DQB

Designated Quality Body
in England

Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students

SP Jain London School of Management Ltd

Review Report

July 2022

Contents

Summary of findings and reasons

Ref	Core practice	Outcome	Confidence	Summary of reasons
S1	The provider ensures that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks.	Met	Moderate	From the evidence seen, the team considers that the standards set for the provider's courses are in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS's regulatory framework. The team also considers that standards described in the approved programme documentation are set at levels that are consistent with these sector-recognised standards and the provider's academic regulations and policies should ensure that standards can be maintained appropriately. The team considers that, based on the evidence scrutinised, the standards that will be achieved by the provider's students are expected to be in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS's regulatory framework. The team also considers that the provider's academic regulations and policies will ensure that these standards can be maintained. The team considers that staff fully understand the provider's approach to maintaining these standards and that the evidence seen demonstrates the provider is committed to implementing this approach.

The School has developed a range of assessment, learning and teaching and quality policies and procedures that, once finalised and adapted for the UK, will provide a robust and credible overarching framework to maintain threshold standards. Although predominantly in draft format, the documentation provided demonstrates clear mechanisms to maintain standards through the School's governance structure. The team was only able to meet members of the senior management team and ascertained that the senior |

| | | | | | management team had a good knowledge and understanding of threshold standards and how these would be maintained. Staff who met the team were able to detail the approach to assessment design, moderation and classification of awards; were clearly able to articulate the role and implementation of RAU's academic regulations; and demonstrated a strong and close working relationship with the RAU in maintaining standards. Therefore, the team concludes that, should the documentation be approved and finalised for the UK as planned, processes be implemented as stated, and staff recruited and trained as outlined, this Core practice is met.

The School has extensive experience in delivering similar programmes at other global campuses and has a strong working relationship with the RAU. The School has an experienced senior management team including members who have significant experience of the UK HE sector. However, given that the School is still at a relatively early stage in its preparation, and delivery has not yet taken place, at the time of the visit the team was unable to examine any finalised programme specifications, policy documents or module assessments with rubrics. External examiner and third-party reports alongside student assessed work and finalised assessment briefs were unavailable. Documents such as the programme specifications, validation conditions and the MoA were still in draft stage awaiting final approval from the RAU. The School's organisation structure is detailed at the higher levels but is yet to be finalised at the lower levels. Therefore, the team has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

S2	The provider ensures that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.	Met	Moderate	The team, based on the evidence presented, determined that the standards set for students to achieve beyond the threshold on the provider's courses are reasonably comparable with those set by other UK providers. The team considered that the standards described in the approved programme documentation and in the provider's academic regulations and policies should ensure that such standards are maintained appropriately.
				The team determined that, based on the evidence seen, the standards that will be achieved by the provider's students beyond the threshold are expected to be reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers. The team considered that the provider's academic regulations and policies should ensure that standards beyond the threshold are maintained. Based on the detailed scrutiny of the evidence, the team considered that staff at the provider fully understand the provider's approach to maintaining such standards and have opportunities for engagement with peers and external experts in teaching and assessment activities. The team considers the provider's plans for maintaining comparable standards to be appropriate, well-documented and understood by staff members.
				The School demonstrated a strong working relationship with the RAU with regard to the maintenance of academic standards and has clear plans to afford students the opportunity to achieve beyond the threshold standards using a combination of its own policies and plans and those set by its awarding body. Clear guidelines of achieving beyond a pass and attaining a merit or distinction are clearly labelled in the

| | | | | | RAU academic regulations and generic postgraduate grade descriptors. Additional information is given through clear learning outcomes in the programme and module specifications. While no assessment briefs or assessment rubrics were available to examine, the School has a good understanding of how these would be implemented using the RAU module assessment rubrics and the assessment brief template. The School has a range of documents and policies in place for maintaining standards including clear RAU grade descriptors, defined programme specifications, Assessment Validation Grading Moderation Policy, [005] the Quality Framework [003] and the Learning and Teaching Plan. [009] These are supported by the RAU's academic regulations and the MoA. The School has defined mechanisms in place to manage these policies including the Learning and Teaching Committee, the Academic Board and the Board of Directors. The team concluded that if implemented as planned, the School can be considered to have robust and credible approaches and clear and comprehensive academic regulations for maintaining comparable standards beyond the threshold level. The School's intended use of external examiners and processes included in the Assessment Validation Moderation and Grading policy and the Quality Assurance Framework provides further evidence to support the team's view. |
| | | | | | At the time of the visit the team did not have access to any communications given to students on achieving beyond the threshold standards or any training material for UK staff in delivering and maintaining standards. However, the team agrees that there are structured and coherent plans in place for training and inducting staff, as confirmed by staff who demonstrated how these |

				would be implemented, and comparable standards that are appropriate, well-documented and understood by staff members. Therefore, the team concludes, based on the evidence described above, that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers and this Core practice is met. Given that the School is still at a relatively early stage in its preparation and delivery has not yet taken place, at the time of the visit the team was unable to examine any finalised student work, marked assessments, assessment briefs or assessment rubrics. External examiner and benchmarking reports for the UK were not available, although staff showed a good understanding of how these would be incorporated. The School additionally has extensive experience in delivering these programmes and modules at its other international campuses and in line with other regulatory bodies. Therefore, the team has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.
S3	Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them.	Met	Moderate	The principal partnership is between RAU and SP Jain UK and is fully documented in the draft MoA and the Institutional Approval Panel Report. The RAU has the responsibility for setting and maintaining academic standards. As such, the School policies, procedures and committee structure for higher education are largely determined by the MoA and academic regulations of the RAU. The key partnership agreement is the MoA between the RAU and SP Jain UK. While the agreement is yet to be formally approved, the team found that, given the very

| | | | | detailed and comprehensive nature of the Memorandum, it provides a robust framework around which academic standards will be assured within the partnership.

Collectively the policies and regulations of both parties form a robust matrix that should secure academic standards delivered by the partnership. Staff from both the School and the RAU demonstrated a clear understanding of their respective responsibilities and were at pains to emphasise the extent to which they had worked productively in a spirit of trust and mutual respect to ensure that the School can meet the standards set by the awarding body.

