31   The audit team concluded that, while there were many examples of good practice, it would be desirable for the Academy to monitor actively the systematic use of its existing quality assurance procedures and institutional level initiatives, to ensure deliberate steps are taken towards enhancement of the learning experience.

Section 5: Collaborative arrangements

32   The Academy has a number of collaborative links with other institutions which contribute to discrete elements of students' programmes (for example orchestral placements, compositional projects and Open Academy placements). The Academy does not award credit to external partners.

33   The long-standing reciprocal teaching arrangement, whereby students can attend certain elective classes at King's College London in return for one-to-one tuition offered by Academy staff or postgraduate students, does not involve credit transfer.

Section 6: Institutional arrangements for postgraduate research students

34   Provision for postgraduate research students at the Academy is recent in origin, only having been introduced in 2000, following the Academy's attainment of full membership of the University of London. There are currently two programmes offered: MPhil/PhD in Performance Practice and MPhil/PhD in Composition, both being awards of the University of London. At the time of the audit, the provision was small, with 15 students in total.

35   The programmes and the progress of the students are overseen by the Academy's Research Degrees Board, which reports to the Standing Committee of the Academic Board, with the regulations, as approved by the University of London. The practical arrangements for the programmes are managed by the Academy's Registry, which coordinates with the University's Research Degrees Examinations Office, particularly for appointment of external examiners and arrangements for the final examinations. The Academy also has representation on the University's Research Degrees Committee and Music Subject Panel.

36   Admission to the research programmes requires a minimum entry standard of an Upper Second class honours degree or equivalent, and is based on a formal interview process involving the Head of Programme and at least one other member of the Academy's supervisory team. Following successful enrolment, new students are inducted into the Academy and provided with documentation, including the Student Handbook and the Research Degrees Code of Practice.

37   Appointment of the Principal Supervisor is by agreement with the Head of Department and is approved by the Research Degrees Board, and students meet with their supervisor at least twice per term. In addition, each student is allocated a subsidiary supervisor and the Senior Postgraduate Tutor acts as a personal tutor for the research students.

38   At the start of each academic year, each student and their supervisor complete an assessment of research needs, as a part of personal development planning, and this is complemented by a formal end-of-year report by the supervisor outlining the student's progress and position for the transfer from MPhil to PhD, or to final submission and examination. The Academy offers specific seminars in research skills and the students are also encouraged to attend the seminars offered by the University of London. The progress of each research student is further monitored by the Research Degrees Board at its twice-termly meetings.

39   The Academy's Code of Practice for Research Degrees sets out the assessment criteria for transfer and for completion and these are endorsed by the University of London which also approves the appointment of the external examiner and oversees the examinations process. The audit team was able to conclude that the Academy's arrangements for its postgraduate research students meet the expectations of the *Code of practice, Section 1: Postgraduate research programmes*, published by QAA, and secure the appropriate academic standards and quality of provision.

Section 7: Published information

40   The Academy provides a range of information for prospective and current students, visitors and the general public, including the prospectus, the website, a twice-yearly news document (The Bulletin), and a seasonal diary of events (Highlights) among other promotional documents. Also published are a variety of handbooks, including a student handbook, separate handbooks for international students and for postgraduate students, a Research Degrees Code of Practice, departmental handbooks, examination procedures and a book of regulations. All are regarded by the Academy as important vehicles for communication, both internally and externally, ensuring that students and staff are fully aware of academic requirements, obligations and responsibilities. A number of key handbooks are published both in hard copy and online.

41   The text for the prospectus is compiled initially by Registry staff, departmental administrators and heads of department. Following circulation to the Principal, the Vice-Principal and the Director of Development, the final proof is signed off by the Vice-Principal. The Communications Manager oversees the process, and is also responsible for approving all other website information. The regulations are updated each year by the Academic Secretary, under the authority of the Governing Body. Major changes are agreed through the committee structure, and for minor changes the Academic Secretary circulates details to relevant staff for consultation before inclusion. Responsibility for the student handbook, examination procedures and induction material rests with the Registry, following consultation with tutors. Departmental handbooks are updated every year by the departmental administrator. Responsibility for the accuracy of programme handbooks rests jointly with the chairs/heads of programmes and the Academic Secretary, with significant changes passed through the committee structure.

42   Students in their written submission commented favourably on the prospectus and departmental handbooks, while noting that a summary sheet of course requirements would also be a useful publication. The usefulness and accuracy of the publications were confirmed by students whom the audit team met.

43   As a result of its sampling of the Academy's published information, and from its meetings with students and staff, the audit team formed the view that overall reliance can be placed on the accuracy, integrity, completeness and frankness of the information published in various formats by the Academy.

Section 8: Features of good practice and recommendations

Features of good practice

44   The audit team identified the following areas of good practice:

- the work of the Open Academy/York Gate, including in particular the provision of community and industry-facing activities (paragraph 21)

- the inclusion of non-academic areas in annual monitoring (paragraph 23)

- the degree of monitoring of student progress and the interaction between academic and pastoral support (paragraph 24).

Recommendations for action

45   Recommendations for action that the audit team considers advisable:

- streamlining the responsibilities and reporting lines of the formal committees and working groups with oversight of academic standards and quality, to ensure they each play a necessary, specific and unambiguous role (paragraph 8)

- reviewing the Academy's internal procedures for the guarantee of academic standards to ensure they are fit for purpose and are properly observed (paragraph 10)

- identifying a reliable means of ensuring that action resulting from the Academy's quality assurance procedures is carried out in a timely and effective manner (paragraph 12).

- making more effective use of management information in monitoring and review procedures (paragraph 15)

46   Recommendations for action that the audit team considers desirable:

- developing institutional-level mechanisms to ensure deliberate and systematic enhancement of the student learning experience (paragraph 31).

Appendix

Royal Academy of Music response to the institutional audit report

The Royal Academy of Music is pleased to receive an encouraging outcome to the QAA Institutional Audit 2007. The Academy notes that the audit team identified the following features of good practice:

- the inclusion of non-academic areas in annual monitoring

- the work of the Open Academy/York Gate, including in particular the provision of community and industry facing activities

- the degree of monitoring of student progress and the interaction between academic and pastoral support.

The Academy is also delighted with the audit team's overall view that confidence can be placed in the soundness of the institution's current and likely future management of the academic standards of the awards that it delivers; and that confidence can be placed in the soundness of the institution's current and likely future management of the quality of the learning opportunities available to students.

The Academy welcomes the advisable and desirable recommendations, noting that there were no 'essential' recommendations, and considers these recommendations to be useful and constructive in terms of the Academy's future enhancement-led agenda. In respect of those recommendations considered advisable, the Academy will be clarifying the role of each institutional level committee and the relationship between them; examining the processes of Annual Monitoring and the annual Planning Cycle with a view to aligning these two processes and also undertaking a review of the Academy's Quality Assurance Procedures which will in turn aid the monitoring of action points arising from the implementation of these procedures.

While the Academy has launched various initiatives under the banner of enhancement, it recognises the need for a more clearly defined institutional approach emphasised by the auditors' recommendations. These have been very helpful in setting a way forward for the Academy's quality enhancement agenda.