Assessment for Variation of Degree Awarding Powers

The Ashridge (Bonar Law Memorial) Trust

Review Report

April 2020

Contents

Summary of the assessment team's findings

Underpinning DAPs criteria	
Criterion A: Academic governance	Met
Criterion B1: Regulatory frameworks	Met
Criterion B2: Academic standards	Met
Criterion B3: Quality of the academic experience	Met
Criterion C: Scholarship and the pedagogical effectiveness of staff	Met
Criterion D: Environment for supporting students	Met
Criterion E: Evaluation of performance	Met
Overarching criterion	
The provider is a self-critical, cohesive academic community with a proven commitment to the assurance of standards supported by effective quality systems	Met

About this report

This is a report of an assessment of Ashridge (Bonar Law Memorial) Trust conducted by QAA in April 2020 in accordance with the process outlined in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment for Variation and Revocation of Degree Awarding Powers*, December 2019.

Assessment for the variation and revocation of degree awarding powers (DAPs) is the process QAA uses to provide advice to the Office for Students (OfS) about the quality of, and the standards applied to, higher education delivered by a provider in England that has an existing DAPs authorisation and where variation or revocation is to be considered.

The assessment was conducted in order to inform advice to the OfS on whether the provider's existing renewable powers be granted on an indefinite basis.

Provider information

Provider details	
Legal name	Ashridge (Bonar Law Memorial) Trust
Trading name	Ashridge Executive Education
UKPRN	10008899
Type of institution	Alternative provider
Date founded	1954
Date of first HE provision	1988
Application route	Variation DAPs
Level of powers applied for (if applying for additional levels)	Not applicable

Locations of teaching	Hertfordshire (Ashridge), London, Dubai, Boston, San Francisco
Subjects applied for	All subjects
Current powers held (if applicable)	Taught degree up to Level 7 (renewable)
Date current powers granted (if applicable)	2008, renewed in 2014
Number of current programmes as at 27 February (provider submission)	Two degree apprenticeship programmes (one in partnership with Coventry University) One postgraduate taught apprenticeship programme One undergraduate degree programme 11 postgraduate taught programmes One doctoral programme (Hult award)
Number of students as at 27 February (provider submission)	4,583: 3,727 full-time and 856 part-time
Number of staff as at 27 February (provider submission)	269

About Ashridge (Bonar Law Memorial) Trust

Ashridge is an independent institution with charitable trust status. Ashridge was initially granted degree awarding powers for taught programmes in 2008, and these powers were renewed in 2014. Ashridge had a Higher Education Review for Alternative Providers (HER AP) in 2017.

In 2015, Ashridge established an operational merger with Hult International Business School. Although Ashridge and Hult remain legally distinct entities, the result of the operational merger is that they operate as a combined institution in many respects.

There is a single senior management structure and a single academic and regulatory framework for the delivery and management of programmes across the combined institution. The Ashridge programmes lead to the award of a UK degree awarded through Ashridge's degree awarding powers and a US degree awarded by Hult under the powers it has from the New England Commission of Higher Education (NECHE).

Hult International Business School has a number of campuses in the UK and internationally: Ashridge, two London campuses (one for undergraduate and one postgraduate), the US (Boston, San Francisco, New York), Dubai and Shanghai. The programmes leading to Ashridge awards are delivered at Ashridge itself, and some programmes are also delivered at other Hult campuses in London, Dubai, Boston and San Francisco. Each Hult campus has a common organisational structure and operates under the governance and regulatory structures of the combined institution.

The combined institutions have a unified academic management structure based on the Schools of undergraduate, postgraduate and executive education. There is a single Chief Executive, the President of Hult International Business School, who is supported by senior staff including a Chief Academic Officer and Presidents of Undergraduate and Postgraduate provision. There are two governing boards with identical compositions (the Ashridge Representative Body and the Hult Board of Trustees).

Ashridge is headed by a Campus Dean who is responsible for day-to-day management of academic programmes, including management of staff and responsibility for student outcomes. The Campus Dean is supported by Heads of Operations and Management, Programme Deans and Programme Management teams.

At present, Ashridge has around 4,583 students on a range of programmes in business and related areas; 3,727 full-time and 856 part-time. Ashridge also provides part-time non-degree executive education programmes for experienced business professionals. Ashridge has two degree apprenticeship programmes leading to its own awards, and a third apprenticeship programme is offered in partnership with Coventry University, leading to an award of the University. Ashridge also delivers a doctoral programme (Executive Doctorate in Organisational Change). This was previously offered in partnership with the University of Middlesex, leading to an award of the University, but now leads to a US degree awarded by Hult through its accreditation by NECHE.

How the assessment was conducted

The QAA assessment team completed an assessment of Ashridge according to the process set out in Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment for Variation and Revocation of Degree Awarding Powers, December 2019.

The team appointed to undertake this assessment was as follows:

Name: Will Curtis
Institution: University of Warwick
Role in assessment team: Institutional assessor

Name: Diane Meehan
Institution: formerly Liverpool John Moores University
Role in assessment team: Institutional assessor

Name: Francine Norris
Institution: West Dean College
Role in assessment team: Institutional assessor

The QAA Officer for the assessment was Julia Baylie.

The assessment team conducted the assessment by reference to a range of evidence gathered according to the process described in the above Guidance for Providers. The criteria used in relation to this assessment are those that apply in England as set out paragraphs 215-216 and in Annex C in OfS's regulatory framework. To support the clarity of communication between providers and QAA, the DAPs criteria and evidence requirements from OfS's regulatory framework have been given unique identifiers and are reproduced in Annex 4 of *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment by QAA*, October 2019.

The size and composition of this team is in line with published guidance and, as such, is comprised of experts with significant experience and expertise across the higher education sector. The team included members with experience of a similar provider to the institution, knowledge of the academic awards offered and included academics with subject expertise. Collectively, the team had experience of the management and delivery of higher education programmes from academic and professional services perspectives, included members with regulatory and investigative experience, and had at least one member able to represent the interests of students. The team included at least one senior academic leader qualified to

doctoral level. Details of team members were shared with Ashridge prior to the assessment to identify and resolve any possible conflicts of interest.

In the course of the assessment, the review team considered a total of 262 items of evidence. The initial submission included 41 items of evidence. Following the initial stage of desk-based analysis, the team submitted requests for clarification and additional evidence covering all five criteria, following which an additional 207 pieces of evidence were provided.

After the team's scrutiny of the additional documentation, clarification was sought on some of the additional evidence provided, and an explanatory note and a further 12 items of evidence were submitted. Further written queries were submitted in order to clarify the team's understanding of a small number of issues. Written responses and one further item of evidence were submitted in response to these queries.

The substantive areas pursued through queries between the submission of additional documentation and the team judgement meeting were: student engagement issues, including student participation in governance committees, and how student representatives are supported; clarification on some governance and organisational structure issues; and clarification of evidence to enable the team to assess depth and strength of academic leadership and senior staff, the academic and professional experience of staff and their engagement with development and research opportunities.

The team made the following requests for samples of documentation. Details of the evidence the team considered are provided in the Explanation of findings section of this report, below.

- A representative sample of programme specifications and definitive programme documentation for four programmes.
- A representative sample of external examiner reports covering the previous three years, at all levels of study, and the responses provided to each of these reports.
- A sample of documentation relating to six complaints and six academic appeals.
- A representative sample of staff CVs across all programmes, including full-time and part-time staff.
- A sample of two programme student handbooks and two course (module) handbooks from two different programmes.
- A representative sample of four Programme Directors' Review reports (annual programme monitoring reports).

Notes on use of terminology

Hult International Business School uses American spelling for some terminology, including, for example 'honor' and 'program'.

Throughout this report, references to 'the institution' refer to the combined institution of Hult International Business School and Ashridge. 'Ashridge' is used to refer to the single entity.

'Faculty' is used by the institution to refer to its academic staff, rather than to an organisational unit.

The word 'course(s)' is used to describe units or modules of study within a programme in most instances, although the word module is also sometimes used.

Explanation of findings

Criterion A: Academic governance

Criterion A1: Academic governance

1   This criterion states that:

A1.1   *An organisation granted degree awarding powers has effective academic governance, with clear and appropriate lines of accountability for its academic responsibilities.*

A1.2   *Academic governance, including all aspects of the control and oversight of its higher education provision, is conducted in partnership with its students.*

A1.3   *Where an organisation granted degree awarding powers works with other organisations to deliver learning opportunities, it ensures that its governance and management of such opportunities is robust and effective and that decisions to work with other organisations are the result of a strategic approach rather than opportunism.*

2   The QAA assessment team conducted an assessment of this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment for Variation and Revocation of Degree Awarding Powers*, December 2019.

The evidence considered and why the team considered this evidence

3   The team assessed this criterion by reference to a range of evidence gathered according to the process described in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment by QAA*, October 2019, in particular the suggested evidence outlined in Annex 5 and Ashridge's submission. The assessment team identified and considered this evidence for the purposes described in Annex 4 and 5 of this Guidance.

4   Specifically, the assessment team considered or assessed the following.

   a.   In order to determine whether the higher education mission and strategy, and the associated policies, are coherent, published, understood and applied consistently, the team reviewed documentation relating to the institution's Mission and Strategy, academic regulations and policies, evidence of how mission and strategy are communicated to staff, committee minutes, and documentation for the periodic review of programmes. This included the institution's Mission [www.hult.edu/en/about], the Strategy Map [Intro-4] (which maps mission and vision, priorities, initiatives, strategies and enablers), the United Nations (UN) Principles of Responsible Management Education (UN PRME) Report [Intro-3], the Teaching and Learning Strategy 2016-17 [13-001] and the Research Strategy [05-003, 48-001]. The assessment team also looked at the Academic Regulations 2019 [Intro-2], evidence of communication of the Mission and Strategy to staff through the President's calls to staff [10-001,10-002], agendas and papers for the Faculty Summits 2017 [10-003] and 2019 [10-004,10-005,10-006], the Alumni Association website [www.hult.edu/en/alumni], minutes of meetings of the Teaching and Learning Committee [06-048, 06-49], the Chief Academic Officer's Report for the Board [05-003], documentation relating to the periodic review of the Executive Masters in Leadership and Management (EMLM) programme [34-001, 34-002, 34-040] and minutes of Academic Board [06-004].

b. To confirm that policies and procedures are developed, implemented and communicated in collaboration with its staff and students and external stakeholders, the team considered the minutes of the Academic Board meetings [06-002, A-2, 06-031] and Academic Board papers [06-035], Academic Regulations 2019 [Intro-2], staff [48-001] and student [39-001] handbooks, student programme handbooks [25-001, 34-004, B-1], and the Ashridge Campus Handbook 2019 [34-044].

c. To assess whether there is clarity and differentiation of function and responsibility at all levels in relation to academic governance structures and arrangements for managing higher education provision, the team reviewed the Terms of Reference of the Representative Body [05-005] and Minutes of the Ashridge Representative Body Meeting Sept 2019 [05-001], the Chief Academic Officer's reports to the governing body [05-003, 05-004], Senior staff and Ashridge Campus Management structure diagrams [00, Intro-2, 01-001, 02-001, 06-020], the EMLM Student handbook 2019 [B-1], Hult Ashridge Campus Handbook 2019 [34-044] and the institution's response to queries raised by the team [R2, R3].

d. To confirm that there is appropriate depth and strength of academic leadership, the team considered the LinkedIn profiles of Senior Management [01-001] and Ashridge Campus Management [02-001] and the Central Academic Team Role Specifications [01-002].

e. To assess whether there is clarity and differentiation of function and responsibility at all levels in relation to the academic governance structures and arrangements for managing the higher education provision, and that the function and responsibility of the senior academic authority is clearly articulated and consistently applied, the team considered the institution's Academic Governance Framework [03-001, Intro-2], the agendas, minutes and papers of Academic Board [A-1, A-2, 06-001 – 06-050, 05-001, 15-002], and agendas and minutes of its subcommittees: Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) [A-3, A-4, 06-029, 15-003, 45-001 – 45-004], Curriculum Committee [A-5, A-6, 06-030, 06-046], Teaching and Learning Committee [A-7, A-8, 06-048, 06-049], Admissions Committee [A-9, A-10, 06-047] and Research Committee [A-11, 06-028, 06-044, 06-045].

f. To determine whether Ashridge manages its degree awarding powers successfully, the team considered reports and documentation relating to external reviews by regulators and accrediting bodies including QAA [Intro-1], New England Commission of Higher Education (NECHE) [18-001], the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) [C-1, 37-001], the European Quality Improvement System (EQUIS) [C-2, E-6] and the Association of Masters in Business Administration (AMBA) [37-002]; and the Academic Regulations 2019 [Intro-2].

g. To determine how students are involved in the governance and management of the institution and Ashridge, and whether students are supported to be able to engage effectively, the team reviewed documentation, including the Self-Assessment Report [00], Academic Regulations 2019 [Intro-2], Minutes of Academic Board [15-001, 06-002, 06-004, A-2, 06-031], Request for Additional Information [R1], Teaching and Learning Strategy [13-001], the responses to queries raised by the team [R2], the Academic Governance Framework [03-001], slides of the President's December 2017 call to staff [10-002], Student submissions [SSA, SSHSA], the Hult Student Association (HAS) website [https://www.hsalondonug.com/has], HSA Meeting Notes Example [E-3], Workshop for HSA representatives [22-003], ToR [34-044] and minutes of Board of Studies [21-001, 21-002, 34-026 – 34-031], Course Evaluation Example [E-1], Student Survey NPS Example (Screenshot) [E-2], evidence of student feedback EMLM 2019 [55-001], Faculty Annual Review example [C-4],

Programme Directors' Review reports (annual programme monitoring reports) [56-001 – 56-004], documentation relating to the periodic reviews of the EMLM programme [34-002, 34-040], Masters in Executive Coaching (AMEC) programme [34-048] and Executive Doctorate in Organisational Change (EDOC) programme [34-054].

h. To assess whether Ashridge's arrangements for working with other organisations to deliver learning opportunities are based on a strategic approach, informed by the effective assessment of risk, defined in a written legal agreement and subject to robust oversight and governance, the team reviewed a range of documentation relating to partnership arrangements, including formal agreements and addendums to agreements relating to partnerships [16-001, 19-002, 18-005, 17-002], evidence of due diligence and risk assessment prior to setting up a partnership [17-001], processes relating to development of the partnership [17-003 – 17-005], confirmation of termination of partnerships documentation [18-002 ,18-003, 19-001], confirmation of completion of students in terminating partnerships [19-003] and minutes of the Board of Studies for the Doctorate in Organisational Change [21-002].

How any samples of evidence were constructed

5   There was no sampling involved in the team's consideration of evidence for this criterion as the volume of evidence relating to criterion A was sufficiently small to allow for all documents to be assessed by the team.

What the evidence shows

6   The assessment team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

7   The institutional mission is clearly articulated on Hult's website. The mission sets out the goal to be 'the most relevant business school in the world' [www.hult.edu/en/about]. The strategy 2017-21, aligned with the mission, is summarised in a Strategy Map [Intro-4]. The strategy [Intro-4] highlights three priorities: 'Enhance teaching excellence': 'Drive relevance'; and 'Demonstrate Impact'; and there are five initiatives and five enablers designed to support achievement of these priorities. The mission and strategy are communicated widely to staff and other stakeholders through the Faculty Summit (evidenced in its introduction [10-003], schedules [10-004], and presentations [10-005 – 10-006]), which is held every two years, the alumni association [www.hult.edu/en/alumni] and the President's 'monthly call' to staff [10-001, 10-002] where the President and other senior staff present to staff on progress in achieving the mission, and the role of staff in implementing strategic objectives; and provide opportunities for questions from staff. The institution is also committed to the UN Principles of Responsible Management Education (UN PRME) [Intro-3] which promote the integration of ethics, societal impact and sustainability into management education. Alignment of programmes and courses with these principles is checked through validation and periodic review processes, as evidenced in documentation relating to the periodic review of the EMLM programme in January 2019 [34-001, 34-002, 34-040].

8   Delivery of the overarching institutional strategy is underpinned by a number of strategies, notably the Teaching and Learning Strategy (developed in 2016-17 and due to be revised in 2020) [13-001] and the Research Strategy [05-003, 48-001]; and policies such as the Admissions Policy [Intro-2], which are encapsulated in the Academic Regulations [Intro-2]. The clear focus on delivering these strategies is demonstrated by the newly reformed Teaching and Learning Committee to allow more focus on teaching, learning and assessment priorities and agreed annual objectives [06-048, 06-049], the 2019 Faculty summit [10-005] (which included sessions on Inspiring Pedagogy [10-004] and Research

[10-006]) and the Chief Academic Officer's January 2020 report to the governing body in relation to progress against the Research Strategy [05-003].

9   Policies are developed in consultation with staff and students, with a recent example being the development of the policy on the award of Professorial titles [06-035] which, as shown in its minutes, was discussed extensively at Academic Board meetings [A-2, 06-002, 06-031]. Policies are widely communicated through staff [48-001] and student handbooks [39-001, B-1, 25-001, 34-044, 39-001] and the Academic Regulations [Intro-2]. The Central Academic Team has overall responsibility for ensuring the consistent application of regulations and policies [Intro-2]. The minutes of Academic Board August 2019 note the appointment of a Director of Strategy Implementation to ensure consistency of policy implementation across the various campus locations, although the team found no further information in relation to this role [06-004].

10   To meet the needs of a complex, global institution and to promote consistency of operation, arrangements for the management of higher education provision at senior level are common across Hult and Ashridge, with the Head of the institution being the President of Hult International Business School; these arrangements are described in the Academic Regulations [Intro-2]. As evidenced from the 2019 Academic Regulations [Intro-2] and from the organisational structure and LinkedIn profiles [01-001], the Chief Academic Officer, as academic head of the institution, reports to the President and manages the central academic team. The central academic team comprises the Deans of Academic Affairs, Research, Faculty and Programs, and Executive Programs [Intro-2]. Central academic team members have cross-institutional functions (such as accreditation and regulations, admissions, research, faculty policies, curriculum development, and oversight of academic quality and consistency), which are clearly defined in their role descriptions [01-002].

11   Until recently, and as stated in the 2019 Academic Regulations, the institution comprised three Schools (Undergraduate, Postgraduate and Executive Education), with each School having a President [Intro-2]. However, as shown in the most recent management structure diagram which was provided to the team [01-001], and confirmed by the institution in response to a query from the team [R3], following the restructuring of Executive Education at the end of 2019 the role of President of Executive Education has been removed and responsibility for the delivery of executive programmes now resides under the remit of the Dean of Executive Programs. The institution confirmed that this change will be reflected in the 2020 version of the Regulations [R3].

12   Each campus of the institution, including Ashridge, has a Campus Dean who is responsible for the day-to-day management of academic programmes at their campus and for the management of local staff and student outcomes, supported by a campus management team [00, 02-001]. The Dean of Executive Programs is currently the Ashridge Campus Dean [01-001, 02-001] (referred to as the Dean of Faculty in various documents, including the Hult Ashridge Campus Handbook 2019 [34-044] and in student programme handbooks [B-1, 25-001, 34-004]). It was confirmed to the team [R3] that following the recent restructuring of Executive Education mentioned above, the role of the Dean of Qualifications, with responsibility for all degree programmes at Ashridge [06-020], has been replaced by the role of Associate Dean of Degree Programs, reporting to the Dean of Executive Programs [R3]. The functions previously undertaken by the Dean of Qualifications are now shared by the Dean of Executive Programs and the Associate Dean of Degree Programs. They are supported by the Academic Registrar/Associate Dean of Quality, Heads of Program Management and Academic Directors, who collectively comprise the academic management team as confirmed in the structure diagram provided to the team [R3, 02-001]. Although confirmation of these changes was provided in a written response to the team prior to the team judgement meeting [R3], no evidence of the rationale for the changes in senior and campus-level management structures was provided. These changes, while appearing

appropriate, are too recent for the team to be able to comment on their impact and effectiveness.