The team heard how RAU and the School senior staff have worked together and in detail over an extended period to ensure that the School's academic policies, regulations and programmes fully align with and meet the standards set by the awarding body, which in turn meet sector-recognised standards. Evidence scrutinised by the team confirms that approaches to securing standards are enhanced by the active engagement of the awarding body and the full compliance of the School with requirements set by the RAU. Standards of the proposed internships are underpinned by the internship module specifications and by the internship assessment requirements set by RAU and will be overseen by an appointed Academic Tutor. The team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.

Because the School has yet to commence delivery it was not possible for the team to scrutinise external examiner reports, third party endorsements (such as PSRB reports) or assessed student work. The team also |

					found that conditions set by the Institutional Approval Panel and the RAU Validation and Review Panel were not yet confirmed as having been met as they are due to be formally approved by the RAU Academic and Quality Standards committee and by the School's Academic Board by end of July 2022. Therefore, the team has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.
S4	The provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent.	Met		Moderate	Clear and comprehensive regulations and policies describe assessment practices that are in accordance with the academic regulations of RAU and detailed in the programme and module specifications and in the School's Assessment, Validation, Grading and Moderation Policy. These approved specifications will be used to inform students of the School's approaches to, and expectations for, assessment. The specifications have been developed with the input of external experts and have been subject to a rigorous approval process led by the awarding body.

The School's approach to assessment of the mandatory internship modules aligns with the assessment regulations of the awarding body, which in turn align with sector-recognised standards informing the team's view that assessment of these modules is likely to be fair, reliable and transparent.

The School's approaches for assessment and classification are strongly supported by the awarding body link tutor. They include validation of assessments prior to them being set for students, the use of first and second markers, sampling by the link tutor, moderation and review. School staff and the RAU link tutor had a good understanding of their roles in terms of ensuring that assessments are reliable and fair. |

				The School has clearly defined and broad ranging plans for using independent external expertise to inform its course development and review and its assessment practices. The team heard from senior staff a strong conviction of the value of ensuring that there is input from independent external experts both from an academic and a sector-specific background. The assessment team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.
				The School has in place a wide range of appropriate policies which the team was able to examine and staff understanding of their roles in implementing these policies was tested in meetings which included not only School staff but also the RAU link tutor and a member of the Industry Advisory Board. School staff demonstrated a strong commitment to the use of external independent expertise to inform course development and review, and assessment and classification, in addition to the planned input from external examiners. However, at the time of the assessment, the team was not able to examine external examiner reports or any other external input on actual assessment practice and outcomes as the School is yet to commence delivery and assessment of programmes. Therefore, the assessment team has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.
Q1	The provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system.	Met	Moderate	The School has clear policies for the recruitment and admission of students set out in its own approved and clearly written policy documents which plan for an admissions process that is reliable, fair and inclusive because it clearly articulates roles and responsibilities, enables the admission of students according to a meritocratic standard and clear published criteria. Through the admissions process the School also plans

				to take steps to recruit students from under-represented groups, and supports those with additional needs through the admissions process.
				The team concludes that the School's approaches for ensuring that admissions systems are reliable, fair and inclusive are robust and credible because they are specific and consistent in their detail about roles and responsibilities, are well-understood by staff, and are based on plans that are logical in their sequence. They are inclusive because they make provisions for the diverse needs of students including those that may need support with their application or interview, those who might have had professional careers and who are returning to learning, or those who need advice on visas and arriving in a new country.
				The team found that the School's plans for admissions will allow for the provision of information that is transparent, accessible and fit for purpose because detailed samples and templates for comprehensive admissions information already exists within the wider SP Jain Global School. The School recognises the types of information to be provided, and the need for such information to be detailed cover academic, pastoral and financial information, and be carefully managed and quality assured.
				While the School has not yet decided whether it wants to use recruitment agents, the team concluded that, where parts of the wider SP Jain organisation work with recruitment agents, these are managed effectively to ensure strict adherence to its policies and requirements because it has a comprehensive and detailed policy on the management of agents, the details of which are

				consistently replicated in the template agreement with agents, and reports resulting from internal procedures reveal active monitoring of agents and actions taken in response to issues. Moreover, students are invited to give feedback on agents. Therefore, the team concludes that the Core practice is met.
				The team found the plans for admissions to be detailed, credible and consistently well-understood by staff and supported by robust documentation including approved policies, an access and participation plan, and clearly articulated responsibilities for oversight and management of admissions. As the School has yet to commence delivery the team was unable to examine the views of students or to meet with those employed directly in admissions roles, as they have yet to be recruited, and the team was unable to carry out a direct assessment of student records. It was also unable to check approved course documentation since the agreement with the RAU had not been finalised. In addition, since the School has not begun admitting students, the team was unable to test the admissions processes in practice and, as such, the team has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.
Q2	The provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses.	Met	Moderate	The School has a clear understanding of high-quality programmes and has experience in designing and delivering high-quality courses at other campuses overseas. The new programme MFT has been developed in response to industry demand and has been designed in a similar manner to established programmes. The School has an active Industry Advisory Board which provides strategic direction in terms of programme design and is well positioned to inform the curriculum in terms of current industry

				demands, ensuring that programmes and content are up to date. The School has a number of mechanisms to ensure high-quality programmes are maintained through annual review processes both including feedback and action plans from the Programme Manager and the RAU Link Tutor. This is facilitated and overseen by Learning Teaching and Quality Assurance Committee highlighting robust, credible and evidence-based approaches in designing and delivering high-quality courses.
				Programme and module specifications are well developed because they contain detailed information on learning, teaching and assessment strategies and are closely aligned with learning outcomes, which would enable students to meet and demonstrate the intended learning outcomes through assessment. Staff plans to support teaching staff to ensure the smooth delivery of courses at a high standard include training sessions, workshops on assessments, presentations on using the VLE and ELO and support for gaining certifications with the HEA. Staff were able to articulate what high quality means in the context of the School. The team was unable to observe any teaching or delivery of these programmes and some training resources are still to be developed. However, the team found that the School has a strong track record of designing and delivering these programmes elsewhere and their current plans to do so in the UK are credible and would facilitate the design and delivery of programmes if those plans are implemented as outlined. Therefore, the team concludes that this Core practice is met.
				The team was able to examine plans regarding the mechanisms that would be used to monitor the quality of courses including policy documents and templates. Staff

					were able to clearly articulate their processes for designing and delivering high-quality courses and the School was able to demonstrate it has extensive experience in delivering postgraduate programmes at other international campuses and has well-structured mechanisms in place for their delivery that would be able to be adapted for the UK. However, given the School is still at a relatively early stage in its preparation and delivery has not yet taken place, the team was unable to examine any evidence of programme delivery including teaching observations, student feedback, teaching staff feedback, external examiner feedback, examples of annual review documentation or meeting notes from the LT&QAC committee regarding the quality of programmes. Therefore, the team has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.
Q3	The provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience.	Met	Moderate		The School has clear plans to recruit, appoint, induct and support staff so that it meets the outcome. The School has detailed policies and processes regarding the recruitment and appointment of staff as outlined in the Staff Recruitment Selection Induction Performance Review. This is underpinned with clear academic and administrative job descriptions. While some job descriptions lacked consistent formatting, overall the team considered them suitable. Clear induction and support plans are in place. The School has robust and credible approaches for the recruitment, appointment, induction and support of sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff evidenced through the policies laid out in the Staff Development Policy, the Academic Staff Promotion Policy, the Academic Staff Recruitment Policy and Scholarship of Learning and Teaching Policy. The School has a strong Senior Management Team which collectively has substantial experience in the HE sector

| | | | | globally and within the UK and extensive experience of recruiting appropriately skilled staff. The School has a high-level organisation structure that provides an overview of key management roles and where they fit in with reporting lines. The team does have concerns regarding the progress of staff recruitment as the School did not have key personnel in place at the time of the visit. However, plans are in place as shown in the project plan and the School has stated key appointments are currently on target. Overall, the School has within it good experience and tried and tested mechanisms for recruiting, managing and supporting suitably skilled and qualified staff and has detailed project plans. Therefore, the team concludes that this Core practice is met.

The team was able to examine plans and policies regarding the mechanisms for staff recruitment, appointment, induction and support, as well as staff development and promotions. Staff were able to clearly articulate these processes and how they would focus on recruiting and developing qualified and skilled staff to enable the delivery of a high-quality academic experience. However, given the School is still at a relatively early stage in its preparation and delivery has not yet taken place, at the time of the review meeting the team was unable to examine CVs of certain staff (including those involved in teaching delivery), staff experiences of recruitment and induction, student views on teaching staff, documented evidence of recruitment or be involved in any observations of teaching and learning. Therefore, the team has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement. |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Q4	The provider has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience.	Met	Moderate	The team concludes that the School has strategies and approaches for facilities, learning resources and student support services that are credible because they are described across several comprehensive and approved policies and formal business plans, are consistent in their details and wording and timescales, are feasible, and are well understood by staff. The plans are realistic and credible because they are tailored to the phased operationalisation of the School and key events and activities are prioritised. The plans are linked to the delivery of successful academic and professional outcomes for students because they demonstrate serious consideration of the diversity of students' needs, how they will be met, and how feedback will be sought from students.
				From an assessment of planned facilities and learning resources, the team confirms and concludes that the School will provide a high-quality academic experience because facilities and learning resources would allow for a rich learning experience supported by a sufficient volume of academic and professional support staff, and be facilitated by appropriate physical and electronic resources and professional support. The approach to learning resources demonstrates the School's plans to tailor them to students' needs and support personalised learning.
				Evidence from the partner University reveals some concern from the RAU about facilities and learning resources recorded nearly six months prior to the visit, but the team found that, in the time since, plans for premises and software had become more advanced, developed, and detailed such that they are credible, and the prioritisation and timescales within them assured the

					team that they were realistic. The team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.
					As the School has yet to commence delivery, the team was unable to examine any third-party endorsements or the views of students through surveys or course evaluations. The team was unable to meet with those employed directly in student support roles, as they have yet to be recruited, and was also unable to carry out a direct assessment of facilities, learning resources and support services. However, plans for resources and facilities are advanced in their development, policies had been approved and staff met by the team understand their approach to resourcing and facilities. The team was unable to test whether these plans were effective in their implementation and as such it has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.
Q5	The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.	Met		Moderate	The School has clear and comprehensive plans to engage students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience. This is set out in clear and appropriate policies and frameworks including the RAU's MoA, academic regulations, the School's Student Feedback Policy, and Student Representation Policy. Further, the terms of reference of committees that operate at both programme and School level make clear and unambiguous commitments to engaging with students as members, but with the exception of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Assurance Committee, although the team was satisfied that student representatives are involved in programme quality assurance through their membership of Academic Board. Notwithstanding this, committees aim to consider and act upon student feedback to improve courses and

					the School's provision
					The team found that the School's plans to actively engage students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience were robust and credible. Documentation showed arrangements to elect student representatives as soon as the School starts delivering courses, and that it had already determined on which committees to locate student representatives. Its plans for student surveys throughout courses were clearly determined and their reporting processes set out. In light of the plans for engaging with student representatives, and for running surveys, and the School's high-level commitment to using student feedback, the team considered that the Core practice is met.
					Because the School is yet to commence delivery, the team was unable to examine students' views or examples of the School changing or improving provision as a result of student engagement. It was also unable to meet students to assess whether they consider they are engaged in the quality of their educational experience. While the team considered the School's plans for student engagement to be appropriate and credible, it was unable to test whether these plans were effective in their implementation and, as such, it has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.
Q6	The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students.	Met	Moderate		The School has plans for handling complaints in a manner that will be definitive, fair and transparent, and deliver timely outcomes. This is because it has already approved a Complaints Policy that is definitive, clear, and subject to the signing of the Memorandum of Agreement with the RAU, will be fair to all students

| | | | | because the process is designed to include the independent and impartial consideration of complaints, and students are allowed representation and written outcomes within a process operating in a timely way. Complaints of students against students are also designed to be handled fairly because both parties will be allowed to make representations, and both parties can either appeal or raise a complaint against the outcome, which will be delivered in a timely process.

The School has plans for handling appeals in a manner that will be definitive, fair and transparent, and deliver timely outcomes according to RAU's appeals procedure. This is because the students will use an appeals process that is managed by the RAU and will not involve staff involved in the direct delivery of their programme; the appeals process also has clear criteria. The outcomes of appeals will be delivered via RAU's procedures in a timely fashion and with further escalation to an independent ombudsman available to students.