13   The team requested copies of job descriptions for senior staff and Ashridge campus management team staff. The team was told that there is not a central log of job descriptions and that line managers are expected to keep up-to-date role descriptors for their direct reports [R2]. The team was provided with sample role descriptions for the Central Academic Team which clearly specify the roles and responsibilities of these senior staff and differentiate their various functions [01-002]. The institution also confirmed that it does not keep a central database of senior staff CVs, preferring to retain staff profiles on LinkedIn [R2]. From its consideration of these profiles, the team confirmed that they provide sufficient evidence of appropriate depth and strength of academic leadership at all levels of the institution, with senior managers at institutional [01-001] and campus levels [02-001] having appropriate qualifications and experience; and that Ashridge programmes are managed by well-qualified and appropriately experienced Academic Directors and programme management staff [02-001].

14   There is a single academic governance structure for the combined institution. The highest academic decision-making body is the Hult and Ashridge Academic Board (the Academic Board), which is chaired by the Chief Academic Officer. As explained in the self-assessment document [00] and the Academic Regulations [Intro-02], the Academic Board's authority to award US and UK degrees is delegated by the governing bodies of Hult International Business School and Ashridge (Bonar Law Memorial) Trust (both governing bodies having the same membership). The governing body of Ashridge (known as the Representative Body) comprises a number of external members, referred to as Fellows, from both the US and UK. Its Terms of Reference, dating from 2015 [05-005], clearly state its remit in ensuring that Ashridge's academic standards, programming and activities are compliant with the requirements of regulators in relation to acquiring and/or maintaining accreditations and the power to award degrees. Its Terms of Reference are also explicit about how conflicts of interest are managed [05-005]. The Chief Academic Officer attends the Ashridge Representative Body. The minutes of a meeting of the Ashridge Representative Body [05-001] show that the Chief Academic Officer provides its members with reports [05-003, 05-004] relating, for example, to current matters raised at the most recent Academic Board meetings, performance against strategic priorities and strategies and student progression and achievement data to support its role in the oversight of the standards of Ashridge awards. The minutes also demonstrate that the Representative Body discusses, challenges and approves relevant items.

15   The Academic Governance Framework [Intro-2, 03-001] clearly sets out the academic committee structure and the membership of Academic Board and its subcommittees. Membership of Academic Board, as set out in the Terms of Reference [03-001], comprises ex-officio members and elected staff (from across the institution) and student representatives. It also includes Chairs of the Academic Board's subcommittees, up to two members of the governing body and an external representative. As stated in its Terms of Reference [03-001], Academic Board has oversight of (i) the institution's mission and strategy, (ii) the planning and delivery of the educational provision of the institution, and (iii) student progression and achievement. It also approves the Academic Governance Framework and the Academic Regulations [Intro-2] and any changes to the Regulations.

16   As defined in the Academic Governance Framework, responsibility for the development and monitoring of specific areas of academic strategy and operation is delegated to Academic Board's subcommittees [Intro-2, 03-001], namely ASQC, Academic Integrity Committees, Curriculum Committee, Teaching and Learning Committee (which reports to the Curriculum Committee), Research Committee, Research Ethics Committee (which reports to the Research Committee) and the Admissions Committee. Chairs of these

subcommittees are appointed by Academic Board, and are generally members of the Central Academic Team; a review of the framework documentation by the team demonstrated that each committee includes appropriate staff representation from across the institution [03-001].

17   The sample agendas, minutes and papers for Academic Board reviewed by the team [A-1, A-2, 06-00 – 06-005, 06-006 – 06-030, 06-031, 06-032 – 06-50, 15-001,15-002], show that it is operating in line with its stated Terms of Reference; standard agendas are utilised, papers are well written and actions are noted and followed up. Examples of items approved by the Board include updates to the Academic Governance Framework [A-2, 06-002, 06-031], changes/updates to the Academic Regulations [A-2], approval of all Ashridge and Hult awards [A-2, 06-002, 06-004, 06-031], approval of the rescinding of an award [06-002] and approval for an award to be made under exceptional circumstances [15-001,15-002]. Academic Board minutes [A-2] show that, in order to support its oversight of academic standards, it receives reports on student performance data [06-010, 06-011] including an analysis of the awards made.

18   The minutes of Academic Board [A-2, A-4, 06-002, 06-004, 06-031] demonstrate effective upward reporting from its subcommittees, through their minutes and the inclusion of chairs of the subcommittees as members of Academic Board, thus enabling it to retain appropriate oversight of academic standards and quality, teaching, learning and assessment, admissions, curriculum development, and research and scholarship activities. Minutes of the November 2019 meeting of Academic Board noted that the annual reporting arrangements from its subcommittees were being discussed and that a meeting of the Chairs of the various subcommittees was being arranged so that details of exactly what is reported, and when, could be agreed [A-2]. As recorded in its minutes [06-031], the February 2020 meeting of Academic Board showed that the meeting of Chairs had taken place and that a paper on the agreed arrangements [06-038] was received at the meeting. This paper set out the agreed arrangements and schedule for issues to be reported to Academic Board from Research Committee, ASQC and Curriculum Committee; with Teaching and Learning and Admissions Committee details to follow.

19   The sample agendas, minutes and papers of Academic Board's subcommittees considered by the team, namely ASQC [A-3, A-4, 06-029, 15-003, 45-001 – 45-004], Curriculum Committee [A-5, A-6, 06-030, 06-046], Teaching and Learning Committee [A-7, A-8, 06-048, 06-049], Admissions Committee [A-9, A-10, 06-047] and Research Committee [A-11, 06-028, 06-044, 06-045], also show that they are operating in accordance with their stated terms of reference.

20   All committees, including Academic Board, focus on both Ashridge and Hult issues and have representation from Ashridge, including senior staff and faculty; as well as representation from other campuses. Committees consider matters from the various campus locations, are well attended and meet sufficiently often to ensure robust oversight and that timely action is taken, where appropriate. Minutes evidence separate discussion of issues pertaining to Ashridge and its programmes. For example, Academic Board receives separate reports on the award of degrees and analysis of awards for Ashridge [A-2] and ASQC receives separate reports on Ashridge assessment boards and external examiner arrangements [45-001]. The team considers the institution's academic committee structure to be appropriate and operating effectively.

21   The institution reviews and updates its Academic Governance Structure on a regular basis and, as noted in the minutes of the February 2020 meeting of Academic Board [06-031], has recently decided that its Doctoral Committee responsible for overseeing its research degree provision is no longer required. This is due to the recent, successful periodic review of the EDOC programme and the change of awarding body. Academic Board

papers [060-036, 060-037] indicate that the Curriculum Committee will oversee the development and review of all programmes (undergraduate, master's and doctoral programmes) in the future. The team consider this to be an appropriate adjustment to the governance structures.

22   The Academic Regulations state that, outside of the academic committee structure, the President has the authority to approve closure of a programme [Intro-2] and give initial approval ('Business Approval') for new programme development (although this decision may also be ratified by the Governing Body) [Intro-2]. Ashridge confirmed that there have been no recent new programme developments or closures [R2] and therefore the team was not able to see evidence of this process in practice.

23   Ashridge has also undergone several recent successful reviews in the past four years undertaken by its regulating and accrediting bodies, including the 2017 QAA HER (AP) [Intro-1], reviews in 2017 by AACSB [C-1, 37-001], and EQUIS [C-2, E-6], reaccreditation in 2016 by AMBA [37-002] and the 10-year institutional review and accreditation of the EDOC programme in 2018 by Hult's US accreditor NECHE [18-001, 37-002]. The institution's Academic Regulations are well established, reviewed and updated annually and are fit for purpose [Intro-2].

24   The self-assessment document [00] and supporting evidence stated that students are engaged individually and collectively in the governance and management of the institution in a number of ways, including representation on Academic Board and its subcommittees [00, Intro-2], as panel members on validation and review panels [Intro-2], through student surveys [E-1, E-2], Board of Studies meetings [D-3] and meetings of, and with, the Hult Student Association (HSA) [E-3]. The Teaching and Learning Strategy [13-001] also sets out a benchmark to 'maintain an environment that fosters mutual respect, excellent communication, effective feedback, high levels of student satisfaction and a commitment to continuous improvement in respect of teaching, learning and assessment'.

25   The evidence provided included two student submissions - one from Ashridge students and the other from HSA. HSA is the representative student body for the combined institution, which elects its representatives annually [R2]. As stated on the HSA website, its mission is to 'ensure that students have the most enjoyable and fulfilling undergraduate experience possible' [https://www.hsalondonug.com/has]. HSA also states in its submission [SSHSA] that its 'common goal' is to be the bridge between the student and faculty as well as working together to strengthen the Hult community. Quarterly meetings are held between senior managers and the student body at which issues may be raised and information communicated [R1]. In its submission for this assessment [SSHSA], HSA commented positively on these meetings and noted that they provide an opportunity to discuss the academic curriculum and topics leading to improvements in the student experience and to 'cement' the Hult community; the submission also commented positively on the access HSA representatives have to senior, academic and support staff and the institution's willingness to hear and respond to the student voice [SSHSA]. HSA representatives are supported by the institution through workshop sessions (for example, evidence was provided of a workshop on supporting students with mental health issues [22-003]), although the institution provided no evidence of formal, systemic training for all student representatives. Regular meetings of HSA also take place, the minutes of which [E-3] indicate that they largely focus on social events, trips and fund-raising events.

26   As stated in the self-assessment document [00] and the HSA student submission [SSHSA], until recently, students were represented on Academic Board and its subcommittees. Minutes of Academic Board demonstrate that student representatives are members of, and attend, Academic Board, although only the current President of HSA, recorded as the representative for Hult undergraduate programmes, attended meetings in

2019-20 [06-002, 06-004, A-2, 06-031]. The minutes of the August [06-004] and November [A-2] 2019 meetings of Academic Board note that the Ashridge student representative position (for executive programmes) and the Hult postgraduate representative position on the Board were vacant. Recognising the inconsistent engagement of students with these committees, and the nature of its student body, the institution has recently reviewed its approach to student representation on Academic Board and its subcommittees. The minutes of Academic Board in November 2019 [A-2], noted consideration of the possibility of committee chairs meeting student representatives prior to meetings to discuss the forthcoming meeting and gain their views. Following further discussion of this issue, a model is being trialled in 2020 where formal student representation is retained on Academic Board, supplemented by regular informal meetings between HSA and subcommittee chairs/ secretaries to gain student feedback on issues to be discussed [R2]. It was also confirmed to the team in a written response [R2] that feedback from both students and subcommittees on this approach had so far been positive. The membership of Academic Board reviewed by the team [03-001] confirmed that it retains an elected student representative as a member.

27   Programme and senior staff and student representatives attend programme Board of Studies meetings for Ashridge programmes, which are held approximately every six months [B-1] and 'seek to receive, consider and respond to student feedback on all aspects of their learning experience'. The terms of reference of Boards of Studies are clearly set out in the Ashridge Campus Handbook, which is made available to all students [34-044]. The minutes of Boards of Studies meetings for Ashridge programmes [D-3, 21-001, 21-002, 34-026 – 34-031] demonstrate an effective and thorough approach to gaining and responding to student feedback. Meetings focus on a wide range of academic matters (for example, length of student supervision sessions, format of webinars, consistency of marking and assessment feedback) and non-academic matters (for example, quality of some student accommodation, ease of navigation of the institution's website and utility of some pre-joining information). Actions are recorded, as appropriate, followed up and reported at subsequent meetings. For example, inconsistency of marking and assessment feedback were raised by students on the Executive Masters in Management (eMiM) programme (now renamed as the Executive Masters in Leadership and Management) in the 2016-017 academic year [34-029 – 34-031] and follow-up actions included confirmation of training for new and existing markers [34-031], sampling of the marking undertaken by new markers and a meeting between the programme directors and course leaders to discuss the issue [34-031]. The Academic Director's report on the operation of the programme [34-002] for the 2019 periodic review, and the minutes of the periodic review process [34-040] confirmed that an updated markers' guide has also been produced to address the issue. The Ashridge Student submission [SSA] comments positively on the opportunity to attend Boards of Studies meetings and on Ashridge's proactive approach to seeking out and responding to student feedback.

28   Ashridge uses the institutional system of course/faculty student evaluations noted in its submission as being 'typical for a US institution', undertaken at the end of each course [00, E-1]; and students are also asked to complete regular surveys in relation to the institution's overall performance [E-2]. Course evaluations cover a range of questions relating to the course and the course teaching staff, and seek both quantitative and qualitative feedback [E-1]. These evaluations are considered by the course tutor and the campus management and discussed during a faculty member's performance review, of which the team was provided with an example [C-4]. As evidenced by their minutes, evaluations are also considered by ASQC [A-3] and Academic Board [06-004] as well as through events such as the President's call to staff [10-002]. In addition, student feedback is considered through the annual monitoring process, with Academic Directors commenting on feedback as part of the Programme Directors' Review reports (annual monitoring reports) for their programmes [B-5, 56-001, 56-002, 56-003, 56-004]. Student satisfaction is also reported on a weekly basis to Deans and made available to Chairs of committees [R1]. The example student feedback action log seen by the team [55-001] demonstrates that

appropriate action is taken in response to feedback provided by students to improve their experience and this was confirmed in both the Ashridge and HSA student submissions [SSA, SSHSA]. In relation to periodic review, the institution confirmed that recent alumni are included as members of periodic review panels [R1]. Minutes of periodic review events for Ashridge programmes [34-040, 34-048, 34-054] confirmed this approach, and showed that periodic review panels also meet with groups of current students on the programme being reviewed to hear their views.

29   At the time of the formation of the strategic alliance with Hult in 2015, Ashridge had two partners delivering its programmes through validation arrangements: the first with Lorange Institute of Business, Zurich, involving the delivery of a Master of Business Administration [19-002] and the second with Pearson College Ltd, involving delivery of a bachelor's degree in business management [16-001]. Following the strategic alliance with Hult in 2015 it was decided that Ashridge would no longer offer programmes through partnership arrangements and that its collaborative partnerships would be terminated [19-001,19-002]. Following the formal termination of these partnerships in 2016, the remaining students have been managed through a robust 'teach-out' process aimed at safeguarding the student experience and allowing enrolled students to complete their programmes [16-001,19-002]. As evidenced in the minutes of ASQC [45-001, 45-002, 45-003, A-4, 45-004] and Academic Board [06-002, 06-004, 06-031], progress towards completion of the process for both partners, oversight of standards, and of the student experience, has been closely monitored by the institution through its academic governance process. The team also saw correspondence [19-003] which demonstrated that appropriate external examining arrangements have remained in place to ensure that standards are being maintained. At the time of this assessment, all students at Lorange had completed their programme of study and Academic Board minutes [A-2] confirm that one student with extenuating circumstances remains on the Pearson College programme.

30   In 2007 Ashridge entered into a partnership arrangement with Middlesex University, allowing students successfully completing Ashridge's Executive Doctorate programme [34-053] to be awarded a Middlesex University doctorate [R1]. Following NECHE accreditation of the Executive Doctorate programme for award of a US PhD (with initial approval given in 2017 and final approval in 2018) [18-001], Ashridge decided that the partnership with the University should be terminated, with appropriate formal notification being issued by Ashridge [18-002], and accepted by the University [18-003]. Through an extension to the original agreement, Middlesex University agreed to support all University-registered students on the programme registered with them until completion of their studies, or up to the point their registration expires [18-005]. Minutes of ASQC [A-4] demonstrate that the programme is subject to the same robust oversight and governance as the rest of the institution's provision, including through the receipt and consideration of, and response to, the annual external examiner's report [30-007, 30-008], the Programme Director's Review report [56-004] and Boards of Studies meetings [21-002]. The analysis of student performance for 2018-19 considered by the November 2019 meeting of Academic Board included those students still studying on the programme, demonstrating that standards continue to be monitored [A-2, 06-010].

31   Ashridge currently offers a Bachelor in Business Management degree (BBM) through a validation arrangement with Coventry University (which is governed by a formal agreement [17-002]), funded through the degree apprenticeship scheme. The partnership was pursued following a detailed assessment of strategic fit and risk by Ashridge [17-001], after which it successfully underwent institutional [17-003] and programme approval processes [17-004]. The programme is governed by an appropriate formal agreement, signed in April 2018, which clearly sets out the roles and responsibilities of each party [17-002]. Oversight of academic partnership arrangements at Ashridge is the responsibility of the Associate Dean Quality [R1] and minutes evidence that monitoring of the partnership occurs

through ASQC [A-3]. A successful interim review of the arrangement was conducted in January 2020, and the report of this event was provided to the team [17-005].

Conclusions

32   The assessment team formulated its judgement against this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment by QAA*, October 2019, in particular Annex 4.

33   The team considers that, overall, academic governance is effective, with clear and appropriate lines of accountability for its academic responsibilities. The institution's mission and strategy are published and widely communicated to staff with their aims and objectives supported by key institutional strategies which drive its activities. Through its committee structure, the institution develops its policies and procedures in collaboration with staff and students and these policies are widely communicated and consistently applied.

34   As defined in the Academic Regulations, the combined institution has in place a single senior management structure which supports consistency of operation and enables it to oversee its higher education provision effectively, although it is too early to assess the impact of recent changes made to senior and Ashridge campus management structures. Reporting lines at senior level are well defined and the roles and responsibilities of the Central Academic Team, reporting to the Chief Academic Officer as academic head of the institution, are clearly stated in role descriptions. At campus level, the Ashridge campus Dean is supported by an appropriate management structure. Senior and campus staff profiles demonstrate that there is appropriate depth and strength of leadership at all levels.

35   An appropriate and effective academic committee structure is in place. The function of the Ashridge Representative Body is set out in its Terms of Reference. The Chief Academic Officer attends the Representative Body and provides it with regular reports to support its oversight of the academic standards of Ashridge's awards. The Terms of Reference and Membership of Hult and Ashridge Academic Board and its subcommittees are clearly articulated in the institution's Academic Framework, and minutes and papers of these committees confirm that they are operating in line with their stated Terms of Reference, that actions are noted and followed up, and that committees meet sufficiently often to maintain effective oversight and ensure that actions are timely. There is appropriate upward reporting from the subcommittees, with their minutes reported to Academic Board whose membership also includes the Chairs of the various subcommittees; subcommittee annual reporting requirements have recently been confirmed. All committees, including Academic Board, focus appropriately on both Ashridge and Hult issues and matters arising from the various campus locations. Notwithstanding the delegation of responsibility to its subcommittees for specific matters, Academic Board retains ultimate academic authority.

36   The team considers, overall, that the institution's academic governance, including all aspects of the control and oversight of its higher education provision, is conducted in partnership with its students. Students have a variety of opportunities to engage individually and collectively in the academic governance and management of the organisation, including at institutional level on Academic Board and through the student representative body, HSA, although for Ashridge students, engagement is strongest at programme level because there is currently not an Ashridge student on the Academic Board. The institution has recognised the variability of student representative attendance on, and engagement with, Academic Board's subcommittees. The institution has addressed this issue, trialling a new approach from 2020 aimed at improving student engagement. At programme level, Boards of Studies provide an effective mechanism for addressing student issues, with timely actions taken as a result of student feedback. Course evaluations are also systematically considered and appropriate and effective action to improve the student experience is taken as a result. Both

student submissions commented positively on the institution's proactive approach to seeking and addressing student feedback and hearing their voices.