The School's plans to develop accessible complaints and appeals procedures are robust and credible since it plans to locate this information in multiple places; this plan was articulated at the start of the QSR assessment and remained consistently well-articulated to the team throughout the assessment process by staff. Because of this the team is assured that, if implemented according to the School's plans, the School will operate fair and transparent procedures for complaints and appeals which will be accessible to all students. Therefore, the team concludes that the Core practice is met. |
|---|---|---|---|---|

					The team found sufficient evidence of an agreed and approved complaints process, and a robust agreement with the RAU which, subject to its signing, will provide a fair and transparent appeals process. The plans the School presents for making information about complaints and appeals accessible to students were realistic and credible. However, as the School is yet to enrol students, the team was unable to consider the numbers and types of complaints and appeals received, and any outcomes (including time to outcome) or any examples of specific complaints and appeals. The team was also unable to meet with students. Ideally, the team would have liked to have examined the School's plans and associated documentation at a more advanced stage in their development, for example after some consideration of complaints and appeal outcomes by the School's committee structure. Therefore the team has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.
Q8	Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them.	Met		Moderate	The principal partnership is that between the RAU and the School and the team found that both parties have worked productively over an extended period to ensure that students at the School will enjoy a high-quality academic experience which is at least comparable with that of the awarding body. This has arisen from the awarding body's rigorous institutional and programme approval processes and is captured in the extensive Memorandum of Agreement between the two parties which clearly details their respective roles and responsibilities and how these will be discharged. The team considers that the active role of the RAU Link Tutor with senior School staff has been pivotal in the development and likely success of the partnership and the team found that all have a good understanding of

| | | | | | their respective roles for quality.

The team found that the School has a clear and coherent set of policies and processes to secure student internships which are safe, and which allow students to meet the intended learning outcomes of the programmes and of the internship module, and ensures that the academic experience is of high quality. There are clear lines of responsibility for the School, the internship provider and the student, which were fully understood by the staff. Information that will be provided to students about placements is likely to enable students to fully understand how their internship relates to the programme as a whole and how they will be assessed and will lead to a high-quality experience. The assessment team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.

The team was able to examine a wide range of policy and process documentation, including the MoA with the awarding body, programme and internship module specifications and numerous documents to be used by the School to ensure the quality and safety of internships. However, as internships had not yet been established the team could not test the effectiveness of their management in relation to the quality of the experience or speak to students about their views on the internships. Therefore, the assessment team has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement. |
| Q9 | The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. | Met | Moderate | Staff demonstrated a clear understanding of their role in supporting student achievement. There is a broad range of plans (policies and procedures) which collectively forms a coherent and comprehensive approach to support all students to achieve successful academic and |

| | | | | professional outcomes. The School has sound plans to recruit both the academic and professional support staff who will undertake student support, through roles such as that of the academic personal tutor, the counsellor and language support. The team found that the School has a strong commitment to supporting students to achieve successful professional outcomes and this commitment is supported by comprehensive and credible plans to bring this about, for example through its core internship programme and emerging proposals for a Professional Readiness Programme. The School plans to implement an effective approach to comprehensive, helpful and timely assessment feedback with staff demonstrating understanding of those plans. The assessment team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.

The team was able to test this Core practice in meetings with staff and in consideration of a range of relevant policies and procedures, including the School's Access and Participation Plan, the Assurance of Learning Policy, the School's Quality Assurance Framework, the Student support policy and the Professional Readiness Programme. However, the team was unable to consider assessed student work or speak to students and test the effectiveness of the plans and policies for achieving successful academic and professional outcomes. Therefore, the assessment team has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement. |
|---|---|---|---|---|

About this report

This is a report detailing the outcomes of the Quality and Standards Review for providers applying to register with the Office for Students (OfS), conducted by QAA in July 2022, for SP Jain London School of Management Ltd.

A Quality and Standards Review (QSR) is a method of assessment QAA uses to provide the OfS with evidence about whether new providers applying to be on the OfS Register meet the Core practices of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the Quality Code), based on evidence reviewed by expert assessors. This report is structured to outline the assessment team's decisions about the provider's ability to meet the Core practices through detailing the key pieces of evidence scrutinised and linking that evidence to the judgements made.

The team for this assessment was:

Name: Dr Sree Beg
Institution: Roehampton University
Role in assessment team: Subject assessor, Business and Management

Name: Ms Gemma Long
Institution: University of Cambridge
Role in assessment team: Institutional assessor

Name: Mr Colin Stanfield
Institution: Wigan and Leigh College
Role in assessment team: Institutional assessor

The DQB Officer for the assessment was: Siobhain O'Mahony.

The size and composition of this assessment 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 expertise in subject areas relevant to the provider's provision. 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 the provider prior to the assessment to identify and resolve any possible conflicts of interest.

About SP Jain London School of Management Ltd

SP Jain London School of Management (the School) is a new provider in the UK and forms part of the established SP Jain Group of Business Schools owned by the company SP Jain Education FZ LLC. These schools are based in Dubai, Singapore, Sydney and Mumbai, the first of which was opened in 2004 in Dubai. Following registration as an Australian higher education provider in 2009 with the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA), all campuses outside the UK currently operate according to the standards regulated by TEQSA. In this report the term 'SP Jain Global' will be used for the collective non-UK sites of delivery.

The School intends to deliver online from February 2023 and face-to-face teaching from one site in Canary Wharf, London from September 2023. The programmes the School intends to offer are:

- Master of Financial Technology (MFT) online to students around the world
- Global Master of Business Administration (GMBA) (face-to-face)
- Master of Global Business (MGB) (face to face)
- Master of Business Administration (Executive) (EMBA) online to UK students.

The MFT, MGB, GMBA will be delivered on a full-time basis only. The EMBA will be delivered to part-time students. The proposed number of full-time and part-time students is expected to be 274 and 108 respectively. All the programmes, with the exception of the MFT, are currently being delivered at the other SP Jain campuses but in the UK all the programmes will be validated by the Royal Agricultural University (RAU). At the time of the assessment visit the validation process was yet to be completed, with the final conditions of validation and the final Memorandum of Agreement to be signed off by the RAU by the end of July 2022.

At the time of the visit, the School had made the following staff appointments: interim Chief Operating Officer, the Dean, Chair of Academic Board and Deputy Director - Accreditation and Regulatory Compliance. Plans of future staff appointments are detailed throughout the report. The Board of Directors (BoD) has ultimate responsibility and accountability for the strategic direction of the School and the quality of the operations of the School and delivery of the programmes. Academic Board, which reports to the Board of Directors, has delegated authority from the BoD for the quality of the programmes. The Learning, Teaching and Quality Assurance Committee (LTQAC), which reports into Academic Board, is responsible for the learning and teaching on the programmes and for providing and monitoring support for staff and students. The Student Council, which is the main forum for students to feed back on their academic experience, will also report into Academic Board.

How the assessment was conducted

The assessment was conducted according to the process set out in Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers (March 2019).

When undertaking a QSR all 13 of the Core practices are considered by the assessment team. However, for this assessment it was clear that the provider does not offer a research degree programme. Therefore, the assessment team did not consider Q7 (where the provider offers research degrees, it delivers these in appropriate and supportive research environments).

To form its judgements about the provider's ability to meet the Core practices, the assessment team considered a range of evidence that was submitted prior to the assessment visit and evidence gathered at the assessment visit itself. [Annex 1] To ensure that the assessment team focused on the principles embedded in the Core practices, and that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other assessments, it utilised Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers to construct this report and detail the key pieces of evidence seen. Annex 4 expects that assessment teams will sample certain types of key evidence using a combination of representative sampling, risk-based sampling and randomised sampling. In this assessment, as the School was not delivering any provision and subsequently there was no assessed student work, admissions records or complaints and appeals examples available, therefore no sampling activity was carried out.

The assessment was conducted online and no facilities tour was conducted as although a site had been chosen, it was in the early stages of development for preparation for 2023 delivery. In this instance, as in other Core practices, the assessment team relied on the School's plans to demonstrate how it would meet the Core practices. The visit included four online meetings with the School's senior staff which included the Dean, interim Chief Operating Officer, Chair of Academic Board and Deputy Director - Accreditation and Regulatory Compliance, as well as SP Jain Global staff, a RAU representative and a member of the Industry Advisory Board. The team did not speak with students, teaching or professional staff as these had not yet been recruited or appointed.

Further details of all the evidence the assessment team considered are provided in Annex 1 of this report.

Explanation of findings

S1   The provider ensures that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks

1   To meet this Core practice a provider must ensure that threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks. The threshold standards for its qualifications must be articulated clearly and must be met, or exceeded, through the delivery of the qualification and the assessment of students.

2   The sector-recognised standards that are used in relation to this Core practice are those that apply in England, as defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS regulatory framework. That is, those set out in Table 1, in paragraphs 4.10, 4.12, 4.15, 4.17, 4.18, in paragraphs 6.13-6.18 and in the Table in Annex C, in the version of The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies (FHEQ) published in October 2014. These sector-recognised standards represent the threshold academic standards for each level of the FHEQ and the minimum volumes of credit typically associated with qualifications at each level.

3   The QAA assessment team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers (March 2019).

What the evidence shows

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

5   The School intends to deliver four postgraduate programmes at its London campus which is currently under development. The programmes to be delivered are:

- Master of Financial Technology (MFT), a 16-month full-time programme to be delivered online with the option of a four-month internship. [056]
- Global Master Business Administration (GMBA), a one-year full-time programme to be delivered face-to-face at the London campus with the option of an internship for four months. [054]
- (Master of Global Business (MGB), a 16-month full-time programme to be delivered face-to-face at the London Campus with the option of a four-month internship. [055]
- Executive Master of Business Administration (EMBA), an 18-month part-time programme to be delivered online. [053]

6   The School has been approved as an institutional partner with the RAU and is planning delivery of programmes from February 2023. Detailed information regarding the responsibilities and roles of parties is provided in a Memorandum of Agreement (MoA). [038] While the final MoA was scheduled to be approved and signed off by the RAU in July 2022, it was not available to the team at the time of the visit. However, the draft version of the MoA clearly sets out the respective roles and responsibilities of both parties to ensure that the threshold standards for the programmes leading to RAU awards delivered by the College are consistent with sector-recognised standards. These include responsibilities for the oversight and maintenance of academic standards; the operation and management of the validated programmes; initial validation, monitoring and review; and assessment and examination arrangements.

7   The School confirms that it will be responsible for maintaining standards in alignment with the RAU framework and sector-recognised standards. While initial documentation in the School submission [001] stated the School would be responsible for 'setting and maintaining' standards, this was further clarified at the staff meeting [M1] where School senior staff were clear on the School's role as a delivery partner in maintaining standards solely and this would be through the use of RAU regulations alongside adherence with sector-recognised standards that apply.

8   The programme validation report [066] indicates that four programmes have been validated by the RAU. The programmes are subject to conditions and recommendations which are to be implemented by 30 June 2022. The team examined the validation report and concluded that the conditions would be met by the School and the recommendations would be implemented by the date set. The conditions are based around updates to the module and programme documentation in 'terms of greater alignment with the RAU' with regard to assessment and formatting, clearer differentiation across common modules on programmes and updating the attendance policy in line with the RAU's requirements and are evidenced in updated programme specifications provided by the School. [053, 054, 055, 056]

9   The School confirmed that the RAU generic grade descriptors, which are applicable at programme level, [057] will be implemented across the programmes. The RAU grade descriptors show the minimum threshold level required is 40%. This mark is further shown in updated module specifications provided. [058; 059; 061, 062, 063, 064] Initially, documentation provided by the School stated minimum threshold levels of 50% in the module specifications. This was further queried by the team and updated module specifications subsequently provided in a request for additional evidence showed threshold levels updated and fully aligned with the RAU. The team concluded that while there was conflicting information regarding minimum threshold levels, updated documentation shows threshold levels in alignment with the RAU's regulatory framework. No module-level assessment rubrics were provided so the team could not judge threshold standards from an assessment rubric perspective. However, staff who met the team [M1] were able to clearly detail how module assessment rubrics would be designed, indicating that the RAU has a generic assessment rubric for all modules and these can be adapted to specific modules and will be included with the module specifications. The School's response to additional evidence [044, pt 18] confirmed this, indicating that the School '…plans to develop assessment briefs for all modules and will work with the RAU Link tutor to ensure good practice and will be using the RAU assessment rubric. Module handbooks are not available as the module specification sheet provides details of the approved format for the module'. While the team could not examine any examples of these, the team is confident that appropriate rubrics would be supplied with modules in line with the RAU Academic Guidelines [001] and the RAU Teaching Quality Handbook. RAU staff demonstrated in the staff meetings [M1, M2] how closely the School and the RAU are currently working together and plan to do so in ensuring close adherence to RAU's academic regulations. Furthermore, the School currently has module-level assessment rubrics on modules delivered internationally and will be adapting these for the UK market. [M1]

10   The team examined the updated programme specifications [053, 054, 055, 056] and a selection of module specifications [058, 059, 061, 062, 063, 064] and concluded that qualification titles, credit volumes, credit values, qualification descriptors and learning outcomes were in line with sector-recognised standards. Staff were also able to verbally confirm an awareness of the need to secure threshold standards in line with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies (FHEQ) and RAU regulations to develop master's-level programmes. [M1] While overall credits in the programme specifications were not clearly stated in the documentation for a master's Level 7 award, School senior staff were able to clarify credit requirements. A master's (without internship) would require 180 credits and a master's (with internship) would require 210

credits. [M1] The team considered that these credit values reflect typical credit values that are aligned with sector-recognised standards.