37   The team considers that, where Ashridge works with other organisations to deliver learning opportunities, it ensures that its governance and management of such opportunities is robust and effective and that decisions to work with other organisations are the result of a strategic approach rather than opportunism. Following its strategic alliance with Hult, in 2016 Ashridge terminated the two partnerships through which it offered Ashridge programmes. ASQC and Academic Board minutes provide evidence of robust arrangements for the 'teach-out' of the programmes offered through these partners, ensuring that standards were maintained, and the student learning experience remained appropriate until the teach-out process was complete. A third arrangement with Middlesex University was also terminated in 2018 and robust arrangements remain in place to ensure that existing University-registered students are supported through completion of their programme or until their registration period expires. ASQC and Boards of Studies minutes and external examiners' and the Academic Directors' reports, demonstrate that the partnership programmes are subject to the same robust oversight and governance as the rest of the institution's provision. Partnerships are entered into by Ashridge following a comprehensive assessment of strategic fit and risk, and are governed by an appropriate agreement.

38   The assessment team concludes, therefore, that the criterion is met.

Criterion B: Academic standards and quality assurance

Criterion B1: Regulatory frameworks

39   This criterion states that:

B1.1   An organisation granted degree awarding powers has in place transparent and comprehensive academic frameworks and regulations to govern how it awards academic credit and qualifications.

B1.2   A degree awarding organisation maintains a definitive record of each programme and qualification that it approves (and of subsequent changes to it) which constitutes the reference point for delivery and assessment of the programme, its monitoring and review, and for the provision of records of study to students and alumni.

40   The QAA assessment team conducted an assessment of this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment for Variation and Revocation of Degree Awarding Powers*, December 2019.

The evidence considered and why the team considered this evidence

41   The team assessed this criterion by reference to a range of evidence gathered according to the process described in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment by QAA*, October 2019, in particular the suggested evidence outlined in Annex 5 and Ashridge's submission. The assessment team identified and considered this evidence for the purposes described in Annex 4 and 5 of this Guidance.

42   Specifically, the assessment team considered or assessed the following.

   a. To assess whether the academic frameworks and regulations governing Ashridge's programmes are appropriate and are implemented fully and consistently, the team considered the Academic Regulations [Intro-2], the Academic Committee structure [03-001], the student and campus handbooks [34-044, 39-001] a sample of programme handbooks [B-1, 25-001, 34-004], a sample of programme specifications [26-001 – 26-004], examples of complaints and appeals logs and communications relating to complaints and appeals [27-001 – 27-009], an example of recognition of prior learning (RPL) documentation [27-011], admissions data [27-010] and the 2020 Registry Report on trends in admissions, progression and achievement [27-012]. The team also assessed the regulatory framework for the apprenticeship programmes, and alignment with external requirements for apprenticeship provision, by reviewing documentation on the arrangements [28-001 – 28-004].

   b. To assess whether Ashridge maintains definitive and up-to-date records of each qualification it awards and each programme it offers, that these records are used as the basis for the delivery and assessment of each programme and that students and alumni are provided with records of study, the team considered the Academic Regulations [Intro-2], the Student Handbook [39-001], a sample of programme specifications for Ashridge programmes [26-001 – 26-004], documentation from the 2019 EDOC periodic review [B-6 – B-8], and the 2019 AMEC programme director's review report (annual report) [B-5].

How any samples of evidence were constructed

43   The team considered a representative sample of programme specifications for four Ashridge programmes, including undergraduate and postgraduate provision. The programmes were AMEC, the Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA), the Master of Business Administration (MBA), and the Master of International Business (MIB). The team also considered programme handbooks for AMEC and EMLM. These documents were reviewed to test that definitive and up-to-date records of each qualification Ashridge awards, and each programme being offered, are maintained.

What the evidence shows

44   The assessment team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

45   The team reviewed the Academic Regulations [Intro-2] and found that these are comprehensive and appropriate in that they cover the breath of academic activities, including governance, the awards framework, committee structure, programme approval and management, admissions, assessment and awards, external examining, academic integrity, complaints and appeals. Academic Board has oversight of the academic regulations and any changes are approved by this body, as set out in its Terms of Reference [03-001]. The committee Terms of Reference also indicate that ASQC oversees the implementation of academic regulations [03-001].

46   The Academic Regulations [Intro-2], and how they are implemented, are set out in a clear and accessible manner in the Ashridge Campus Handbook [34-044] and the Hult Student Handbook [39-001]. Strategies, policies, key performance indicators (KPIs) and quality assurance procedures are also communicated to students and staff in the Campus Handbook [34-044]. Ashridge has considerable experience in awarding its own taught degrees and the team was confident that institutional frameworks and regulations, and the way in which they are applied by Ashridge, are appropriate and communicated effectively. Handbooks articulate, in a student-centred manner, how regulations and academic frameworks impact on learning and teaching [34-044; 39-001].

47   Academic regulations are applied to specific programme level and context through programme regulations - which cover, collectively, the programme specifications, programme catalogues (which detail courses available) and programme and course student handbooks. Institutional academic regulations frequently refer to programme-level regulations and programme specifications. The sample of programme-level academic regulations examined by the team indicate consistency between institutional [Intro-2] and programme-level regulations as expressed in programme specifications [26-001 – 26-004] and in student handbooks [B-1, 25-001, 34-004]. Although programme specifications do not include learning outcomes for exit awards, these are included in the associated handbooks.

48   The team noted two unusual features of the regulations. Both the academic regulations document [Intro-2] and the self-assessment document [00] specify that a minimum of 600 UK credits (of which at least 90 are at Level 6) need to be attained for the bachelor's degree award. This anomaly is partly explained by the mapping of credits across the US and UK, with the institution utilising a 'highest bar' approach to reconcile differences between the two national regulatory frameworks. This means that where there are differences between the US and UK, the most stringent requirements are applied. The programme specification for the bachelor's programme confirms that it is also offered over four years and includes some 'general education courses' which are set at UK Level 3 [26-002]. The postgraduate credit frameworks are in line with other UK institutions, requiring 180 credits for master's degrees and 60 and 120 credits for postgraduate certificate and diploma respectively. Ashridge's academic regulations allow for students to study towards a dual

award (a UK award from Ashridge and a US award from Hult) [Intro-2]. Otherwise, credit frameworks, policies and processes are in line with other UK-based institutions. Progression arrangements for students are set out clearly in student handbooks and tracking of students is recorded on spreadsheets at programme and institutional levels [27-010, 27-012], which enables identification of patterns and trends in admissions [27-010] and in progression and attainment [27-012].

49   The team reviewed a sample of documentation on appeals [27-006 – 27-009] and complaints [27-001 – 27-005] in order to assess regulations in operation and to test whether there is consistency between policy and practice. The institution sets out clear policies on appeals and complaints in its Academic Regulations [Intro-2]. The logs of complaints and appeals are detailed and up to date and a log of correspondence with students on different programmes showed that the processes are implemented appropriately and in line with institutional policies [27-004] (see paragraphs 106-107 for more detail on appeals). Similarly, the team reviewed an example of RPL documentation [27-011] and found that there is a detailed process for consideration of RPL/APL (accreditation of prior learning) requests and evidence of mapping processes relevant to each of the programmes.

50   Ashridge currently offers degree apprenticeship programmes leading to its awards. The team found that the documentation was compliant with the apprenticeships requirements of the Education and Skills Funding Agency, and was up to date. Templates and documentation that record progress and expectations of employers and apprentices, including commitment statements [28-001 – 28-002] and tripartite reviews [28-003 – 28-004], clearly outline roles and responsibilities of those involved and indicate consistency and transparency.

51   Programme specifications for Ashridge's programmes [26-001 – 26-004] constitute the definitive programme record. Documentation includes a curriculum map which sets out how each module/course aligns with the programme learning outcomes and is included in the programme student handbook [B-1]. All programmes comprise core and elective courses/modules (see paragraph 86 for more detail). Their coherence and currency are scrutinised at validation and reviewed on an annual basis as required by the Academic Regulations [Intro-2]. The team reviewed a range of documents to check that up-to-date information is maintained at programme level. Four examples of programme specifications were reviewed [26-001 – 26-004]. Documentation is current and there is consistency between the specifications and information communicated to students through the various handbooks. For example, the student programme handbook for the EMLM details programme-level learning outcomes, course (module) lists and assessments that are in alignment with the definitive record [B-1]. A sample of documentation from the most recent periodic review of EDOC [B-6 – B-8] and the last annual review of the AMEC [B-5] demonstrate thorough monitoring and review systems and processes to ensure that programme-level information is accurate and current (discussed further under Criterion B2). The Academic Regulations [Intro-2] set out the regulations for the issuing of transcripts, which provide a record of a student's studies, and confirm that the transcript format is approved by ASQC. The regulations [Intro-2] specify what is to be included in transcripts and confirm that these are made available to students, including those who do not pass or complete their award, with duplicates available to alumni on request. The Student Handbook [39-001] also includes clear details of what the transcript includes.

Conclusions

52   The assessment team formulated its judgement against this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment by QAA*, October 2019, in particular Annex 4.

53   The team concludes that the academic frameworks and regulations governing the provision are transparent and comprehensive, and sampling undertaken by the team indicated that these are implemented fully and consistently. Regulations cover the breadth of academic matters, including governance, award frameworks, assessment, quality assurance, complaints and appeals and do so in a clear and concise manner.

54   Ashridge maintains definitive and up-to-date records of each qualification it awards and each programme it offers. Programme-level documentation, in the form of programme specifications and student-facing handbooks, are consistent with institutional frameworks and regulations. Learning outcomes and assessment details in programme specifications align with programme handbooks and are systematically mapped. Programme specifications are reviewed and updated on an annual basis and changes are reflected in student-facing documentation. Based on the sample reviewed by the team, programme records are clear and up to date. They form the basis for delivery, ongoing monitoring and review, and the information provided to students. Students and alumni are provided with transcripts of their programmes of study, the details of which are drawn from the definitive documentation. Overall, the academic frameworks, regulations and records of programmes are comprehensive, transparent and accessible. They form the basis for delivery, ongoing monitoring and review, and the information provided to students.

55   The assessment team concludes, therefore, that the criterion is met.

Criterion B2: Academic standards

56   This criterion states that:

B2.1   *An organisation granted degree awarding powers has clear and consistently applied mechanisms for setting and maintaining the academic standards of its higher education qualifications.*

B2.2   *Organisations with degree awarding powers are expected to demonstrate that they are able to design and deliver courses and qualifications that meet the threshold academic standards described in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ). Organisations with degree awarding powers are expected to demonstrate that the standards that they set and maintain above the threshold are reliable over time and reasonably comparable to those set and achieved by other UK degree awarding bodies.*

57   The QAA assessment team conducted an assessment of this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment for Variation and Revocation of Degree Awarding Powers*, December 2019.

The evidence considered and why the team considered this evidence

58   The team assessed this criterion by reference to a range of evidence gathered according to the process described in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment by QAA*, October 2019, in particular the suggested evidence outlined in Annex 5 and Ashridge's submission. The assessment team identified and considered this evidence for the purposes described in Annex 4 and 5 of this Guidance.

59   Specifically, the assessment team considered or assessed the following.

a. To assess whether Ashridge's higher education qualifications are offered at levels that correspond to the relevant levels of the Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree Awarding Bodies, the team examined a sample of programme specifications [26-001 – 26-004], a sample of programme handbooks [B-1, 25-001, 34-004], the Academic Regulations [Intro-2], the self-assessment report [00] and responses to queries raised by the team [R3] and the 2017 HER report [Intro-1].

b. To assess whether Ashridge takes appropriate account of relevant external points of reference, and external and independent points of expertise, in setting and maintaining academic standards, the team examined recent reports from professional accreditation bodies [C-1, C-2, E-6, 37-001, 37-002], student submissions [SSHSA, SSA], mapping to UN PRME (the UN's Principles of Responsible Management Education) [Intro-3], programme specifications [26-001 – 26-004], student handbooks [B-1, 25-001, 34-004], a sample of external examiner reports and responses [30-001 – 30-008], mapping to Degree Apprenticeship Standards [32-001, 32-002], and minutes of Academic Board [06-006] Assessment Boards [B-4, 31-001, 58-001] and Boards of Studies [D-3, 34-026 – 34-031].

c. To evaluate whether programme approval arrangements are robust, applied consistently, and ensure that academic standards are set appropriately in relation to internal and external requirements, the team examined the Academic Regulations [Intro-2], the 2019 periodic review of EMLM [34-001 – 34-039], the 2019 EDOC periodic review [34-052 – 34-054], the 2018 AMEC review [34-046 – 34-050], the MiM periodic reviews of 2012 [34-003] and 2019 [34-040 – 34-041] and Curriculum Committee agenda and minutes [A-5, A-6, Intro-5, 06-036].

d. To establish the basis for the award of credit and how Ashridge makes use of appropriate external and independent expertise when establishing and maintaining threshold academic standards and comparability of standards, the team considered student handbooks [25-001, 34-004] and external examiner reports and responses to these [E-4, E-5, 30-001 – 30-008, 34-005 – 34-022], ASQC agendas and minutes [A-3], Assessment Board minutes [B-4, 31-001, 58-001], and Academic Board agendas and minutes [06-001 – 06-050].

e. To assess the extent that programme approval, monitoring and review arrangements are robust, applied consistently and explicitly address whether the UK threshold academic standards are achieved, the team considered Programme Directors' Review reports [B-5, 34-002, 34-023 – 34-025, 56-001 – 56-004], EMLM review of 2019 [34-001 – 34-039], the MiM reviews of 2012 [34-003] and 2019 [34-040 – 34-041], the EDOC 2019 periodic review [B-6, B-7, 34-052 – 34-054], Curriculum Committee minutes [34-051], Academic Regulations [Intro-2], Boards of Studies meetings [34-026 – 34-031, D-3], external examiner termly and annual report templates [B-2, B-3] and the campus handbook [34-044].

How any samples of evidence were constructed

60   The team considered a representative sample of programme specifications and definitive documentation for four programmes, including undergraduate and postgraduate provision (AMEC, BBA, MBA, and MIB); and a representative sample of external examiner reports covering the past three years, for BBA, Master of International Management (MIM), AMEC and EDOC. The team also looked at a sample of programme handbooks for two programmes (AMEC and EMLM). The team requested this sample to verify how the setting and maintenance of academic standards are demonstrated through these documents.

What the evidence shows

61   The assessment team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

62   The Academic Regulations [Intro-2] set out systems and processes to ensure that qualifications are designed, delivered and maintained to meet threshold academic standards. The regulations and requirements for higher education qualifications are set out in the Regulations, including the requirements for alignment with the FHEQ and the UK Quality Code, specifying the credit and level requirements for each award. The regulations also require alignment with professional and accrediting body requirements, and relevant Subject Benchmark Statements [Intro-2]. The procedures for programme approval set out documentary requirements and arrangements for approval, including the constitution and operation of approval panels. ASQC specifies grading criteria and algorithms for module and course grading, as well as processes for moderation or 'sample grade review' to enable judgements about consistency of grades across staff, programmes and campuses [Intro-2]. The Committee reviews regulations and frameworks on an annual basis and recommends amendments to Academic Board. The latter maintains oversight of academic standards and regulations set out how standards are common across campuses.

63   Ashridge is externally accredited by three bodies - AACSB, EQUIS and AMBA - and has undergone successful reviews in 2016 and 2017. Accreditation standards [C-1, C-2] shape the institution's provision. It also underwent successful HER review by QAA in 2017 [Intro-1], by the US accreditor NECHE in 2017 [18-001], AACSB in 2017 [37-001] and by AMBA on an annual basis [37-002]. Different campuses are also scrutinised by local regulatory bodies. The EQUIS progress report [E-6] provides a good example of how these reviews and the actions that follow have impacted on practice: in this instance, in the development of research investment, resource and publication. There appears to be a good

congruence between the requirements of bodies in the different jurisdictions and, where there are differences, the institution adopts a 'highest bar' principle whereby the most stringent criteria of a body are applied across the board. The self-assessment document, for example, cites UK expectations on the use of external examiners, US policies on contact hours and dealing with harassment as examples of where the regulations use the requirements which are the most stringent [00].

64 External expertise is utilised in programme approval, periodic review and through the use of external examiners. The use of external expertise is also embedded in governance structures: for instance, there is external representation on Academic Board [06-001 – 06-050]. The team found considerable evidence to demonstrate that, at programme and institutional levels, academic standards are shaped by external expertise through engagement with professional bodies, industrial partners and external academic colleagues. The latter are heavily involved with monitoring and review through external examining as well as periodic review. Minutes from Assessment Boards [31-001] and periodic review processes [34-001 – 34-054] demonstrate engagement with external expertise and that external perspectives impact on action planning. Likewise, actions from accrediting body reviews inform planning for improvements, as evidenced in the EQUIS progress report [E-6], which shows that good progress has been made to address recommendations from its review.

65 The team identified high levels of involvement with key external stakeholders for apprenticeship provision. For example, there is evidence of engagement with the End Point Assessment Organisation, and the Chartered Management Institute (CMI), to ensure Ashridge's degree apprenticeship programmes meet the Apprenticeships Standards. Documents mapping the Masters in Leadership and Management programme against the CMI Level 7 degree apprenticeship [32-001, 32-002] demonstrate full engagement with the Standards.

66 From reviewing programme specifications for AMEC [26-001], BBA [26-002], MBA [26-003] and MIB [26-004], the team identified clear articulation of programmes to the FHEQ. Course-level learning outcomes in programme documentation are appropriate to the relevant level descriptor and this has been confirmed in external examiner reports [30-001 – 30-008, 34-005 – 34-022]. Programme-level learning outcomes are clearly aligned to relevant level descriptors, with distinct levels of expectation at undergraduate and postgraduate levels that are appropriate to the level of assessment. For example, the structure of the BBA demonstrates academic progression between levels through the four years of the programme, and students are able to specialise as they progress through the programme with the use of elective courses. There is a good balance between core and optional/elective courses and documentation shows that programme-level learning outcomes are mapped to the learning outcomes and content of core modules [26-001], which is a requirement of the programme approval process. These learning outcomes are grouped under the headings conceptual, applied, global, interpersonal and ethical, which provides a useful way of categorising outcomes and enabling students to understand the theoretical and applied nature of their courses of study. A sample of programme documentation from EMLM and AMEC [B-1, 34-004, 25-001] further demonstrates that programme-level learning outcomes are aligned to FHEQ level descriptors. The Regulations state that academic credit is awarded for the achievement of the learning outcomes of a course as set out in the course document [Intro-2]. While distinct learning outcomes for the various exit awards are not identified in programme specifications, they are outlined in student handbooks [25-001, 34-004]. Module/course learning outcomes are detailed fully in student handbooks, as is the mapping of module/course learning outcomes to interim awards such as Certificate and Diploma awards. This mapping also aligns assessments to course and programme-level learning outcomes [B-1, 25-001, 34-004]. The Regulations and evidence of mapping

between programme outcomes, course outcomes and assessment clearly sets out the basis for the award of credit and qualifications.

67   The programme approval and periodic review process is set out in the Academic Regulations [Intro-2]. The Curriculum Committee checks programme documentation meets external requirements, as evidenced in its agenda [A-5]. There are various stages to approval, including outline validation, programme design and final approval. The Curriculum Committee appoints a validation panel with external membership which makes a recommendation on outcome to the Curriculum Committee, including any conditions on approval. Programmes are validated for a specified length of time up to a maximum of six years and the Curriculum Committee monitors progress on any actions and recommendations that are set. The team saw examples of this monitoring taking place in the Curriculum Committee agenda [A-5] and minutes received [A-6, Intro-5, 06-36]. While no new programmes have been developed in recent years, documentation for programme review processes [34-001, 34-002, 34-003, 34-004, 34-040, 34-041, 34-050], external examiner reports and the responses to them [E-4, E-5, 30-001 – 30-008, 34-005 – 34-021], and Programme Directors' Review reports (annual monitoring reports) [B-5, 34-023 – 34-025, 56-001 – 56-004] demonstrate thorough and multifaceted annual review processes. The external examiner template includes asking examiners to comment on whether academic standards are appropriate to the level of the award and also asks about the comparability of standards, and levels of student performance, with other higher education institutions. These comments are addressed in Academic Directors' written responses to examiners, and in the Programme Directors' Review reports (which also look at data on student performance and achievement).