11   In the updated programme specifications provided, [054, 055, 056] the term 'placements' had been removed as an option and programmes only included internships. Staff explained the rationale for this change which was primarily due to visa restrictions and requirements needed for placements for international students. To address this concern the School decided to only offer four-month internships to students which are shorter in length than the original planned placements (whose duration was not confirmed in the original documentation). [M1] The team does not view the change of placement to internship as a serious concern because students are still given the opportunity to develop work-based learning and gain industry experience through internships.

12   The internship module specification document [063, 064] (offered on both the MFT and MGB) is the only example of a module that is 30 credit-rated and designed with a pass/fail outcome. The School was not able to give an example of the assessment rubric and could not clearly articulate how a pass would be measured. [M1] Consequently, the team did have concerns as to how threshold standards for this module would be met, particularly as the assessment includes a 30-minute presentation and a 3,000 word report. The School stated assessment of this module is in line with the RAU regulations, and rubrics are not provided for this type of module; this was confirmed by the RAU link tutor. [M1] While the School provided detailed guidance in the internship module specification regarding the weekly content, learning outcomes and assessment, they were unable to provide further grading criteria as RAU equivalent internship modules are designed around a binary pass/fail basis. In this instance the School was not in a position to change this module without risking non validation from the RAU. This point was raised by the School and is questioned in the comments section of the validation document. [066] The Internship module specifications [063, 064] do show some relation to sector-recognised standards and reflect qualification descriptors for Level 7 master's degrees and, in particular, detail transferable skills for employment. For example, learning outcome 4 mentions 'Develop strategies to improve their ability to learn effectively from work-based learning opportunities'. The Dean and President stated that [M1] they have robust processes in place to ensure the internship is going well, through milestones and feedback. They also explained that with their experience of managing internships at other campuses and the variety of networks the School has with key employers, the internship opportunity would be a benefit to students. The Dean explained that while grading criteria was not currently offered to students and this was not something they had planned for, the School would discuss this further with the RAU and how students could achieve the threshold standards. The Dean further expanded they would be working on developing assessment rubrics to determine minimum threshold standards to be ready for the first cohorts of the internship module in 2024. [M1] While the design of the current Internship module is not aligned with all the other modules on the programmes, the team agrees the Internship module and opportunities it provides to students is a main strength and of valuable learning benefit within the programmes.

13   The School has developed its own policies and frameworks to ensure threshold standards are consistent with sector-recognised standards and the FHEQ. The Quality Assurance Framework [003] sets out the provision for maintaining quality standards through quality guidelines and the academic governance structure. The Framework policy states that all aspects of the operation and management of the programme will be in accordance with the academic regulations of the RAU and with procedures approved by the RAU. The approach to assessment design is specified in the School's Assessment, Validation, Grading and Moderation Policy. [005] Assessments are constructed around learning outcomes which in turn are consistent with sector-recognised standards at both module and programme level enabling students to achieve threshold academic standards. Validation of assessment briefs will be undertaken at an internal validation through the completion of an Internal Validation

form and in the first year will be overseen by RAU academics. A combination of formative and summative assessments will be used giving students opportunities to receive feedback to enable them to achieve threshold standards. The Learning and Teaching Enhancement Plan [009] shows development plans for teaching and learning at faculty, department and course levels and is overseen by the Academic Board. This document additionally highlights the mechanism for monitoring academic standards through the School's Learning, Teaching and Quality Assurance Committee (LTQAC) and Academic Board. The School has Terms of Reference for its Academic Board [045] which set out the Board's scope and responsibilities. For example, Academic Board will monitor the quality of courses, teaching and learning and report to the Board of Directors. While no evidence is available from previous meetings and minutes that this has so far taken place because the School is not currently delivering any programmes, the team concluded that the combination of the School's Quality Assurance Framework, [003] Assessment, Validation, Grading and Moderation Policy, [005] Learning and Teaching Enhancement Plan, [009] and Academic Board Terms of Reference [045] provided evidence to suggest robust and credible plans and policies are in place to ensure threshold standards.

14   The School has additional documents relating to Learning and Course Development that will be adapted for the UK. [087] Its Assurance of Learning Policy [050] highlights that, at all times, the degree/accredited courses offered and delivered by the School adhere to the Core practices of the UK Quality Code and any other relevant professional standards that may apply. The Equivalency of Student Learning and Experience Policy [051] aims to provide all students with the opportunity to achieve the expected learning outcomes for the programme on which they are enrolled, regardless of their mode of study or the campus at which they are taught. The Course Development, Review and Approval Policy [050] stipulates that the Academic Board internally reviews each programme offered by the School at least once every two years for minor modifications and also stipulates a comprehensive external and independent review at least once every five years for each course. While these policies have been designed for SP Jain Global programmes validated by TEQSA, the School has stated that these will be modified to UK standards once the MoA with the RAU has been agreed. [044, 087] The team concludes that the addition of these School policies, once adapted for the UK, will further strengthen the credibility and the robustness of the School's approach to ensuring threshold standards are consistent with sector-recognised standards.