68   The multiple external reviews contribute at institution and programme level and there is evidence in the periodic review process, which takes place on a seven-year cycle, of improvement taking place. Academic and professional external panel members form part of the periodic review panel. The periodic review processes are evidence-based, evaluative and developmental, as evidenced in the documentation for the EMLM review of 2019 [34-001 – 34-003], the eMiM reviews of 2012 [34-003] and 2019 [34-040 – 34-041] and the 2019 EDOC review [B-6, B-7, 34-052 – 34-054]. For the periodic review process, the Programme Director is required to produce an evaluative report [34-02] on the operation of the programme. This covers a range of issues, including a summary of the proposed changes, teaching and learning, assessment, data on student progression and achievement, feedback and responses (both internal, including students, and external), key challenges and areas for development. The Curriculum Committee formally reviews outcomes from these processes and tracks progress on actions [34-051]. Programme teams demonstrably engage reflectively in these processes and give careful consideration to changes. For example, the Programme Director's evaluative report for the periodic review of EMLM [34-002] explains in detail how the programme has been modified to ensure alignment with CMI and standards for a Level 7 degree apprenticeship in Leadership and Management.

69   Programme Directors' Review reports [B-5, 34-023 – 34-025, 56-001 – 56-004] require programme leads to produce a self-assessment document on a yearly basis, outlining main achievements, data on recruitment, progression and attainment, and feedback from external examiners and other external stakeholders. Directors also outline challenges, priorities and enhancement activities. The team noted that the Programme Directors' Review reports are produced for all programmes and those reviewed by the team demonstrated robust and evidence-based critical reflection on provision.

70   Board of Studies meetings [34-026 – 34-031, D-3] consider student feedback at programme level. Minutes from these meetings document thoughtful discussion of issues/concerns raised and detail actions where appropriate. Subsequent meetings track updates on those actions; meeting minutes [for example, 34-029] show detailed discussion

of issues raised at the previous meeting, and the action being taken. Examples of Board of Studies minutes seen by the team list a large number of actions which focus on the student experience. Quality assurance processes, including the Board of Studies process, are communicated to students through the Ashridge Campus Handbook [34-044] and facilitate the input of student views to the monitoring process.

71   External examiners are appointed to the higher education provision and provide the key source of external and independent expertise in the maintenance of academic standards. External examiner reports use standard templates to produce termly [B-2] and annual [A-3] reports. Reports are presented and discussed at programme Assessment Boards, and minutes of these meetings [B-4, 31-001, 58-001] show thorough discussion of the external examiners' views. The sample of external examiner reports that the team considered indicate consistent satisfaction that threshold standards have been met [30-001 – 30-008, 34-005 – 34-022]. The team noted that external examiner reports are detailed, supportive and positive and confirm that standards are equivalent to those set and achieved by other UK awarding bodies. Programme teams produce written responses to examiners' reports [30-002, 30-004, 30-006, 30-008] and, where examiners identify a particular academic standards issue, these are escalated and addressed. For example, where an examiner raised an issue concerning third marking of a student's assessment, this led to a minuted discussion of the examiner's comments at the Assessment Board [31-001] and subsequent discussion of the case and formal approval of agreed action at Academic Board [06-006]. Likewise, the written response to the external examiner for the MiM programme [34-022] indicates that the programme team developed and implemented a marker review process to enable markers to discuss experiences and concerns about providing assessment feedback and share good practice.

Conclusions

72   The assessment team formulated its judgement against this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment by QAA*, October 2019, in particular Annex 4.

73   There are clear mechanisms for setting and maintaining the academic standards of Ashridge's programmes through programme approval, programme-level annual review, analysis of data and periodic review. These processes are set out clearly in the Academic Regulations and examples reviewed by the team demonstrated consistency in application. The Regulations cover the breadth of matters relating to academic standards, ranging from awards frameworks, assessment practices, appointment and involvement of external examiners, approval and review mechanisms, and processes for complaints and appeals. Regulations are reviewed annually and overseen by ASQC. Programme-level frameworks are aligned with these institutional regulations in specifications and details are clearly communicated to students in handbooks alongside information on student involvement in quality assurance processes.

74   Relevant external points of reference are taken into account in setting and maintaining standards, including those relating to professional body accreditation, regulatory requirements, Subject Benchmark Statements and degree apprenticeship standards. Ashridge designs and delivers programmes that align to the relevant levels of the FHEQ. Programmes are mapped to FHEQ level descriptors and this is articulated in programme specifications and presented to students in programme and campus handbooks. External examiners confirm that appropriate standards are set and maintained, and that these are comparable to those of other UK awarding bodies. There is detailed engagement with external bodies, as well as academic and professional experts, in establishing and maintaining threshold standards.

75   The assessment team concludes, therefore, that the criterion is met.

Criterion B3: Quality of the academic experience

76   This criterion states that:

B3.1   Organisations with degree awarding powers are expected to demonstrate that they are able to design and deliver courses and qualifications that provide a high-quality academic experience to all students from all backgrounds, irrespective of their location, mode of study, academic subject, protected characteristics, previous educational background or nationality. Learning opportunities are consistently and rigorously quality assured.

77   The QAA assessment team conducted an assessment of this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment for Variation and Revocation of Degree Awarding Powers*, (December 2019).

The evidence considered and why the team considered this evidence

78   The team assessed this criterion by reference to a range of evidence gathered according to the process described in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment by QAA*, October 2019, in particular the suggested evidence outlined in Annex 5 and Ashridge's submission. The assessment team identified and considered this evidence for the purposes described in Annex 4 and 5 of this Guidance.

79   Specifically, the assessment team considered or assessed the following.

Design and approval of programmes

    a.   The team considered the Academic Regulations [Intro-2] to understand the processes for the design, development and approval of programmes; and how staff are informed of, and provided with, guidance and support on these procedures and their roles and responsibilities in relation to them. The team also considered the Teaching and Learning Strategy [13-001], sample minutes from the Teaching and Learning Committee [06-048, 06-049], and the Faculty (Staff) Handbook [048-001].

    b.   The team considered programme specifications [26-001 – 26-004], a range of Student Handbooks for programmes [B-1, 25-001, 34-004], and the student and campus handbooks [34-044, 39-001], to assess how programmes are designed in practice, including benchmarking, credit and the mapping of learning outcomes across programmes and courses.

    c.   In order to assess the effectiveness of the periodic review process, including how the coherence of programmes with multiple elements or alternative pathways is secured and maintained, how effectively the institution includes support services in the programme planning and approval arrangements, and how the institution involves external expertise and monitors actions, the team considered reports from several recent periodic review events [B-6-8, 34-040 to 34-045, 34-046 to 34-050, 34-052 to 34-055], minutes of the Programme portfolio, programme management and module leaders meeting [34-032 to 34-038] and the Curriculum Committee Redesign Update [075-001].

    d.   To assess how effectively the institution oversees these processes and assures itself of their rigour and effectiveness, the team considered the agendas and minutes of meetings of the Academic Board [A-2, 06-001 to 06-050], ASQC [Intro-5, A-3, A-4], and the Curriculum Committee [A-5, A-6, 34-051].

Learning and Teaching

e. The team reviewed the terms of reference of the Curriculum Committee and the Teaching and Learning Committee to understand the way in which the institution articulates and implements a strategic approach to, and monitors the quality of, its teaching and learning [00, Intro-2, A-5, A-6, A-7, A-8]. The team also considered the Teaching and Learning Strategy [13-001], the alignment with UN Principles for Responsible Management Education [Intro-3], sample minutes from the Teaching and Learning Committee [A-8, 06-048, 06-049], minutes of review events [34-001, 34-002, 34-040] and the Faculty (Staff) Handbook [048-001]. Staff engagement in this process was assessed through the Programme Portfolio Management and Course Leaders meetings [34-032 to 34-038].

f. The team considered the Academic Regulations [Intro-2], student handbooks [B-1, 25-001, 34-004, 39-001] and Teaching and Learning Committee minutes [06-048, 06-049], in order to understand how the institution maintains its learning environments. In order to assess how distance and work-based programmes are organised and supported, the team reviewed the Student Learning Handbooks for the Executive Masters in Leadership and Management [B-1. 34-004], and the Masters in Executive Coaching [25-001] programmes, together with the Hult Student handbook [39-001].

Assessment

g. The team considered the Academic Regulations [Intro-2], and the Self-Assessment [00] to consider the validity and reliability of the institution's assessment process, and a selection of student handbooks [B-1, 25-001, 34-004] to see how assessment requirements are communicated to students.

h. The team considered the minutes of Assessment Boards in order to understand the assessment processes in operation and to test their reliability [B-4, 31-001, 58-001], together with evidence of the Grade Review process [44-001] and the analysis of awards [06-010]. External examiner reports were also considered in order to determine their views on the reliability of the institution's assessment processes [B-2, B-3, E-4 and E-5].

i. Regulations [Intro 2] and guidelines [43-001, 43-002] on academic integrity and student handbooks [B-1, 25-001, 34-004], were reviewed to understand how these processes operate and are communicated to students to ensure understanding of the skills to demonstrate good academic practice. The team also reviewed the template for correspondence with students about academic integrity cases [43-006]. The Annual Analysis of Academic Integrity Cases report was scrutinised [45-005], together with a sample Appeal Tracking Sheet [27-005] in order to assess how the institution operates procedures for preventing unacceptable academic practice, and how it monitors such cases.

j. In order to understand how assessment outcomes are reported at institutional level, and how the institution ensures a shared understanding with students about assessment and the basis for academic judgements, the team considered ASQC minutes [A-4], Academic Board minutes [06-004] and papers [06-010, 06-011, 06-033, 06-38], student handbooks [B-1, 25-001, 34-004] a sample Student feedback log [55-001] and the student submissions [SSHSA, SSA].

External examining

k. The team reviewed the Academic Regulations to understand the procedure for and the role and remit of external examiners [Intro-2]. The team also considered

Assessment Board minutes [B-4, 31-001, 58-001] and external examiner reports [B-2; B-3; E-4; E-5; 30-001, 003, 005, 007; 34-005, 007, 009, 011, 013, 015, 017, 019, 021] in order to assess the external examiner processes in practice. A sample of programme leader responses to external examiner reports [30-002, 30-004, 30-006 30-008; 34-006 to 34-022], and Assessment Board minutes [B-4, 31-001, 58-001] were reviewed to assess whether full and serious consideration is given to examiners' comments and recommendations and that they are provided with a timely and considered response. Additionally, the team reviewed a selection of Programme Directors' Review reports [B-5, 34-023 to 34-025 and 56-001 to 56-004] to see how the external examining process is incorporated into the annual review process.

Complaints and appeals

l.   The team reviewed the Academic Regulations [Intro-2] to understand the institution's stated procedures for complaints and appeals. In addition, examples of student handbooks [B-1, 25-001, 34-004] and an example of student induction [59-01] were examined to understand how the procedures are communicated to students. ASQC minutes were considered in order to determine how complaints and appeals are reported, monitored and used to enable enhancement [A-3, A-4, 45-02, 03, 04, 05, 06]. A sample Student feedback and action log [55-001], samples of complaint documentation [27-001 to 03 and 27-006 to 009], the Complaints and appeal log 2019-20 [27-004] and Academic Integrity Committee appeal tracking sheet 2019 [27-005] were considered to determine how complaints and appeals are managed. The Academic Integrity Committee guidelines [43-001 and 002] and committee terms of reference [03-001] were also considered to understand specifically how academic integrity matters are managed, monitored and subject to institutional oversight and review.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

80   The team considered a representative sample of external examiner reports, and the responses to these reports, covering the past three years for both undergraduate and postgraduate provision. These related to BBA, MIM, AMEC and EDOC. The team requested this documentation to assess the implementation of the stated procedures for external examining and to assess how external examiners' comments are considered and responded.

81   The team considered a representative sample of programme specifications for four programmes (AMEC, BBA, MBA, MIB) and student handbooks for two programmes (AMEC and EMLM) to assess how programmes are designed in practice, including benchmarking, credit and the mapping of learning outcomes across programmes and courses.

82   The team also considered a sample of four Programme Directors' Review reports for a representative sample of Ashridge programmes (Postgraduate Diploma in Organisational Supervision; Executive Masters in Leadership and Management; Masters in Executive Coaching and the Executive Doctorate) to assess how external examiner feedback is incorporated into annual monitoring.

83   The team considered a random sample of records for six complaints and six appeals in order to assess the processes and procedures for handling academic appeal and student complaints.

What the evidence shows

84   The assessment team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

Design and approval of programmes

85   Ashridge operates a three-stage process for programme approval, as set out in the Academic Regulations [Intro-2]. This is comprehensive as it comprises business approval, outline approval and final approval, with business approval undertaken as a parallel activity to academic approval. Normally, programme validation is for six years with a further six years approval following a periodic review [Intro-2]. Evidence that ongoing development of programmes takes place is clearly evidenced through a range of recent periodic reviews, including the eMiM programme [34-040 to 34-045], the AMEC programme [34-046 to 34-050] and the EDOC programme [34-052 to 34-055], which show the regular process of curricula redesign and updating. Responsibility for approval of programmes is delegated from Academic Board to a Curriculum Committee, the minutes of which [Intro-5] show that membership includes representatives from across the delivery sites. Evidence of staff engagement is evident from the minutes of Programme Portfolio, Programme Management and Module Leaders meetings [34-032 to 34-038], which demonstrate involvement of a wide range of staff and the sharing of good practice.

86   The Academic Regulations [Intro-2] require the Curriculum Committee to ensure that there is a definitive programme document for all approved Ashridge programmes and that these secure programme coherence, meet the regulations and any external requirements (for example from AMBA), and have an appropriate resource allocation. Outline approval is given by the Curriculum Committee on the basis of an initial programme specification [Intro-2]. Final approval requires the scrutiny of a validation panel which includes two external members and student representation through the involvement of recent alumni, as set out in the Academic Regulations [Intro-2] and demonstrated by minutes of review events [34-003]. The definitive documentation includes a curriculum map which sets out how each module/course aligns with the programme learning outcomes and this is provided to students in the programme handbook [B-1, 25-001, 34-004]. All programmes comprise core and elective courses, and the coherence of a programme is tested at the final approval stage by the validation panel. Minutes of the Curriculum Committee reviewed by the team [34-051] duly note discussion of the appropriateness of individual courses and electives within programmes. These minutes [34-051] also confirm that the Committee scrutinises the final reports of validation panels along with the responses of programme teams prior to giving final approval. The coherence of programmes and scrutiny of their development through periodic review is evidenced by the examples of the eMiM, AMEC and EDOC programmes as noted above.

87   Documentation for the periodic review of the EDOC programme confirms the presence and contribution of external panel members in the scrutiny of programme design [B-7], and also provides evidence of how subsequent action is progressed and monitored [B-8]. The role of external expertise in the periodic reviews of the eMiM and the AMEC is further evidenced in the minutes of these review events [34-040, 34-048], which show that the panels, including external members, raise issues for discussion, identify good practice and agree conditions of approval that the academic team is required to address.

88   Ashridge involves relevant support services in the design of programmes. The Academic Regulations state that the process of initial business approval for new programmes and courses should ensure that appropriate resources and staffing are allocated from the outset [Intro-2]. Academic Board minutes [A-2] indicate that staff from support services are involved in the design team for new programme development, and the curricula redesign process for the MBA and BBA programmes demonstrates inclusion of representation from learning support services as part of the task force group [075-001]. At final approval stage the definitive programme documentation is required to include a statement on resources, staffing and student support in accordance with the Academic Regulations. Discussion of the effectiveness and appropriateness of learning support

services forms part of the periodic review process and minutes of review events show that panels routinely meet with support staff as well as teaching staff as part of the review event to discuss resource provision [34-048; 34-054].

89   As evidenced by Academic Board minutes [A-2], a major review of the MBA and BBA programmes to develop a new curricula model for programmes which are delivered across more than one site is currently underway. This is being led by the Curriculum Committee which received an update on progress in January 2020 [075-001]. The year-long process, which is planned to be completed by the end of 2020, involves engagement from across the organisation, and includes teaching and support staff participating in a task force group led by a steering group of senior staff. The new model has defined core attributes and skills alongside the specialist skills for each programme and seeks to promote greater coherence and integration between the individual blocks of study making up the award. The Curriculum Committee's process for this curricula redesign process [075-001] has provided an opportunity for a wide range of staff to be actively involved in programme design through face-to-face campus-based workshops led by senior staff.

90   Modifications to programmes may be classed as administrative, minor or major modifications [Intro-2]. Administrative changes include, for example, updating of a reading list. Minor modifications normally involve substantive change of less than 25 per cent to a programme and are approved by the Curriculum Committee. Major modifications (for example, changes to programme learning outcomes) are approved initially by the Curriculum Committee and are then subject to final approval by Academic Board. Changes over 25 per cent year to year or 50 per cent overall trigger a periodic review, and minutes of Curriculum Committee [A-6, 34-051] indicate that there is detailed discussion of planned changes and monitoring of their significance. This is a secure process for maintaining the coherence of programmes. The institution operates a system of '100/80 consistency' which is set out in its Faculty (Staff) Handbook [48-001] and describes the way it ensures consistency of learning outcomes for courses and programmes delivered over several campuses alongside some flexibility in terms of topics covered. The 100/80 rule is that for any given course, when offered at different campuses, there must be 100 per cent consistency of learning outcomes and at least 80 per cent consistency of topics covered in the course, with discretion for the tutor to select up to 20 per cent of topics. This approach is effective in ensuring consistency of learning outcomes between delivery sites while enabling some flexibility in topics. The team considers that the institution operates an effective process for the design and approval of programmes.

Learning and teaching

91   The Teaching and Learning Strategy [13-001] was developed in the 2016-17 academic year, setting actions and KPIs for the following three years. The team was informed by Ashridge [R2] that this is due to be rewritten in 2020 in alignment with the curriculum review process and minutes of Academic Board demonstrate that the Board has been receiving updates on the progress of this [06-021, 06-034]. Operational responsibility for ensuring the implementation and development of new strategies for teaching, learning and assessment has been delegated by the Curriculum Committee to the Teaching and Learning Committee, as confirmed by its minutes [06-048, 06-049]. Its Terms of Reference [03-001] also indicate that the Teaching and Learning Committee has delegated responsibility for monitoring the student experience on degree programmes, including oversight of support services and the learning environment including e-learning. The review of the curriculum [075-001] for the MBA and BBA programmes is being led by the Chair of the Teaching and Learning Committee, demonstrating how the institution enables and implements a strategic approach to teaching and learning which is consistent with its stated academic objectives. The Teaching and Learning Committee has recently been expanded to improve ownership of activities such as faculty development seminars, workshops, and

peer-mentoring at campus level, and each campus now has an elected faculty member on the Committee who is responsible for ensuring that development initiatives are implemented at their respective campus, which is evidenced in its minutes [06-048, 06-049, A-8]. Staff engagement in this process is evident through the Programme Portfolio Management and Course Leaders meetings [34-032 to 34-038].

92   Ensuring that teaching and learning is strategically aligned is the responsibility of the Curriculum Committee and stated in its terms of reference [00; Intro-2]. The institution has a particular emphasis on ensuring that it teaches management skills in order to promote sustainability and ethics and, as such, it has adopted the UN Principles for Responsible Management Education [Intro-3]. The alignment of programmes and courses with these principles is specifically tested at validation/periodic review with a dedicated ERS (ethics, responsibility and sustainability) specialist on each panel, as evidenced from documentation and minutes from review events [34-001; 34-002, 34-040].

93   The institution promotes an environment of dignity, courtesy and respect by operating an 'Honor Code', which is outlined in the Academic Regulations [Intro-2] and in Student Handbooks. The Code is a standard of conduct firmly observed throughout the institution, which encompasses academic, professional, and interpersonal behaviour. All students sign the Code during orientation, indicating that they have read, understood, and will abide by its terms, governing their behaviour throughout their studies [Intro-2].

94   The Academic Regulations [Intro-2] set out the approach to ensuring equal access for students with disabilities or support needs. The student submissions [SSHSA, SSA] attest to the 'inclusive community' and commitment to equality and diversity at the institution, and confirm that the teaching environment provides a space for the expression of diverse opinions and cultural perspectives. Campus handbooks [34-004] provide details of available support, resources and policies on diversity (see paragraph 148 for more detail). The HSA student submission [SSHSA] also describes how HSA, with the support of the institution's senior management, is active in promoting mental and physical wellbeing initiatives and a supportive range of social activities for the diverse student body [SSHSA]. The Ashridge student submission (SSA) described how part of the induction process included group and individual discussion of support needs, including study skills to address particular needs (for example, for students returning to study), and students with more specific support needs are encouraged to have individual discussion about their needs [SSA].

95   Ashridge has well established arrangements for supporting students studying at a distance, with a high proportion of students studying on executive development programmes with limited time spent on campus. Students on distance-learning programmes have access to a comprehensive virtual learning environment (VLE), The Learning Zone (a virtual environment that includes teaching and learning tools designed to enhance the student learning experience), and virtual lectures, tutorials and webinars [B-1]. Ashridge aims to create a community of learning, interaction and participation; some of the elements of participation are within supported online teaching and discussion events. These are mandatory and participation is measurable, enabling student engagement with the programme and progress to be effectively monitored, as evidenced from Assessment Board minutes [B-4]. Student handbooks for distance-learning students are comprehensive, clearly set out expectations and available support, and are consistent with those for students studying predominantly on campus [25-001, B-1, 34-004, 39-001]. The student submission for Ashridge [SSA] and Board of Studies minutes [D-3] indicate that students learning at a distance sometimes feel that they require more support, but that Ashridge is responsive in making changes to address these issues. Resources and facilities on campus, as set out in the student handbooks [34-004, 39-001], include large conference and teaching rooms, syndicate rooms, library and reading room, study spaces which have 24 hour access; and

social and leisure facilities. As noted in paragraph 86, resource considerations form part of the programme approval and periodic review processes.

96   Student progress is monitored carefully during the academic year, and academic staff are advised to report to the appropriate Programme Manager/Dean any students they believe to be struggling or falling behind in their coursework, which enables appropriate resources to be put in place to support the student [00]. The student handbooks set out procedures for the effective monitoring of student progress [B1, 25-001, 34-004]. Ashridge enables students to monitor their own progress and academic development through a mandatory process of assessed critical reflection entitled 'The Learning Review'. Students are required to record their personal learning journey through each course and, over time, through the whole programme to the final qualification, as shown in the Programme Handbook for EMLM [B1]. Comments from students in the Ashridge student submission [SSA] confirm the effectiveness of this process in encouraging them to reflect on how their learning can be applied and developed in professional contexts. Students also indicate in the Ashridge student submission [SSA] that they are able to access their course grades on an ongoing basis via the VLE, but that this process could be further developed to enable overall progress to be monitored more effectively. Undergraduate students [SSHSA] describe positively how events such as the Majors Fair and the Rotation Fair are used to inform students about the range of progression opportunities available to them.

Assessment

97   Ashridge operates clear processes of assessment, including for the recognition of prior learning, which are set out in the Academic Regulations [Intro-2]. The Regulations state that programmes are composed of courses, and that academic credit is awarded for the achievement of the learning outcomes of a course as set out in the course document [Intro-2]. The Regulations set out clear procedures for the recognition of prior learning which specify the amount of credit that can be transferred for different awards [Intro-2]. The Admissions Committee oversees the operation of transfer arrangements. The assessed elements (assignments) for a given course are explicitly linked to one or more course learning outcomes and programme handbooks reviewed by the team confirm this practice [34-004, 25-001, B-1]. Faculty are able to design assignments appropriate to their method of running the course, albeit within established guidelines concerning the type of assignment and the approximate 'length or equivalent' of the assignment. These guidelines, and any such amendments, are approved by the Curriculum Committee and are published in Programme Regulations [00, Intro-2].

98   Student performance is evaluated and assessed according to the course learning outcomes and assessment criteria set out in each course syllabus in programme handbooks [34-004; 25-001, B-1]. Means of assessment include a variety of individual and team-based assessment methods, including written assignments, classroom participation, presentations, and mid-term or final examinations. External examiners cite the range of assessment tasks as good practice in their reports [for example, E-5]. The institution requires the use of grading rubrics for assessments, to ensure consistent and transparent grading and feedback to students. Furthermore, each School (Undergraduate, Postgraduate and Executive Education) maintains an assessment tariff to assure that assessment criteria and volume of assessment are weighted appropriately according to the academic level and number of credits awarded. As such, while assessments vary between courses, there is consistency with regard to comparative assessed workload [Intro-2]. Assessment criteria are explained clearly for students in programme handbooks [25-001, 34-004, B-1].

99   At the end of each academic term, there is a process of first and second marking, followed by external review prior to a programme-level Assessment Board being convened. The self-assessment [00] stated that the Assessment Board meetings consists of faculty

teaching on the programme, programme administrators, and the appointed external examiners, and is chaired by a senior member of staff (not involved with the delivery/ assessment of the particular programme). Its purpose is to review the feedback from external examiners, to review and approve all course grades, and to discuss potential programme enhancements. Minutes of Assessment Board meetings seen by the team [B-4, 31-001, 58-001] demonstrate that they operate with a standard agenda which ensures that they achieve these purposes. Minutes of Academic Board [06-004] show that the Board receives reports from Assessment Boards and confirms decisions. The Academic Board also receives reports analysing Ashridge awards made during the year [06-010]; and the ASQC minutes [A-4] demonstrate oversight of the quality and consistency of provision, and of student outcomes through consideration of reports of assessment boards and summaries of external examiner feedback. These documents show that at the end of the academic year, the institution reviews a full analysis of awards across all programmes, checking consistency between campuses and allow for the monitoring of trends in the grade averages.

100   Student handbooks are used to assist students in understanding the assessment requirements and processes and include links to the relevant regulations and policies [B-1]. Examples reviewed by the team confirmed this to be the case [25-001, 34-004]. The course evaluation processes enable students to comment on their experience of the assessment processes and for any issues raised to be identified in feedback logs [55-001] which are then fed into monitoring processes. The Academic Regulations [Intro-2] set out principles and processes for the maintenance of academic integrity, including plagiarism, referencing, cheating and collusion. There are clearly set-out procedures for how alleged cases will be investigated, including the rights of the students and clearly defined sanctions for different levels of academic misconduct. The student handbooks seen by the team [B-1, 25-001, 34-004] signpost to the full Academic Regulations and give additional information to students about the use of plagiarism-detection software and the use of cover sheets for submitted work. Students confirm the effectiveness of orientation sessions in introducing good academic practice, for example for referencing [SSA]. The Academic Regulations also set out how students can access support and advice if they are accused of academic misconduct, and also how to appeal a decision by the campus Academic Integrity Committees that handle cases. The sample Academic Integrity Committee tracking sheet [27-005] demonstrates that unacceptable academic practice is being reported/monitored and actions taken, with feedback reported to ASQC [45-005]. The ASQC minutes reviewed by the team [45-005] indicate that the institution receives summary reports on misconduct cases, interrogates the data and identifies key issues.

101   Assessment Board minutes seen by the team indicate that the processes for marking and moderating are understood and being applied robustly and consistently [B-4, 06-004]. The ASQC minutes [A-4] show that it oversees the work of the individual Assessment Boards, monitoring any issues arising and the consistency of practice across the institution. The ASQC also reports an overall analysis of degrees being awarded by the institution to the Academic Board annually in November [06-038, 06-011, 06-033]. To assure consistency of course grades across campuses and subject areas, there is a system of sample grade review in which a sample of assignments is reviewed by a suitably qualified and experienced 'grade reviewer' other than the 'first grader' of the assignment, prior to grades being released to students [Intro-2, 44-001]. This process is set out in the Academic Regulations. Evidence of the grade review process [44-001] shows that the process is effective in the internal moderation of student grades and external examiner reports seen by the team [34-001 – 34-008, 34-005 – 34-022] indicate that the process of marking, moderation and grade review works effectively and indicate accuracy and consistency of marking.

External examining

102   The Academic Regulations [Intro-2] clearly set out the role and remit of external examiners [Intro-2] who provide a formal mechanism by which the academic standards of programmes are confirmed. The Academic Regulations determine that the Academic Board has ultimate responsibility for external examiners and has delegated responsibility for appointment and oversight of external examiners to ASQC [Intro-2]. At least one external examiner is appointed for every programme, and programmes are required to have sufficient external examiner coverage such that all assessments (at Level 4 and above) can be effectively reviewed. Larger programmes employ small teams of examiners who each review a number of modules.

103   The arrangements for appointment of external examiners take account of the UK Quality Code and the criteria for appointment additionally require knowledge and understanding of both UK and US requirements for academic standards and quality [Intro-2]. The regulations also specify requirements on avoidance of conflicts of interest. The external examiner's role is to ensure that standards are met, that assessment procedures are followed and that outcomes are fair and appropriate. Their role is limited to reporting an opinion and confirming the overall academic standards of the programme. External examiners are not able to amend assignments or grades but can comment overall on grading. They do this through attendance at all Assessment Board meetings at which grades are confirmed and/or degree awards are recommended (and where attendance is not possible, they make a written report available to the meeting), and through scrutinising representative samples of assessed work, together with the feedback to students. Minutes of assessment boards [B-4, 31-001, 58-001] indicate that detailed discussions take place between staff and external examiners and that there are high levels of engagement of external examiners with the boards, including commenting on assessment processes, the appropriateness of assessment tasks, marking and moderation. They make an annual written report using a standard template [B-2, B-3, E-4, E-5].

104   Relevant programme staff formally review the external examiner's annual report and submit a written response which is made available to students on the VLE [Intro-2] along with the examiner's report. The external examiner annual reports show that external examiners are routinely involved in the moderation of assessment tasks and assessed work [30-001, 003, 005, 007, 34-005, 007, 009, 011, 013, 015, 017, 019, 021]. Minutes of assessment boards show that external examiners are actively challenging staff, for example in discussion about how markers have reached decisions and how marking processes could be improved [B-4]. Assessment Board minutes [B-4, 31-001, 58-001] also show thorough discussion relating to ensuring that the individual circumstances of individual students from all backgrounds are considered appropriately. The response letters to external examiners verify that the dialogue with external examiners is consistently followed through by programme leaders [30-002, 004, 006 and 008, 34-006, 008, 010, 012, 014, 016, 018, 020 and 022], and reported back at Assessment Boards [B-4, 31-001, 58-001].

105   The external examiner process is effective in benchmarking the provision in relation to other providers, and in providing feedback regarding areas for improvement [B-2, B-3, B-4]. The external examiner annual reports [B-3, E-5, 30-001, 30-003, 30-005, 30-007, 34-005, 34-007, 34-009, 34-011, 34-013, 34-015, 34-017, 34-019, 34-021] and the response letters [30-002, 004, 006, 008, 34-006, 008, 010, 012, 014, 016, 018, 020 and 022] examined by the team, together with the relevant Academic Directors' responses [34-023, 34-024, 34-025 and 56-001 to 56-004] show that full and serious consideration is given to the comments and recommendations contained in external examiner reports. For example, the Programme Directors' Review reports for eMiM show that suggestions made by the external examiner about critical engagement with journals and the alignment of online discussion tasks with assessment questions being taken forward through the programme-level annual monitoring

process [34-023 – 34-025, 56-001 – 56-004]. In general, external examiners confirm that action is taken as a result of their feedback. The annual report pro forma includes the requirement for external examiners to confirm whether their comments have been acted on [B-3]. In one case [E-5] the examiner indicated that two recommendations previously made had not been fully addressed across the board; however, this did not impact on the examiner's otherwise positive views of the programme.

Appeals and complaints

106   The regulations for academic appeals are clearly set out in the Academic Regulations [Intro-2] and referred to explicitly in the student handbooks [B-1, 25-001, 34-004]. The team was told that both these documents are made available to students before they start on a programme [00], and the team saw evidence from induction materials that regulations (including academic appeals) are covered in student induction [59-001]. The Complaints Procedure is also set out in the Academic Regulations and is referenced in Student Handbooks as a policy with which students should make themselves familiar [Intro-2; B-1]. The institution states that where an appeal or complaint is of an academic nature, it is initially processed by the campus deanery and escalated, as appropriate, for example to campus Academic Integrity Committees or ASQC. Other more general complaints, for example regarding access to facilities, are processed by the campus operations team, and escalated as appropriate to the case [00]. In the case of both procedures, reference is made in the Academic Regulations to a final route of external appeal being available through the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education [R3] and an example of a Completion of Procedures verified this practice [27-013].

107   Committee terms of reference [03-001] indicate that ASQC has oversight of academic appeals and complaints, and this is evidenced in its agendas [A-3]. The sample student feedback and action log [55-001], complaints log [27-004], examples of correspondence relating to complaints and appeals cases [27-001 – 003, 27-006 – 009] and the Academic Integrity Committee tracking sheet [27-005] demonstrate that complaints and appeals are thoroughly considered, reported and monitored, and appropriate actions taken. For example, a student complaint about a capped submission led to resulting action for programme managers to remind faculty of assessment requirements [27-004], and student complaints about inconvenient webinar times led to a rescheduling of times to ensure they fell within scheduled working hours [55-001]. The complaints log [27-004] indicates that feedback from complaints is given directly to Programme Managers, and minutes [45-005] indicate that information on complaints and appeals is reported to ASQC. There is evidence that the institution is using this process to enhance its provision. For example, feedback from the Academic Integrity Committee led to the development of a common set of Academic Integrity Guidelines [43-001, 43-002] for use by the campus Academic Integrity Committees to ensure a standard approach to decision-making and penalties.

Conclusions

108   The assessment team formulated its judgement against this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment by QAA*, October 2019, in particular Annex 4.

109   Ashridge operates thorough processes for course design with clearly assigned responsibilities. ASQC has delegated authority from Academic Board for academic standards and quality assurance across all programmes and has responsibility for oversight of compliance. The Academic Regulations set out a framework for providing equal access for students with support needs or disability, and students attest to the inclusive and diverse community and the provision of support for additional needs. Learning support functions are

engaged in programme development and approval and the team found that the design of courses enables a high-quality academic experience to students from all backgrounds.

110   The Teaching and Learning Committee monitors the student experience in degree programmes and oversees the enhancement of student learning. There are clear processes for assessment and the appointment of external examiners and evidence that these operate effectively, with external examiners being fully engaged in providing expert advice and being confident in the standards of the provision. Similarly, there are clear processes for complaints and appeals, which are set out in the Regulations and in student-facing handbooks, including mechanisms for tracking and learning from outcomes. There are well established arrangements for supporting students studying at a distance, including mechanisms for creating student interaction and creating learning communities. Resources on campus include appropriate facilities for teaching, learning and study and the adequacy of resources is considered as part of programme approval and review processes. There is careful monitoring of student progress, and processes to identify students who may be falling behind and need additional support in order to achieve.

111   The annual cycle of Academic Board and ASQC minutes and papers demonstrate that actions arising from external examiner reports, programme monitoring, complaints and appeals are systemically tracked and that the institution is thorough in assuring itself of the quality of the academic experience through the consideration of comprehensive internal reports covering key areas of performance including student outcomes and academic misconduct.

112   The team concludes, therefore, that the criterion is met.

Criterion C: Scholarship and the pedagogical effectiveness of staff

Criterion C1: The role of academic and professional staff

113   This criterion states that:

C1.1   *An organisation granted powers to award degrees assures itself that it has appropriate numbers of staff to teach its students. Everyone involved in teaching or supporting student learning, and in the assessment of student work, is appropriately qualified, supported and developed to the level(s) and subject(s) of the qualifications being awarded.*

114   The QAA assessment team conducted an assessment of this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment for Variation and Revocation of Degree Awarding Powers*, December 2019.

The evidence considered and why the team considered this evidence

115   The team assessed this criterion by reference to a range of evidence gathered according to the process described in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment by QAA*, October 2019, in particular the suggested evidence outlined in Annex 5 and Ashridge's submission. The assessment team identified and considered this evidence for the purposes described in Annex 4 and 5 of this Guidance.

116   Specifically, the assessment team considered or assessed the following.

a) To assess whether Ashridge has relevant learning, teaching and assessment practices that are informed by reflection, evaluation of professional practice, and subject-specific and educational scholarship, the team considered the UN PRME report [Intro-3] (the report on how the provision is aligned with the UN Principles of Responsible Management Education), the Academic Regulations [Intro-2], Teaching and Learning Committee agenda and minutes [A-7, A-8], annual faculty review templates [47-002], the Very Green Book (which sets out institutional guidance on appointments) [47-005] and a range of periodic review documentation [B-8, 34-00 – 34-054].

b) To identify the academic and professional expertise of the staff, the team examined LinkedIn profiles of senior managers [01-001] and academic staff [02-001], accreditation bodies' standards and reports [C-1-2, E-6, 37-001, 37-002], the staff database [47-001] and profiles of staff on the Ashridge website.

c) To establish the extent that staff actively engage with the current research, advanced scholarship and pedagogic development of their discipline knowledge, and how this informs teaching, the team considered the staff handbook [48-001], Teaching and Learning Strategy [13-001], the staff database [47-001] and a range of documentation associated with the biennial Faculty Global Summit [C-3, 10-003 – 10-006].

d) To identify opportunities for academic staff to engage in reflection and evaluation of their learning, teaching and assessment practice, and to enhance their practice and scholarship, the team considered the Faculty Performance Review [47-002], the staff handbook [48-001], Boards of Studies minutes [D-3, 34-026 – 34-031], Programme Directors' Review reports [B-5, 34-002, 34-023 – 34-025, 56-001 – 56-004], periodic

review documentation [B-8, 34-001 – 34-054], Faculty Global Summit documentation [10-004 – 10-006], and an example of an event run by the Recruitment and Employee Development team [47-006].

e) To establish the extent of opportunities for academic staff to gain experience in curriculum development and assessment design and to engage with the activities of other higher education providers, the team considered the Faculty database [47-001] and the staff handbook [048-001].

f) To indicate staff experience of curriculum development and assessment design, the team considered a sample of programme handbooks [B-1, 25-001, 34-004] and course assignment briefs [54-001, 54-002] and to illustrate staff expertise in providing feedback on assessment, the team considered a range of external examiner reports [34-001 – 34-025], Boards of Studies [D-3, 34-026 – 34-031] and Assessment Board minutes [B-4], periodic review documents [B-8, 34-001 – 34-054] and the student submissions [SSA, SSHSA].

g) To assess whether there are appropriate staff recruitment practices and how Ashridge evaluates the skills and expertise required for its programmes, the team considered the self-assessment document [00], the Teaching and Learning Strategy [13-001] the Very Green Book (which set out guidance on appointment) [47-005], the Very Blue Book [47-003] (which provides essential information for new staff including outlining core values), the Very Pink Book [47-004] (which supports staff with the transition to management roles), the internal management training outline [47-006], and a range of periodic review documentation [B-8, 34-001 – 34-054].

How any samples of evidence were constructed

117   The assessment team requested a sample of staff CVs in order to assess the academic and professional expertise of staff and their engagement in development activities. However, as CVs were not available, the team considered staff profiles (which cover all staff) and a random sample of records from the staff database.