15   The School's high-level governance and administration structure is laid out in the School submission, [001] Academic Board's Terms of Reference, [045] the Industry Advisory Board's Terms of Reference [049] and The Quality Assurance Framework. [003] The Board of Directors (BoD) has ultimate responsibility for the overall quality of the higher education operations in the School. The School's CEO is responsible, under delegated authority from the Board of Directors, for the quality of the corporate, financial operations and academic administration of the School. The Academic Board is responsible, under delegated authority from the Board of Directors, for the quality of all educational courses offered by the School. [045] In addition, the Industry Advisory Board provides strategic advice to the BoD to ensure programmes and the education provided is relevant to industry. [049] The School was not able to provide a detailed organisation structure because it said that this was under constant review and was not finalised, so the team cannot comment on the organisation structure. Staff stated this will be updated once key personnel including the Head of Student Admissions, Head of Recruitment and Marketing, Head of Student Support, Learning Technologist, Head of Finance, Registrar, Head of Quality Assurance, and Head of Careers and Internship are in place, [M1] [087] (further details of future appointments can be found under Q3, paragraph 155).

16   Staff demonstrated an understanding of sector-recognised standards by referencing Level 7 FHEQ standards and how these would be maintained. [M1, M4] Staff were able to

clearly articulate their responsibilities for maintaining standards and referenced the guidelines agreed with the RAU. Staff made clear reference to the 180 and 210 credit structure for a master's degree (with and without internship). School senior staff were able to reference sector-recognised standards and confirmed appropriate credit values had been assigned for Level 7 master's with internship and without internships. In addition, staff discussed relevant qualification titles for Level 7 master's degrees with various exit awards. The School's Dean, Interim Chief Operating Officer and SP Jain Global's President were able to discuss all programmes in relation to the qualification descriptors for this level of award and provided a suitable reflection of expected student outcomes. The Dean and the Interim Chief Operation Officer were able to show significant knowledge and experience of the UK higher education sector. Staff were able to discuss the approach to assessment design and highlighted the design of assessments to test Level 7 outcomes at threshold standards which will be scrutinised with the RAU through internal validation. Staff were able to discuss marking and moderation processes as set out in the School's Assessment, Validation, Grading, Moderation Policy. [005] Staff discussed the use of the standardisation process where full scripts would be marked and compared to ensure consistent marking between markers. Samples of assessed work will be sent to the RAU with 10% of samples used for moderation. Staff will mark in line with the Assessment Validation Grading and Moderation document, [005] using assessment rubrics and generic grade descriptors. The team concluded that staff had a good understanding of the approach to maintaining standards and were verbally able to confirm aspects of the documentation provided, including the School's Assessment Validation Grading and Moderation document, [005] the Learning Teaching and Enhancement Policy, [009] and the Quality Assurance Framework. [003]

Conclusions

17   As described above, the assessment team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the assessment team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other assessments and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

18   From the evidence seen, the team considers that the standards set for the provider's courses are in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS's regulatory framework. The team also considers that standards described in the approved programme documentation are set at levels that are consistent with these sector-recognised standards and the provider's academic regulations and policies should ensure that standards can be maintained appropriately. The team considers that, based on the evidence scrutinised, the standards that will be achieved by the provider's students are expected to be in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS's regulatory framework. The team also considers that the provider's academic regulations and policies will ensure that these standards can be maintained. The team considers that staff fully understand the provider's approach to maintaining these standards and that the evidence seen demonstrates the provider is committed to implementing this approach.

19   The School has developed a range of assessment, learning and teaching and quality policies and procedures that, once finalised and adapted for the UK, will provide a robust and credible overarching framework to maintain threshold standards. Although predominantly in draft format, the documentation provided demonstrates clear mechanisms to maintain standards through the School's governance structure. The team was only able to meet members of the senior management team and ascertained that the senior

management team had a good knowledge and understanding of threshold standards and how these would be maintained. Staff who met the team were able to detail the approach to assessment design, moderation and classification of awards; were clearly able to articulate the role and implementation of RAU's academic regulations; and demonstrated a strong and close working relationship with the RAU in maintaining standards. Therefore, the team concludes that, should the documentation be approved and finalised for the UK as planned, processes be implemented as stated, and staff recruited and trained as outlined, this Core practice is met.

20   The School has extensive experience in delivering similar programmes at other global campuses and has a strong working relationship with the RAU. The School has an experienced senior management team including members who have significant experience of the UK HE sector. However, given that the School is still at a relatively early stage in its preparation, and delivery has not yet taken place, at the time of the visit the team was unable to examine any finalised programme specifications, policy documents or module assessments with rubrics. External examiner and third-party reports alongside student assessed work and finalised assessment briefs were unavailable. Documents such as the programme specifications, validation conditions and the MoA, were still in draft stage awaiting final approval from the RAU. The School's organisation structure is detailed at the higher levels but is yet to be finalised at the lower levels. Therefore, the team has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.

S2 The provider ensures that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers

21   This Core practice expects that the provider ensures that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.

22   The QAA assessment team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

What the evidence shows

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

24   The School is fully aware of its role in maintaining academic standards and the levels of achievement required for students to achieve beyond the threshold levels. [M1] This was articulated in the meeting by the President, Dean, Interim Chief Operating Officer and the Chair of the Academic Board. Additional evidence for students to achieve beyond the threshold standards is demonstrated in the RAU Generic Grade Descriptors, [057] the programme descriptors, [053, 054, 055, 056] and the School's Assessment Validation Grading Moderation Policy. [005] Clear guidelines have been agreed and allocated between the School and the awarding body as stated in the draft MoA [038] and the responsibilities checklist. [043] The School will be responsible for course design/delivery, setting assessments, first marking of student work, moderation or second marking of student work, giving feedback to students on work with shared responsibility with the RAU for use of external expertise in maintaining academic standards and moderation or second marking of student work. Standards for programmes and assessments will be monitored by the School's LTQAC, programme leaders, module leaders, the RAU link tutor and overseen by the School's Academic Board, and assessment processes are outlined in the Quality Assurance Framework [003] and the Learning and Teaching Enhancement Policy. [009] Levels beyond the threshold statement are clearly described in the RAU academic regulations [001] for Level 7 qualifications and various grade boundaries are fully explained in the generic programme grade descriptors [057] with indications of a pass, merit and distinction. Each programme specification outlines clear learning outcomes reflecting Level 7 standards and gives an overview of credits required for various awards. [053, 054, 055, 056] The PG Diploma is 120 credits, the PG Certificate 160 credits and the MSc (without internship) 180 credits, this credit structure is further aligned with the RAU credit structures outlined in the RAU academic regulations. [001] The team also found that there is clear information available for students to achieve beyond the threshold standards because it is available in the RAU academic regulations, the programme specifications [053, 054, 055, 056] and the generic programme grade descriptors. [057]

25   Given the early stages of the School's development, the team was unable to examine any specific module assessments briefs or assessment rubrics which would have given an indication of how students could achieve beyond the threshold standards and the levels of achievement required. The approach to assessment design is specified in the School's Assessment, Validation, Grading and Moderation Policy. [005] Assessments are constructed around learning outcomes which in turn are consistent with sector-recognised standards at both the module and programme level enabling students to achieve beyond threshold academic standards. Templates which have been approved by RAU and can be

found in the RAU academic regulations [001] are used for assessment briefs to ensure consistency and quality and the School's Assessment, Validation, Grading and Moderation Policy [005, Appendix A] which, when implemented, would ensure credit and qualifications are awarded only where standards have been met. The assessment brief template provides information on requirements for the assessment, learning outcomes tested and marking criteria.