What the evidence shows

118   The assessment team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

119   Staff expertise and teaching excellence are central to the institution's mission. The Teaching and Learning Strategy emphasises the importance of ensuring, 'adequate opportunities for faculty development and training on issues of teaching and pedagogy' [13-001]. The essential guide for new staff (Very Pink Book) [47-003] and the support guide for new managers (Very Blue Book) [47-004] articulate the institution's core values and practices to all staff and to managers respectively and are consistent with the strategic aims. Both guides emphasise the importance of recruiting and supporting the progression and development of highly skilled and expert staff.

120   The Teaching and Learning Committee develops policies and promotes innovation and enhancement of learning, teaching and assessment [A-7, A-8]. The Committee's terms of reference include the development and promotion of effective pedagogy and learning innovation, including e-learning [03-001] as well as assurance and enhancement activities such as a peer-mentoring scheme. As such, its goals for 2019-20 include the creation of a web space to share pedagogic best practice and collaboration, the development of a series of teaching development webinars, the cultivation of innovation and the increased use of new teaching tools [A-8]. Ashridge considers the professional experience and expertise of teaching staff to be highly important, given the specialist subject matter of the programmes [000]. Accrediting bodies specify levels of experience and qualifications in their Standards

[00, Intro-2] and a series of successful accreditation visits recently by AACSB [37-001], EQUIS [E-6] and AMBA [37-002] provide testament to the external recognition of the academic and professional expertise of staff. The most recent AACSB report commends the institutional policy to expect new academic staff appointments to have a minimum of seven years professional experience, thereby enabling students' classroom experiences to reflect the business sector [37-001]; and the success of this policy is further illustrated by the AMBA report [37-002] which commends the leadership components of the MBA for the strength of academic underpinning combined with practical relevance [37-002].

121   Staff are appointed on the basis that they have expertise in their subject, in professional practice and in scholarship [00, 47-005]. The Very Green Book [47-005] provides a detailed guide for recruitment of staff, identifying desirable candidate characteristics, fit with the institution's values and culture, as well as more detailed examples of interview questions to match qualities in role descriptions. Although the institution does not keep staff CVs in a traditional form, it maintains a database with details of staff qualifications, professional memberships and accreditations and publications lists [47-001]. The institution also makes use of LinkedIn profiles to ensure staff details are kept up to date and are publicly available [01-001, 02-001]. Staff profiles are also published on the external-facing website. Having reviewed the database and profiles, the team considers that staff have appropriate academic and professional expertise. There is a breath of professional and industrial expertise across the staffing body and evidence that staff participate in a range of external engagements, including membership of external national and international bodies and review boards, as well as holding roles as external examiners and reviewers [47-001]. The database does not fulfil the same functions as a traditional CV would, for instance, it does not include details of ongoing professional development. Similarly, the database [47-001], the primary of purpose of which is to populate the external web profiles, is not a complete staff record as it only details the highest level of qualification attained, although sufficient information was available to the team to verify academic and professional expertise.

122   The Teaching and Learning Committee has responsibility for staff development, including ensuring engagement with other higher education institutions [00]. In its self-assessment document [00], the institution notes that full-time and part-time academic staff have equal development opportunities [00]. One of the most significant mechanisms for the enhancement of teaching and research expertise of staff is the Faculty Global Summit. The Summit is a three-day event for academic staff held every two years [C-3, 10-003]. The opening communication for the 2019 event [10-005] states that teaching excellence is the institution's 'top priority' and highlights internal and external recognition of achievements. Evidence from the paperwork for the Summit indicates high levels of engagement, and awards are made to staff for developing innovative approaches to learning and teaching. Case studies presented demonstrate innovation in the development of collaborative classrooms, experiential learning, cross-disciplinarity and flexible learning; and the summit enables teaching staff to present their pedagogic research and innovative teaching practice to their colleagues in workshop settings [10-005]. Part of the event [10-004] focused specifically on inspiring pedagogies and a range of presentations detailed innovative practice in areas such as mobile learning, active learning and radical pedagogies.

123   Alongside the biennial Global Summit, the institution has a Recruitment & Employee Development team, which leads a series of professional development workshops for staff, including a three-day training programme for new managers [47-006]. The Very Blue Book (for staff) [47-003] and the Very Pink Book (for managers) [47-004] detail processes for staff and managers to review and develop their own practice, as well as to enhance the teams they work with.

124   The profiles included in the sample of records from the staff database [47-001] demonstrated research activity in all cases. In the most recent submission to AACSB, the institution reported that there were 108 full-time staff out of a total of 180 faculty and that half of these (90) possessed a doctorate. A presentation at the last Faculty Global Summit details a very active and successful research environment, with teaching staff awarded internal and external funding and significant levels of publications in high impact peer-reviewed journals and trade/industrial publications [10-006]. Research is incentivised and funded when it demonstrably impacts on practice in the institution, and there are annual awards for researcher of the year and for research impact. As outlined at the Faculty Global Summit, the institution has developed a template for using research in teaching to provide an evidence-base for the development of innovative pedagogies [10-006]. The report on how the institution is aligning itself with the UN Principles of Responsible Management Education (UN PRME) [Intro-3] demonstrates a commitment to increasing the numbers of staff who are engaging in research in areas relevant to UN PRME. Staff are encouraged to develop research interests in topics such as ethics, responsibility and sustainability in applications for research funding; and Ashridge's research centre for business and sustainability provides a hub for research in these areas.

125   There are support systems to enable staff to reflect on and evaluate their own performance on an individual basis. The Faculty Annual Review provides a development-focused process for personal and professional reflection [47-002]. The structured template links performance to overall institutional strategy and faculty priorities based around three areas of activity: teaching, research/scholarship, and service and community engagement (which includes, for example, serving on committees or representing the institution externally), as explained in the staff handbook [48-001]. It also enables staff to identify and agree future training and development needs [47-002].

126   The impact of staff expertise and professional engagement on student learning is evidenced in the international and professionally based provision. Academic staff are international, representing 25 different nationalities, aligning to the institution's mission to be a global business school and bringing different international perspectives to delivery. Staff scholarship directly informs and enhances teaching, as evidenced in the alignment between staff research and professional expertise in the faculty database [47-001] and the programme and course content as detailed in the programme handbooks [B-1, 25-001, 34-004]. A sample of course handbooks and assignment briefs reviewed by the team demonstrate tasks that enable students to reflect on professional challenges drawn from real business and coaching contexts [54-001, 54-002]. There is specific strength in the professional, business and industrial expertise of academic staff, as noted in the two most recent accreditation visits from AACSB and AMBA [37-001, 37-002], enabling them to prepare students for the knowledge and skills employers seek. This is commended in the recent AACSB accreditation visit [37-001], the report of which comments that academic staff are 'largely experienced professionals, many of whom also have research accomplishments …this commitment to faculty work experience outside of academia ensures that the classroom experience of the students reflects business practice and prepares the students with the knowledge and skills sought by employers'.

127   At the programme and institutional levels the approach to programme approval, monitoring and review processes includes consideration of the expertise and effectiveness of staff. The processes for programme approval [Intro-2] have two stages which include assessing business and academic cases. Both stages of the process involve consideration of resource needs, including the requirements for staffing. Business approval includes a process of ensuring that appropriate resources will be allocated to programmes and the academic case stage includes the requirement for consideration to be given to the resource needs, including staffing skills and expertise, required to successfully deliver the programme. Ashridge has not approved any new programmes in the past three years; therefore, it was

not possible for the team to view an example of a full programme approval process. The team was, however, able to review documentation for two programme periodic reviews [B-8, 34-001 – 34-054] and this evidence showed that the process includes consideration of staffing needs for the programme. For example, the panel report for the review of eMIM [34-001] records discussion of staffing requirements to support the changes to the programme, as well as staff development. Consideration is given to resources, including staffing requirements, in the periodic review of programmes [B-8, 34-001 – 34-054] and in Boards of Studies meetings [D-3, 34-026 – 34-031]. Annual review [B-5, 34-002, 34-023 – 34-025, 56-001 – 56-004] and periodic review [B-8, 34-001 – 34-054] also provide formal processes for teams to reflect on and evaluate their practice, as well as to plan enhancement activities.

Conclusions

128   The assessment team formulated its judgement against this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment by QAA*, October 2019, in particular Annex 4.

129   The team considers there to be a high level of academic and professional expertise within the staff and that staff engage in a range of internal and external professional activities. Ashridge has processes to assure itself that it has sufficient appropriately skilled and expert staff to deliver its programmes. The Teaching and Learning Committee monitors staff scholarship and engagement and has oversight of a range of activities to promote enhancement and innovation. Samples of staff profiles confirmed that those involved in teaching or supporting student learning, and in the assessment of student work, are appropriately qualified, supported and developed to the level and subject of the qualifications being awarded. A wide range of staff development opportunities are offered internally, and staff are supported to engage with external associations and act as external reviewers and examiners. The Faculty Global Summit provides a periodic focal point for the promotion and sharing of innovative research, pedagogies and practice.

130   The scholarship and the pedagogical effectiveness of staff are further evidenced by successful accreditation by external bodies, which stipulate levels of qualifications and training for teaching. The two most recent external accreditation visits commend the institution for the high levels of professional and academic expertise staff possess. Recruitment and selection processes are clearly articulated. There is detailed guidance for hiring managers and an extensive selection process to ensure new staff have the relevant professional and academic experience and that the values and expectations of candidates match those of the institution. The Faculty Annual Review requires individual academic staff to reflect on their performance in dialogue with their line manager in relation to institutional strategy and priorities. Review processes, at the institutional and programme levels, assess and enhance staff effectiveness and align skills and expertise with provision, as evidenced consistently in the annual reviews and periodic review documentation reviewed by the team.

131   The assessment team concludes, therefore, that the criterion is met.

Criterion D: Environment for supporting students

Criterion D1: Enabling student development and achievement

132   This criterion states that:

D1.1   Higher education providers have in place, monitor and evaluate arrangements and resources which enable students to develop their academic, personal and professional potential.

133   The QAA assessment team conducted an assessment of this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment for Variation and Revocation of Degree Awarding Powers*, December 2019.

The evidence considered and why the team considered this evidence

134   The team assessed this criterion by reference to a range of evidence gathered according to the process described in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment by QAA*, October 2019, in particular the suggested evidence outlined in Annex 5 and Ashridge's submission. The assessment team identified and considered this evidence for the purposes described in Annex 4 and 5 of this Guidance.

135   Specifically, the assessment team considered or assessed the following.

a. The team reviewed the Teaching and Learning Strategy [13-001] to understand the approach to enabling student development and achievement across a diverse student body. The team also reviewed the Campus and Student Handbooks [34-044, 39-001] to understand the range of student support and resources available and the information provided to students about support and resources along with policies on diversity, support for students with disabilities, health and safety information and other relevant legislation and policies. The team also looked at the Terms of Reference of the Teaching and Learning Committee [03-001] to assess its responsibilities for monitoring and overseeing the student experience and the learning environment.

b. The team reviewed minutes of Board of Studies meetings [D-3, 34-026 to 031], Periodic Review Reports [B-6 – B-8, 34-002 – 34-003, 34-040, 34-047 – 34-049, 34-052 – 34-055] and a sample student feedback log [55-001] together with the student submissions [SSHSA, SSA] and orientation/immersion programmes [22-001 – 22-002, 59-001, 59-003] in order to understand how students are inducted and how account is taken of different students' choices and needs.

c. The team considered the student survey information [E-2] and student submissions [SSHSA, SSA] to understand how the institution uses information to assure itself of the effectiveness of processes for monitoring support and counselling services, and that any resource needs arising are considered.

d. The team scrutinised Academic Board minutes and papers [A-2, 06-001 to 050], Periodic Review Reports [B-6 – B-8, 34-002 – 34-003, 34-040, 34-047 – 34-049, 34-052 – 34-055], ASQC minutes [A-3, A-4] and student submissions [SSA, SSHSA] to understand how the administrative support systems enable the monitoring of student progression and performance and provide timely information to enable the institution to monitor its performance.

e. The team considered annual reports on graduate employability for both undergraduate and postgraduate programmes in order to see how effectively the

institution achieves and monitors professional progression for its students [D-1, D-2], Periodic Review Reports [B-6 – B-8, 34-002 – 34-003, 34-040, 34-047 – 34-049, 34-052 – 34-055] and minutes of the Teaching and Learning Committee [06-048 and 06-049]. Orientation presentations for the MBA and undergraduate programme [59-001, 59-002], Student Survey information [E-2] and the Alumni magazine [D-4] were also reviewed to understand the specific support offered to students.

f. The team reviewed student handbooks [B-1, 34-044, 34-004], Curriculum Committee minutes [A-5, A-6], annual monitoring reports [B-5], and Periodic Review Reports [B-6 – B-8, 34-002 – 34-003, 34-040, 34-047 – 34-049, 34-052 – 34-055], to assess how students make effective use of the learning resources provided, including the safe and effective use of specialist facilities, and the use of digital and virtual environments.

g. The team also reviewed the Academic Regulations [Intro-2] and sample letters to students regarding reasonable adjustments [66-001 and 002], together with student handbooks [B-1, 25-001, 34-044, 34-004, 39-001] and student submissions [SSHSA, SSA] to understand how the institution's approach is guided by a commitment to equity, diversity and equal opportunities, including the Equal Opportunity Policy [B-1], and equality references on the website (legal page www.hult.edu/en/legal-privacy).

How any samples of evidence were constructed

136   The team considered a sample of programme handbooks for two programmes, and two course/module handbooks in order to assess how students make effective use of learning resources provided.

What the evidence shows

137   The assessment team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

138   The Teaching and Learning Strategy [13-001] demonstrates an effective approach to enabling student development. A global approach to business education is articulated in the Strategy, which sets out a commitment to developing the characteristics of incoming students in order to be distinctive graduates with open-mindedness, self-confidence and the ability to deal with ambiguity. Specific commitment to supporting diversity is referenced on the website www.hult.edu/en, in the campus handbooks [34-044, 39-001] and the programme handbooks [25-001, 034-004, B-1]. The team found that there is an effective approach to enabling student development across a diverse body of students.

139   The Teaching and Learning Strategy also sets out benchmarks to support the maintenance of an effective learning environment that aims to foster mutual respect, excellent communication, effective feedback, high levels of student satisfaction and a commitment to continuous improvement in respect of teaching, learning and assessment [13-001]. The current Teaching and Learning Strategy has reached the end of its specified four-year term and is now being updated. This update is linked to the curriculum review process due to complete during 2020, enabling evaluation of current and future aims to be considered as part of programme development and review [06-012, 06-034]. The Teaching and Learning Committee is responsible for monitoring the student experience in programmes and providing oversight of learning support services and the learning environment [03-001, 06-49] and minutes of the most recent meeting demonstrate proactivity, for example in planning a teaching and learning activities on 'innovating course assessments' [06-49].

140   Campus handbooks set out the range of student support and resources available, along with policies on diversity, support for students with disabilities, health and safety

information and other relevant legislation and policies [34-044; 39-001]. Each campus holds an induction/orientation for all new students during their first week on campus, organised by programme [22-001, 22-002, 59-001 – 59-003]. The objective of orientation is to explain the learning environment, set expectations about conduct, behaviour and workload, introduce support functions, and collect enrolment documentation, as well as to provide background to the programme and support services that are available to students. Orientation sessions emphasise the cultural norms and expectations of studying in an accredited business school, with focus on plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty [00]. The orientation week timetables/schedules show that the range and delivery of the orientation programmes are consistent with these aims and comprehensive in coverage, as seen in the examples provided of the MBA Immersion calendar [22-001] and Postgraduate Wellbeing Immersion presentation [22-002], the Ashridge MBA orientation [59-001] and Hult Undergraduate orientation [59-002] materials. The relevant student handbook is introduced and discussed at induction, to ensure familiarity with the programme norms and rules. Discussion at Boards of Studies has enabled the institution to respond to feedback from students about orientation [D-3]. The Ashridge student submission confirms that induction is effective and includes input from senior staff, course leaders, library and other support functions [SSA]. The team therefore consider that the institution has a comprehensive approach to induction which enables all students to be informed of, and access, appropriate support.

141   Ashridge gathers feedback from students about their learning experiences largely through surveys and student meetings at programme level [00]. Board of Studies meetings, which usually take place every six months, include senior as well as teaching and support staff alongside student representatives and provide opportunities for dialogue about programme operations [D-3, 34-026 – 34-031]. Boards of Studies minutes [D-3, 34-026 – 34-031] demonstrate effective follow-through of actions in response to student feedback as shown in the eMiM Board of Studies meetings during 2017, in which common writing style guidelines were successfully developed and implemented following student input [34-028]. Live Action Tables are used at programme level to monitor actions arising from management meetings as well as Boards of Studies meetings [34-038]. The institution states that minutes are made available to all stakeholders. The team did not see evidence of a formal process of reporting up to the Teaching and Learning Committee or ASQC, although the annual reporting arrangements are currently under review and minutes from Academic Board [06-031, 06-038] show that the institution has recently debated and clarified the annual reporting requirements to Academic Board from each of its subcommittees. The Programme Directors' Review reports (annual monitoring) [B-5, 34-023 to 34-025 and 56-001 to 56-004] and periodic review reports [B-6 – B-8, 34-002 – 34-003, 34-040, 34-047 – 34-049, 34-052 – 34-055] show student feedback being recorded, monitored and actions followed through, including associated modifications to programme delivery and resources. Similarly, there are regular online student surveys, the results of which are accessible to senior staff via data dashboards [E-2].

142   Ashridge provides student and staff support services, including counselling support, additional English support, personal tutors to help undergraduate students choose their academic path and provide individual academic support, business mathematics, quantitative methods, and accounting tutorials for students requiring additional support [00]. Ashridge students confirm in their submission [SSA] that they feel well supported and specifically make reference to the support for the diverse community of students, including those who are returning to study [SSA]. Students regard the diverse nature of the cohort as a positive factor in their learning experience, supporting their development as professionals. Monitoring the effectiveness of this provision, including resource needs, is the responsibility of the Teaching and Learning Committee [00, 06-049] as stated above. To assure the overall effectiveness of student support services there are informal weekly programme team calls with the Chair of the Teaching and Learning Committee and any issues are escalated as necessary [R1]. The Programme Directors' Review reports seen by the team show student

feedback being recorded and monitored, and actions followed through, including associated modifications to programme delivery and resources [B-5, 34-023 – 34-025]. The Hult Student Report [SSHSA] confirms the institution's provision of support for student well-being, particularly in respect of mental health, while the Student Report from Ashridge [SSA] highlights the effectiveness of support for students with a range of support needs.

143   The institution has effective administrative support systems to enable it to accurately monitor student progression and performance. The Academic Board has overall responsibility for monitoring student progression and achievement and the minutes of the August 2019 meeting indicate that it receives and monitors data regarding achievement at a programme and institutional level [00, A-2, 06-004]. An overall analysis of Ashridge awards for 2018-19 was provided to this Board, outlining the total number of awards granted, grade bandings and gender split [06-010], and notes the following: 'by carrying out this analysis at the end of Academic Year 2019/20 it will provide an opportunity to compare the data across more than one Academic Year and so it will be an opportunity to start to identify trends and patterns' [A-2], indicating that greater analysis is anticipated in the future.

144   Information on student progression and attainment are held in the student information system and data can be made available upon request from the campus Academic Registrar. Tracking of students is recorded on spreadsheets at programme and institutional levels [27-010, 27-012]. Students receive details on assessment requirements for their particular programme through the student handbook [34-004]. Students confirm that they can access information regarding the grading for courses via the VLE [SSA]. As outlined in paragraph 96, students record their personal learning journey, which is verified in the student submission [SSA] as an effective reflective activity encouraging skills to enable their academic, personal and professional progression.

145   Many graduates find work outside of their country of origin, and details of graduate employment are listed on the website and in the Global Careers Reports [D-1, D-2]. Students report being challenged through the intensive programmes offered and consider that they are provided with opportunities for personal and professional development [SSA, SSHSA]. For students on full-time rather than executive programmes, the structure of the programme is specifically designed to support career planning and there are frequent opportunities for students on campus for networking. Students describe in the submission the value of the applied nature of learning, including extensive work with real clients and live projects, as well as the role of events such as the Majors and Rotation Fairs in expanding their horizons through contact with professionals and alumni [SSHSA]. The team considered that these arrangements indicate that students are provided with opportunities to develop professional skills and future career management skills.

146   The institution monitors rates of employment and levels of earnings for graduates, collecting data and publishing Global Annual Careers Reports on the effectiveness of its provision [D-1, D-2]. This information is published on the institution's website and indicates strong graduate employment rates across its degree programmes. Students also positively describe the balance of personal development skills, such as management approaches, leadership, coaching, self-awareness and emotional intelligence with the professional skills within their programmes [SSA]. This approach is further evidenced by programme introduction and orientation material provided, which emphasises the institution's focus on developing the person and not just providing knowledge [59-001, 59-002]. Post-graduation the institution continues to offer advice and support for three months [00] and operates an alumni programme which brings together graduates from Hult and Ashridge, creating a wide geographical network [000]. Resources continue to be available after graduation, such as the alumni magazine [D-5], and all alumni are able to attend one elective a year for life, free of charge, to support their continued professional development.

147   Ashridge prepares students in the safe and effective use of specialist facilities, and the use of digital and virtual environments through the provision of information and guidance. Student handbooks [B-1, 034-004] and orientation presentations [59-001 to 59-003] provide information about the range of online learning resources available to students, specifically the Learning Zone, the online library and the VLE. Although comments made by students at a Boards of Studies meeting suggest that induction to the VLE could be improved and that the interfaces are not as intuitive as students would like [D-3], the Ashridge student submission [SSA] considers both the VLE (Virtual Ashridge) and online library to be effective and that there is good quality technical support provided to address any issues in a timely way. Student safety and wellbeing is also covered on the web site (www.hult.edu/en/legal-privacy), in the campus handbook [34-044] and programme handbooks (for example the EMLM Handbook [034-004]).

148   The institution's approach is guided by a comprehensive approach to equity for its diverse body of students. The Academic Regulations set out the approach to ensuring equal access to its programmes for students with disability and support needs [Intro-002]. Written reports from the student body confirm the institution's approach to equity and inclusivity in practice and acknowledge the diverse nature of the student cohort [SSA, SSHSA]. Campus Handbooks [34-044, 39-001] set out the range of student support and resources available along with policies on diversity, support for students with disabilities, health and safety information, and other relevant legislation and policies. The student handbooks [B-1, 25-001, 34-004] also refer students to the Diversity and Equal Opportunity Policy. Equality is referenced on the website (refer to legal page www.hult.edu/en/legal-privacy), in campus handbooks [34-044, 39-001], and in programme handbooks [B-1, 25-001, 034-004]. Specific evidence of inclusivity in practice can be found in examples of reasonable adjustments for students with hearing and visual impairments [66-001, 66-002], and confirmed by the student submissions [SSA, SSHSA]. Orientation is used at the beginning of the year, to engage students in transparent discussion of what it means to join a diverse peer group, and the importance of a 'growth mindset' in such an environment [22-001, 22-002, 59-001, 59-003]. It also provides students with opportunities to engage in cross-cultural team activities, designed to establish a level of comfort with studying in multinational groupings that students will carry with them throughout their degree.

Conclusions

149   The assessment team formulated its judgement against this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment by QAA*, October 2019, in particular Annex 4.

150   Ashridge has in place a range of support mechanisms, induction arrangements and resources to support student achievement which it monitors and evaluates. The provision of support for students' academic and professional development is strategic and Boards of Studies minutes, programme-level reviews and institutional reports provide evidence of how, at provider level, the institution assures itself of the effectiveness of its provision in this respect and takes account of student views on the support available. Student support mechanisms include comprehensive induction, support for disability and special needs, counselling, English language support, personal tutors; and access to physical resources such as library and technical facilities. The institution provides opportunities for students to access resources to support their skills development and students are supported in making effective use of these through the guidance provided in campus and student handbooks, comprehensive orientation programmes and a Diversity and Equal Opportunity Policy. Preparation for employment and support for alumni is a particular strength, including ongoing access and support for alumni after graduation and evidence from students demonstrates that, overall, students feel well supported.

151   The institution regards the diversity of its student body as a defining characteristic and can evidence its approach to supporting all students through information provided in handbooks and induction, together with specific examples of reasonable adjustments made. Student reports confirm that the diversity of the student body is a positive aspect of the provision.

152   The team concludes, therefore, that the criterion is met.

Criterion E: Evaluation of performance

Criterion E1: Evaluation of performance

153   This criterion states that:

E1:   *An organisation granted degree awarding powers takes effective action to assess its own performance, respond to identified weaknesses and develop further its strengths.*

154   The QAA assessment team conducted an assessment of this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment for Variation and Revocation of Degree Awarding Powers*, (December 2019).

The evidence considered and why the team considered this evidence

155   The team assessed this criterion by reference to a range of evidence gathered according to the process described in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment by QAA*, October 2019, in particular the suggested evidence outlined in Annex 5 and Ashridge's submission. The assessment team identified and considered this evidence for the purposes described in Annex 4 and 5 of this Guidance.

156   Specifically, the assessment team considered or assessed the following.

   a. To assess whether critical self-assessment is integral to the operation of Ashridge's higher education provision, the team considered a range of documents from across institutional activities, including the Self-Assessment Report [00], Academic Governance Framework [03-001], Teaching and Learning Strategy 2016-17 [13-001], student submissions [SSA, SSHSA], Ashridge Campus Handbook [34-044], minutes of the meetings of Boards of Studies [D-3, 21-001, 21-002, 34-026 – 34-031], Academic Board [A-2, 06-002, 06-004, 06-031], ASQC [A-3, 15-001], and Ashridge Representative Body [05-001], an example of a course evaluation [E-1], student satisfaction survey example [E-2], evidence of student feedback on the EMLM 2019 [55-001], minutes of Chief Academic Officer reports to the Board [05-003, 05-004], slides of the President's December 2017 call to staff [10-002], analysis of Ashridge student awards 2018-19 [06-010], information on rankings [www.hult.edu/en/rankings, www.hult.edu/en/executive-education/about/accreditation], and the institution's written response to queries [R1].

   b. To assess whether action is taken in response to matters raised through internal or external monitoring and review, and that clear mechanisms exist for assigning and discharging action, the team considered the self-assessment report, Academic Regulations [Intro-2], responses to request for additional Information [R1], Programme team responses to the outcomes of periodic reviews [B-8, 34-041, 34-049, 34-055], Programme Directors' Review reports [B-5, 56-001 – 56-004, 34-023 – 34-025], Minutes of ASQC [A-4, 06-029, 45-001 – 45-004], agendas [A-5] and minutes of Curriculum Committee [A-6], Academic Board [A-2, 06-002, 06-004, 06-031, 15-001], and Ashridge Representative Body [05-001] minutes, outcomes and follow-up responses and action plans relating to accrediting bodies, including AACSB [37-001], EQUIS [E-6] and AMBA [37-002].

   c. To confirm that ideas and expertise from within and outside Ashridge are drawn into its arrangements for programme design, approval, delivery and review, the team reviewed the self-assessment report, Academic Regulations [Intro-2], Academic Governance Framework [03-001 (updated)], External Examiner Report templates [B-2, B-3], External examiners' reports [E-4, E-5, 30-001, 30-003, 30-005, 30-007, 34-

005, 34-007, 34-009, 34-011, 34-013, 34-015, 34-017, 34-019, 34-021] and the Programme Directors' responses to these reports [30-002, 30-004, 30-006, 34-006, 34-008, 34-010, 34-012, 34-014, 34-016, 34-018, 34-020, 34-022], Summary of external examiners' comments [45-006] and the Programme Directors' Review reports [B-5, 56-001 – 56-004, 34-023 – 34-025]. Documentation relating to programme design and review were reviewed, including agendas and minutes of the periodic reviews of the EMLM programme Jan 2019 [34-001, 34-040], AMEC programme December 2018 [34-046, 34-048], EDOC programme July 2019 [B-7, B-8, 34-052, 34-054], programme specifications [26-001 – 26-004], the Curriculum redesign project [06-046, 75-001], and institutional and programme reviews by regulators and accrediting bodies, namely AACSB [C-1, 37-001], EQUIS [C-2, E-6] and AMBA [37-002]. Minutes of ASQC [15-003, 06-029], Academic Board [A-2, 06-002, 06-004, 06-031, 15-001] and Assessment Boards [B-4, 31-001, 58-001] were also scrutinised alongside graduate employment outcomes, [D-1, D-2, www.hult.edu/en/programs/undergraduate, www.hult.edu/en/programs/mba]

How any samples of evidence were constructed

157   The team assessed a representative sample of four Programme Directors' Review Reports (annual monitoring reports) to identify how these facilitate critical reflection and feedback from internal and external sources. The team also considered a representative sample of external examiners' reports for Ashridge programmes, and the responses to these reports, covering the past three years and both undergraduate and postgraduate provision, for the BBA, MIM, AMEC and EDOC. The team reviewed these to identify how ideas and expertise from outside the institution are drawn into Ashridge's arrangements for programme design, approval, delivery and review.

What the evidence shows

158   The assessment team's analysis of the evidence led to the following observations.

159   Ashridge stated in its submission [00] that it reviews its performance in a number of ways, including through student feedback, which it collects through a variety of mechanisms. As discussed in paragraph 26, at institutional level, students are represented on Academic Board [03-001] and, from 2020, regular meetings are being held with representatives of HSA and chairs/secretaries of Academic Board's subcommittees to ensure more effective engagement at subcommittee level [A-2, R3]. At programme level, programme and senior staff and student representatives attend Board of Studies meetings (see paragraphs 27, 70 and 141). As noted earlier in this report, the minutes of the Board of Studies meetings [D-3, 21-001 – 21-002, 34-026 – 34-031] demonstrate an effective and thorough approach at programme level to gaining and responding to student feedback, on both academic and non-academic issues, to improve the student experience; with minutes showing strong student and staff engagement and clear recording of actions and their follow-up.

160   Ashridge operates the institutional system of student evaluations of courses and staff [00, E-1] and students are asked to complete regular surveys [E-2] in relation to the institution's overall performance. These evaluations are considered through ASQC [A-3] and Academic Board [06-004]. The example action log provided by the institution demonstrates that appropriate action is taken in response to the feedback provided by students [55-001] and this was confirmed in both the Ashridge [SSA] and HSA [SSHSA] student submissions. Slides of the President's call to staff (December 2017) provide evidence of the institution analysing trends from the outputs of student evaluations [10-002].

161   The institution also reviews its performance through consideration of student-related data such as an analysis of students' awards discussed at the highest academic body and

the governing body demonstrated through the minutes of Academic Board [06-004, 06-010] and the Ashridge Representative Body [05-001, 05-004]. Institutional rankings provide another mechanism against which the institution benchmarks its performance in relation to its peers and these are published on its website [www.hult.edu/en/rankings, www.hult.edu/en/executive-education/about/accreditation]. As discussed in paragraph 14, the Chief Academic Officer attends the governing body [05-001] and provides its members with regular and appropriate reports and updates regarding the institution's performance against its strategic priorities. Minutes of this body verify that governors discuss, challenge where necessary and ensure that appropriate action is taken [05-003, 05-004].

162   As set out in the Academic Regulations [Intro-2], Ashridge monitors and reviews provision through internal annual monitoring (Annual Academic Review) and periodic review of its programmes [Intro-2]. Programme Directors produce detailed and reflective annual academic review reports (Programme Directors' Review reports), which include an analysis of student data relating to admissions, progression and achievement, feedback from external examiners and students, successes, good practice and challenges [B-5, 34-023 – 34-025, 56-001 – 56-004]. These reports focus on enhancements made during the year and priorities for the following year. As confirmed by its minutes, these reports are considered as a standing item at ASQC [06-02, 45-001, 45-002, 45-003, 45-004]. Until recently, these reports were considered as and when they were submitted by the Academic Director at the end of a programme's academic year, which varies from programme to programme. As noted in the July 2019 minutes of ASQC [45-003; R1], it has been decided that all of the Annual Reports submitted between September and August of an academic year will now be reviewed at the October/November meeting of ASQC to enhance the current process and allow the identification of themes and trends. Internal periodic review is undertaken on a four to six year cycle [00]. Programme teams are responsible for responding, and make detailed and thoughtful responses, to conditions and recommendations arising from periodic review events [B-8, 34-041, 34-049, 34-055] which are carefully monitored and followed up by Curriculum Committee [A-5, A-6].

163   In addition to internal monitoring, the institution also adheres to the requirements of, and utilises the external reference points and standards relating to, its various accrediting bodies, including AACSB [C-1, 06-041, 06-042, 06-043, 37-001], EQUIS [C-2, E-6] and AMBA [37-002]. Programme specifications for the Ashridge AMEC programme [26-001], the BBA programme [26-002], the MBA programme [26-003] and the MIB [26-004] programme confirm accreditation by these bodies and that the institution aligns its programmes. Accreditation and monitoring visit reports [37-001, 37-002], and their resulting progress reports and action plans [E-6] are reported and regularly monitored through the institution's committee structure, as noted in the minutes of ASQC [A-4, 15-003, 45-001 – 45-004], Academic Board [A-2, 06-002, 06-004, 06-031, 15-001] and the Governing Body [05-001]. Enhancements are made as a result of these reports. For example, an area of improvement in the 2018 EQUIS accreditation report required the institution to adapt 'its faculty appointments process and faculty management systems to reflect the prioritisation of the changing research emphasis'. This led to improvements in the processes for faculty recruitment, development and performance appraisal and the addition (in 2018) of the role of Dean of Faculty and Programs to the central academic team (see paragraph 10) to lead on faculty management and development [E-6].

164   Ashridge routinely incorporates external expertise into its activities in a number of ways, including through its external examining arrangements. The Academic Regulations clearly set out the policy and procedures for the appointment of external examiners [Intro 2]. As stated in its terms of reference, set out in the institution's Academic Governance Framework, ASQC has delegated responsibility from Academic Board for the appointment and oversight of external examiners [03-001 (updated]. As demonstrated through their reports, external examiners provide feedback on a termly [B-2, E-4] and annual basis [00, B-

3, E-5, 30-001, 30-003, 30-005, 30-007, 34-005, 34-007, 34-009, 34-011, 34-013, 34-015, 34-017, 34-019, 34-021]. The minutes of assessment boards confirm that external examiners attend, and their reports are considered at, these boards [B-4, 31-001, 58-001]. ASQC minutes [A-4, 06-029, 15-003] demonstrate that it maintains effective oversight, and action is taken as a result of external examiners' feedback through receipt of their individual reports. Examiner reports indicate that the student learning experience is of high quality and that policies and procedures have been adhered to. Detailed written responses are made to external examiners' comments [30-002, 30-004, 30-006, 34-006, 34-008, 34-010, 34-012, 34-014, 34-016, 34-018, 34-020, 34-022]. External examiner reports are considered as part of the annual monitoring process through the Programme Directors' Review reports [B-5, 56-001, 56-001 – 56-004, 34-023 – 34-025].

165   As specified in the Academic Regulations [Intro-2], panels for the approval of new programmes and for the periodic review of existing programmes [Intro-2] are required to include external members as well as a recent alumnus. The agendas and minutes of the periodic reviews of two master's programmes [34-001, 34-040, 34-046, 34-048] and the Executive Doctorate programme [B-7, B-8, 34-052, 34-054] reviewed by the team confirm that the institution consistently adheres to this requirement and that external members make a sound contribution to the process. Input from employers is utilised in the institution's curriculum design and development process. The current curricula redesign project aimed at its BBA, MIB and MBA programmes demonstrates effective use of employer input to ensure that these programmes have an increased emphasis on the skills and competencies needed for employment [06-046, 75-001]. In accordance with its Mission, the institution strives to make its programmes employer and practice relevant and regularly reviews its performance in relation to graduate employment, with outcomes published on its website [D-1, www.hult.edu/en/programs/undergraduate, D-2, www.hult.edu/en/programs/mba]. As stated in the Academic Governance Framework [03-001 (updated)] and confirmed in its minutes, Academic Board includes an external representative who is a regular attendee at its meetings [A-2, 06-004 – 06-031].

Conclusions

166   The assessment team formulated its judgement against this criterion according to the process set out in *Degree Awarding Powers in England: Guidance for Providers on Assessment by QAA*, October 2019, in particular Annex 4

167   The team considers that Ashridge takes effective action to assess its own performance, to respond to identified weaknesses, and to develop further its strengths. Examples of this include the comprehensive and effective approach to the collection and use of student feedback, with action taken to improve the student experience being evident in the minutes of ASQC and Boards of Studies meetings and confirmed through the student submissions from Ashridge students and HSA. Student performance data is scrutinised by the Academic Board and reported to the Governing Body and regular reports on the institution's performance against its strategic objectives are made to the Governing Body by the Chief Academic Officer, enabling timely and appropriate action to be taken where necessary. These mechanisms demonstrate that critical self-assessment is integral to Ashridge's operation of its higher education provision.

168   Clear mechanisms exist for assigning and discharging action in relation to the scrutiny and monitoring of the institution's academic provision. Appropriate action is taken in response to matters raised through internal annual monitoring, periodic review and external accreditation reports. Programme Directors' Review reports, which are considered by the AQSC, demonstrate a reflective and thorough approach to monitoring programme and student performance and incorporate both student and external examiner feedback. Changes to the timing of receipt of these reports by ASQC have the potential to enhance the

institution's ability to identify trends and themes. Programme teams are responsible for, and provide detailed and thoughtful responses to, the outcomes of periodic review events, which are carefully scrutinised by the Curriculum Committee. Outcomes from external scrutiny by the institution's accrediting bodies are regularly reported through ASQC, Academic Board and the Governing Body, as are the resulting action plans and progress reports.

169   Ideas and expertise from within and outside Ashridge are routinely drawn into the arrangements for programme design, approval, delivery and review. Effective use is made of external examiners whose reports are received on a termly and annual basis and considered by ASQC; comprehensive responses are made to these reports by Programme Directors. Ashridge incorporates external expertise into its activities, including employer input into curriculum design, as demonstrated in its current curricula redesign project. As stated in the Academic Regulations, there is a requirement for subject experts and alumni to be included as members of validation and periodic review panels; reports of these events confirm that the institution consistently adheres to this requirement. Ashridge adheres to and utilises the regulations and external reference points of its accrediting bodies as well as UK external reference points such as the FHEQ and Subject Benchmark Statements.

170   The assessment team concludes, therefore, that the criterion is met.

Full DAPs Overarching criterion

171   The Full DAPs overarching criterion is that 'the provider is a self-critical, cohesive academic community with a proven commitment to the assurance of standards supported by effective quality systems'.

Conclusions

172   The team considers that Ashridge has a self-critical, cohesive academic community with a proven commitment to the assurance of standards, supported by effective quality systems.

173   Ashridge has effective approaches to assessing its own performance, responding to identified weaknesses and developing further its strengths, and critical self-assessment is integral to the operation of its higher education provision and evidenced throughout its academic activities. It takes effective action to assess its own performance across its academic activities, including reflecting of input from internal stakeholders and external experts. The institution is subject to regular external scrutiny by multiple regulators, quality assurance bodies and accrediting organisations which prompt continual self-criticality and have resulted in positive outcomes.

174   The institution's mission and strategy are clear, and its aims and objectives are supported by key institutional strategies which drive its activities. Through the committee structure, policies and procedures are developed in collaboration with staff and students and these policies are widely communicated and consistently applied. The management structure supports consistency of operation and effective oversight. Reporting lines at senior level are well defined and the roles and responsibilities of senior staff are clearly stated in role descriptions. The Academic Regulations are clear, regularly reviewed and approved by the Academic Board. These provide a robust framework for defining and maintaining standards and ensuring quality of the provision. The processes for development, design and approval of programmes are thorough, as are processes for reviewing and monitoring the operation of programmes. There are effective arrangements for assessment, the use of external examiners, annual monitoring, programme approval and periodic review and the outcomes of external examining indicate broad confidence in the standards and quality of programmes.

175   There are appropriate mechanisms in place to support and develop the scholarship and effectiveness of staff. Staff are appropriately qualified, supported and developed and engage in a range of internal and external professional activities. Processes for review, at the institutional, programme and individual staff levels, assess and enhance staff effectiveness and align skills and expertise with provision.

176   There is a cohesive academic community demonstrated by clearly defined roles and activities which bring staff together, such as the President's calls and the Faculty Summits. This is further shown through the encouragement for staff to participate and contribute to the wider institutional community, for example through serving on committees.

177   The observations in the paragraphs above, together with the conclusions for each of the DAPs criteria A - E in this report, demonstrate that Ashridge meets the overarching criterion and has a self-critical, cohesive academic community with a proven commitment to the assurance of standards, supported by effective quality systems.

ANNEX

Evidence

00 Ashridge DAPs Self-Assessment Report (FINAL) 27-02-2020
R1 - Request for additional information and evidence
R2 - Further QAA Questions Response (9 April)
R3 - Responses to Queries prior to team meeting 15 April 2020.docx
SSA - Student Report (Ashridge)
SSHSA - Student Report (Hult)
01-001 - LinkedIn Profiles for Senior Management
01-002 - CAT Role Specifications
02-001 - LinkedIn Profiles for Ashridge Campus Management
03-001 - Academic Governance Committee Structure with ToR (Updated)
03-001 - Academic Governance Committee Structure with ToR
05-001 - Minutes Ashridge Rep Body Meeting Sep 13 2019 (final)
05-003 - 2020-01-30 CAO report for Board
05-004 - 2019-09-13 CAO report for Board
05-005 - Terms of Reference Rep Body July 2015
06-001 - ACBD 14 May 2019 Agenda of meeting 16 v3
06-002 - Minutes of ACBD 14 May 2019 - FINAL
06-003 - ACBD 8 August 2019 Agenda of meeting 17 v2
06-004 - Minutes of ACBD 8 August 2019 FINAL
06-005 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Agenda of meeting 18 v3
06-006 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 3.1a Award of degrees - Ashridge programs
06-007 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 3.1b EMBACI Conferment Sheet 27 September
          2019
06-008 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 3.1c ECAS Conferment Sheet 10 October 2019
06-009 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 3.1d EMLM Conferment Sheet 23 October 2019
06-010 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 3.1e Analysis of Ashridge awards AY 2018-19
          updated
06-011 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 3.2 Award of Degrees - Hult programs updated.xlsx
06-012 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 4.1 Curricula Redesign - Nov Academic Board
06-013 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 4.3 Update on Professorial Title Process
06-014 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 4.3 Updated Professorial Title Proposal - updated
06-015 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 5.1 Updated membership of academic governance
          committees
06-016 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 6.1a OfS Membership (Hult)
06-017 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 6.1b Ashridge OfS Submission
06-018 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 6.1c OfS - Ashridge
          ApplicationForm_10008899.xlsx
06-019 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 6.1d OfS - Ashridge Access and
          ParticipationStatement-10008899
06-020 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 6.1e OfS - Ashridge Management and
          Governance_10008899
06-021 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 6.1f OFS - Ashridge
          StudentProtectionPlan_10008899
06-022 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 6.1g UK Trans National Education Consultation
          process
06-023 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 6.1h UK Trans National Education Consultation
          survey questions
06-024 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 6.1i MBAN 2019 request to NECHE
06-025 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 6.2a first draft of new AACSB standards
06-026 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 6.2b 2020 AACSB Business Accreditation
          Standards Exposure Draft No 1

06-027 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 6.2c 2020 AACSB BATF Standards Comparison
06-028 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 7.1 Minutes of Research Committee Meeting - 9 September 2019
06-029 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 8.1 Minutes of ASQC Meeting 14 October 2019
06-030 - ACBD 7 November 2019 Paper 9.1 Minutes of Curriculum Committee Meeting 7 October 2019
06-031 - Minutes of ACBD 12 February 2020 - FINAL
06-032 - ACBD 12 February 2020 Paper 3.2a Award of Degrees - Hult programs
06-033 - ACBD 12 February 2020 Paper 3.2b Award of Degrees Hult Programs.xlsx
06-034 - ACBD 12 February 2020 Paper 4.1 Curricular Redesign Update_Feb 2020
06-035 - ACBD 12 February 2020 Paper 4.2 Professorial Title Proposal
06-036 - ACBD 12 February 2020 Paper 5.1a Updated Academic Governance Structure
06-037 - ACBD 12 February 2020 Paper 5.1b Changes to membership of academic governance committee
06-038 - ACBD 12 February 2020 Paper 5.2 Subcommittee reporting to Academic Board
06-039 - ACBD 12 February 2020 Paper 6.1 Hult Accreditation Calendar 2019-20
06-040 - ACBD 12 February 2020 Paper 6.2a Ashridge DAP process confirmation
06-041 - ACBD 12 February 2020 Paper 6.3a Second exposure draft of 2020 AASCB Business Accreditation standards
06-042 - ACBD 12 February 2020 Paper 6.3b ED2-2020 AACSB Business Accreditation Standards Final 02032020
06-043 - ACBD 12 February 2020 Paper 6.3c Summary of changes_ed1 and 2_Table_FINAL
06-044 - ACBD 12 February 2020 Paper 7.1a Minutes of Research Committee 18 November 2019
06-045 - ACBD 12 February 2020 Paper 7.1b Minutes of Research Committee 28 January 2020
06-046 - ACBD 12 February 2020 Paper 9.1 Minutes of Curriculum Committee 20 January 2020
06-047 - ACBD 12 February 2020 Paper 10.1 Minutes of Admissions Committee 6 November 2020
06-048 - ACBD 12 February 2020 Paper 11.1a MInutes of Teaching and Learning Committee 25 October 2019
06-049 - ACBD 12 February 2020 Paper 11.1b Minutes of Teaching and Learning Committee 7 February 2020
06-050 - ACBD 12 February 2020 Paper 12.1 Minutes of Doc Com meeting 22 January 2020
10-001 - 170404 Wed Call JR slides
10-002 - 2017-12-05 First Weds Call presentation
10-003 - 170221 Ashridge Faculty Summit
10-004 - Inspiring Pedagogy Schedule_Faculty Summit January 2019
10-005 - 190107 Global Faculty Summit - Kickoff
10-006 - 190109 Global Faculty Summit - Research
13-001 - Teaching and Learning Strategy 2016-17
15-001 - ACBD 14 May 2019 Paper 1.1 Minutes of ACBD 22 February 2019
15-002 - ACBD 22 Feb 2019 Paper 3.1g Potential use of Assessment Board discretion - EMBACI
15-003 - ASQC 15 July 2019 Paper 1.2 Minutes of ASQC Meeting 11 29 Apr 2019
16-001 - Pearson College Signed Agreement - 27 May 2014
17-001 - Validation partners summary
17-002 - Ashridge Contract signed by CU and Ashridge April 2018 FINAL
17-003 - ACBD 14 May 2018 Paper 4.4b Ashridge -IA April 2017
17-004 - ACBD 14 May 2018 Paper 4.4c Ashridge CARP PARP April 2018
17-005 - CU interim review - Ashridge FINAL
18-001 - Outcome of NECHE review of the EDOC program (1)
18-002 - Notice to end MU Doctorate agreement -Letter from Ashridge - 26 May 2017

18-003 - Notice to end MU Doctoral agreement - Letter from MU 6 June 2017

18-005 - Signed Addendum to Partnership agreement - Ashridge and Middlesex August 2019

19-001 - Signed Pearson College reference letter - August 2017

19-002 - Signed Ashridge Lorange CEIBS agreement - January 2016

19-003 - RE_ Status of Lorange students and program

21-001 - Minutes of the AMEC BOS Year 1 Oct 2019 - Final

21-002 - ADOC 6 BoS Minutes - 10th Jan 2019 (final)

22-001 - MBA Sept Calendar

22-002 - PG Wellbeing Immersion Presentation

22-003 - Look After Your Mate Workshop

22-004 - Welcome Week Leaders Training

25-001 - AMEC 14 Handbook

26-001 - AMEC Program Specification August 2019 - MS FINAL

26-002 - BBA Program Specification 2019 (23 Sep 2019)

26-003 - MBA Program Specification 2019-20 (30 Aug 2019)

26-004 - MIB Program Specification 2019-20 (30 Aug 2019)

27-001 - Example - Student Complaint email

27-002 - Formal stage of student complaint - Feb 2020 FINAL

27-003 - Analysis of student complaint - FINAL

27-004 - Complaints and appeal log 2019-20.xlsx

27-005 - AIC appeal tracking sheet - 2019.xlsx

27-006 - Example 1 - AIC Log

27-007 - Example 1 - Letter to Student - AIC Appeal Outcome

27-008 - Example 2 - AIC Log

27-009 - Example 2 - Letter to Student - AIC Appeal Outcome

27-010 - Admission Procedure and Example

27-011 - RPL Procedure and Example.xlsx

27-012 - Hult Registry Report Fall 2019 (no names).xlsx

27-13 Completion of Procedures Letter

28-001 - MBA L7 Commitment Statement Cover Sheet

28-002 - MBA L7 Commitment Statement and Supporting Notes

28-003 - Tripartite Meeting

28-004 - Tripartite Meeting - Follow up meeting

30-001 - ASQC 6 July 2018 Paper 4.1f External examiner annual report 2017-2018 ADOS DCOS ES - Hult ES

30-002 - ASQC 6 July 2018 Paper 4.1f Academic Directors Response ES ACOS ADOS

30-003 - ASQC 6 July 2018 Paper 4.1e External examiner annual report 2017-2018 (KJ MiM May 2018)

30-004 - ASQC 6 July 2018 Paper 4.1e Academic Directors Response KJ MiM

30-005 - ASQC 29 April 2019 Paper 4.1f AMEC Ext Ex Annual Report 2018-19 - PT

30-006 - ASQC 29 April 2019 Paper 4.1g AMEC AD response to Ext Ex Annual Report 2018-19 PT

30-007 - ASQC 29 April 2019 Paper 4.1k EDOC Ext Ex Annual Report 2018-19 KT

30-008 - ASQC 14 October 2019 Paper 4.1g ADOC EDOC Academic Directors response to KT Ext Ex Annual Report 2018-19

31-001 - EMLM Assessment Board Minutes October 2019 FINAL

32.001 - V1 CMI Ashridge EMLM in Leadership and management Mapping L7 SLMDA Outcome-Aug 18

32-002 - V2_CMI_Ashridge master in Leadership and management Mapping L7 SLMDA outcome V2 (1)

34-001 - Draft Agenda for the Periodic Review of the EMLM program v1

34-002 - EMLM Periodic Review Academic Director Report 2019

34-003 - Minutes of the Masters in Management Periodic Review December 2012

34-004 - EMLM Student Handbook 2018 (15.01.19)

34-005 - 2015 - 2016 MiM External Examiner Annual report
34-006 - 2015 - 2016 MiM Response to External Examiner Report
34-007 - 2015 - 2016 MIM External Examiner Annual Report
34-008 - 2015 - 2016 MiM Response to External Examiner Report
34-009 - 2015 - 2016 MiM External Examiner Annual Report
34-010 - 2015 - 2016 MiM Response to External Examiner Report
34-011 - 2016 - 2017 MiM External Examiner Annual Report
34-012 - 2016 - 2017 MiM Response to External Examiner Report
34-013 - 2016 - 2017 MiM External Examiner Annual Report
34-014 - 2016 - 2017 MiM Response to External Examiner Report
34-015 - 2016 - 2017 MiM External Examiner Annual Report
34-016 - 2016 - 2017 MiM Response to External Examiner Report
34-017 - 2017 - 2018 MiM External Examiner Annual Report
34-018 - 2017 - 2018 MiM Response to External Examiner Report
34-019 - 2017 - 2018 MiM External Examiner Annual Report
34-020 - 2017 - 2018 MiM Response to External Examiner Report
34-021 - 2017 - 2018 MiM External Examiner Annual Report
34-022 - 2017 - 2018 MiM Response to External Examiner Report
34-023 - MiM Academic Directors Review Annual Monitoring 2015 - 2016
34-024 - MiM Academic Directors Review Annual Monitoring 2016-2017
34-025 - MiM Academic Directors Review Annual Monitoring 2017-2018
34-026 - Board of Studies Minutes 17 November 2015
34-027 - Board of Studies Minutes 19 May 2015
34-028 - Board of Studies Minutes 20 May 2016
34-029 - Board of Studies Minutes 24 November 2016
34-030 - Board of Studies Minutes 21 November 2017
34-031 - Board of Studies Minutes 25 May 2017
34-032 - PMM 12 November 2015 1
34-033 - PMM 20 April 2015
34-034 - PMM 25 January 2015
34-035 - PMM 25 January 2016
34-036 - PMM 26 September 2016
34-037 - PMM Minutes December 2018
34-038 - Copy of Current Live Action Table V3 Final.xlsx
34-039 - EMLM PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT TEAM BIO NOTES
34-040 - Periodic Review Report minutes - Final
34-041 - Conditions and Recommendations Program Response Final Version
34-042 - Appendix 1 CS and Quals Lite Survey
34-043 - Appendix 2 Job Description CS Student Services Executive
34-044 - Hult Ashridge Campus Handbook 2019 - V1.3
34-045 - Outcomes from EMLM Periodic Review
34-046 - Agenda for the Periodic Review of the AMEC program v3
34-047 - AMEC Revalidation - Periodic Review Document - for December 2018
34-048 - Periodic Review Report minutes - Final
34-049 - AMEC Revalidation - Periodic Review - Faculty Response final - Chair edits Mar 19
34-050 - AMEC Ethics Charter final
34-051 - Minutes of Curriculum Committee 15 July 2019
34-052 - Periodic review of EDOC - agenda
34-053 - EDOC Periodic Review Report FINAL
34-054 - EDOC Periodic Review Minutes - FINAL (1)
34-055 - EDOC Review Response to conditions of the EDOC Periodic Review FINAL
37-001 - Hult AACSB Outcomes Report - Jun17
37-002 - 0116 Hult Review Report
39-001 - Student Handbook AY2019-20 (1)
40-001 - Evidence of Academic Judgement

43-001 - ASQC 20 Feb 2019 Paper 2.1a AIC Guidelines for 2018-19 Academic Year

43-002 - ASQC 20 Feb 2019 Paper 2.1b AIC Guidelines 2018-19 v1.1.xlsx

43-003 - ASQC 14 October 2019 Paper 3.3b AIC letter templates

43-004 - ASQC 14 October 2019 Paper 3.3c AIC - Attendance HCV Letter to Student
Template

43-005 - ASQC 14 October 2019 Paper 3.3d AIC - Outcome Letter to Student Template

43-006 - ASQC 14 October 2019 Paper 3.3e AIC - Initial Letter to Student Template

44-001 - Grade Review Screenshot.png

45-001 - ASQC 29 April 2019 Paper 1.2 Minutes of ASQC Meeting 10 20 Feb 2019

45-002 - ASQC 15 July 2019 Paper 1.2 Minutes of ASQC Meeting 11 29 Apr 2019

45-003 - ASQC 14 October 2019 Paper 1.2a Minutes of ASQC Meeting 12 15 July 2019

45-004 - ASQC 2 March 2020 Paper 1.2a Minutes of ASQC Meeting 13 14 October 2019

45-005 - ASQC 14 October 2019 Paper 3.3a Analysis of AIC cases for AY 18-19

45-006 - ASQC 14 October 2019 Paper 4.1d Summary of Ashridge External Examiner
interim feedback

47-001 - FACULTY DATABASE Sample

47-002 - Hult Annual Faculty Performance Review Template

47-003 - Very Blue Book (All Staff)

47-004 - Very Pink Book (Managers)

47-005 - Very Green Book (Hiring)

47-006 - New Managers Training Email Comms

47-007 - Virtual Ashridge flyer final

48-001 - Faculty Handbook_ Dec2019

54-001 - A5 AMEC Personal Reflection Journey Mod1B - March2020 (10)

54-002 - Certificate Performance Module Assignment Questions 2020

55-001 - Evidence of Student Feedback EMLM 2019.xlsx

56-001 - ADOS Academic Directors Report 2018 2019

56-002 - AML Gen Q Academic Directors Annual Report 2018 2019

56-003 - AMEC Academic Directors Annual Report 2018 2019

56-004 - EDOC Academic Directors Annual Report 2018 2019

58-001 - Jan 2020 MBA EMBA MIB Assessment Board Minutes (Hult)

59-001 - DAP MBA Induction Web Jan 2020 (Ashridge)

59-002 - Orientation September 2019 - 2019-09-03 (Hult UG)

59-003 - Fall 2019 - Registration Presentation - 2019-09-05

64-001 - Student progression example

64-002 - Student progression example

66-001 - Hard of hearing example

66-002 - visually impaired example

71-001 - External Examiner Report (BBA and MBA)

75-001 - Curriculum Committee Redesign Update_1.20.20

A-1 Academic Board Agenda (12 February 2020)

A-10 Admissions Committee Minutes (6 November 2019)

A-11 Minutes of Research Committee (18 November 2019)

A-2 Academic Board Minutes (7 November 2019)

A-3 ASQC Agenda (2 March 2020)

A-4 ASQC Minutes (14 October 2019)

A-5 Curriculum Committee Agenda (20 January 2020)

A-6 Curriculum Committee Minutes (7 October 2019)

A-7 Teaching and Learning Committee Agenda (7 February 2020)

A-8 Teaching and Learning Committee Minutes (25 October 2019)

A-9 Admissions Committee Agenda (13 Feb 2020)

B-1 EMLM Student Handbook (2019-20)

B-2 External Examiner Term Review Form

B-3 External Examiner Annual Review Form

B-4 EMLM Assessment Board Minutes (23 October 2019)

B-5 AMEC Annual Report (2018-19)
B-6 EDOC Periodic Review Report (June 2019)
B-7 EDOC Periodic Review Minutes (1 July 2019)
B-8 EDOC Program Team Response (November 2019)
C-1 AACSB Standards for Accreditation (2018)
C-2 EQUIS Standards for Accreditation (2019)
C-3 Faculty Summit Agenda (7-9 January 2019)
C-4 Faculty Annual Review Example
D-1 BBA Global Careers Report (2019)
D-2 MBA Global Careers Report (2019)
D-3 AMEC Board of Studies Minutes (Oct 2019)
D-4 Student Survey NPS Example (Screenshot).png
D-5 Alumni Magazine (2020)
D-6 EDOC Terms and Conditions (January 2020)
E-1 Course Evaluation Example
E-2 Student Survey NPS Example (Screenshot).png
E-3 HSA Meeting Notes Example
E-4 External Examiner Term Report Example
E-5 External Examiner Annual Report Example
E-6 EQUIS Annual Progress Report (March 2019)

Evidence List as at 9 April.xlsx

INTRO-1 Ashridge-Hult HER(AP) 2017
INTRO-2 Academic Regulations (2019)
INTRO-3 UN PRME Report
INTRO-4 Strategy Map
INTRO-5 Minutes of Curriculum Committee (20 January 2020)