26   Validation of assessment briefs is to be undertaken at internal validation through the completion of an Internal Validation form and in the first year will be overseen by RAU academics. The Assessment, Validation, Grading and Moderation Policy [005] states that a combination of formative and summative assessments is to be used, giving students opportunities to receive feedback to enable them to achieve beyond threshold standards. Details of formative and summative assessments are provided in module specification documents. [058-065] While no module-level assessment rubrics were available for the team to examine, staff were able to clearly articulate the process of setting assessment rubrics for individual modules. [M1] Staff explained the RAU has a standard academic rubric for every level including Level 7. While staff acknowledged this standard may not work as well across every module, it was used as a baseline to ensure a common understanding of marking standards and could be adapted for different modules. It was confirmed that the School's Head of Learning and Teaching would maintain an oversight over assessment rubrics alongside the module moderator to ensure consistency across modules. [M1]

27   While no examples of assessment rubrics or briefs were available for the team to scrutinise, the team found that the School has clear and coherent plans for students to achieve beyond threshold standards as evidenced in the policies and approaches above, which are clear, coherent and credible and would enable a robust approach if plans are implemented as outlined. Staff were able to articulate opportunities for students to achieve beyond threshold standards through the use of formative and summative assignments to assist students and tutorial mechanisms and opportunities for additional feedback and drew attention to the use of the external examiner to examine the spread of marks. [M1]

28   Students are to be given the opportunity to engage in a four-month internship as part of their programme, thus providing students with valuable work experience and extending their learning and development beyond the classroom environment. This is available to students after the taught elements of their programme have finished and is available across the following programmes: GMBA, MGB and MFT. [054,055,056] The Work Based Learning Policy [025] provides guidance on how the WBL will be provided and managed safely and effectively to give a high-quality experience. QAA's Advice and Guidance on Work-based learning defines WBL as '...authentic structured opportunities for learning which are achieved in a workplace setting or are designed to meet an identified workplace need'. While the internship module is based on a pass/fail basis as given in the module specifications, [063, 064] students are not given the opportunity to achieve beyond a pass mark as detailed in S1 (paragraph 12). However, the team agrees that this is a valuable opportunity for students to develop knowledge, experience and professional skills in an industry environment and so holistically achieve beyond the threshold standards. The role of internships and opportunities available to students were further expanded on in the staff meetings where the President, Head of Business Development and Dean of the Global MBA and MGB were able to demonstrate substantial experience in managing and acquiring internships, given their international access to networks and companies. [M1] For example, the President mentioned 80 alumni working in the UK who are willing to work and help the School.

29   Staff shared examples of how the School would train and induct staff on maintaining standards to support students to achieve beyond the threshold standards. [M1] Staff referenced the inclusion of a common orientation programme with tutorials to be shared with

staff on required standards and practices. The team's examination of existing videos for SPJ Global staff led the team to conclude that this was insightful and supportive in onboarding new staff and the team considered the approach could be adapted for UK staff relatively easily and would be a valuable resource if implemented as planned. Furthermore, given the global nature of the School and its experience in delivering programmes at other campuses, the School aims that staff teaching on the same programme share best practice and facilitate sessions where assessment patterns and learning outcomes are understood. In addition, the School aims to include internal staff development sessions for UK staff to be led by a range of senior staff including the Dean (already appointed), programme leaders (to be appointed) and the Head of Learning and Teaching (to be appointed). The RAU will also provide feedback on internal training sessions. The team concludes that the plans for inducting and training staff are comprehensive and already well embedded at other campuses and, if implemented as outlined, would contribute to staff understanding and support the School's approach to ensuring that students awarded qualifications would have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK HE providers.

30   The School stated that external examiners will be used to examine assessments and confirm academic standards. [M1, M4, 003 and 005] The Dean explained that working in collaboration with the RAU, the School will work with external examiners on standards to ensure comparability with other UK HE providers. While no external examiner reports were available to the team to scrutinise, staff were able to clearly articulate the inclusion and use of external examiners in maintaining academic standards and ensuring comparability with other UK HE providers. Staff [M1] confirmed that the RAU would be responsible for hiring and allocating external examiners to programmes, which was reinforced by the RAU link tutor. External examiners will have access to the School's virtual learning environment (VLE), and to marking rubrics and moderation. The external examiner will sit on the examination board and produce a report, which would reflect the School's standards and quality of marking and moderation. Staff explained how they would ensure standards would be comparable to the other providers through the use of external examiners and benchmarking methods. [M4] The Chair of the Academic Board confirmed that every aspect of the curriculum had been vetted and changes made to ensure comparability with other UK higher education providers. The School's Benchmarking Policy and Procedures document [013] contains detailed information on benchmarking across the sector using internal and external processes but relates to Australian external benchmarking organisations (TEQSA). Staff [M4] confirmed that this document would be adapted to the UK sector and will include UK benchmarking organisations. The team considers that, if external examiners are used as outlined in the plans and benchmarking procedures are updated to include UK organisations, the School is likely to ensure that students awarded the qualifications to which their programmes lead will have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK HE providers.

Conclusions

31   As described above, the assessment team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the assessment team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other assessments and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

32   Based on the evidence presented, the team determined that the standards set for students to achieve beyond the threshold on the provider's courses are reasonably comparable with those set by other UK providers. The team considered that the standards

described in the approved programme documentation and in the provider's academic regulations and policies should ensure that such standards are maintained appropriately.

33   The team determined that, based on the evidence seen, the standards that will be achieved by the provider's students beyond the threshold are expected to be reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers. The team considered that the provider's academic regulations and policies should ensure that standards beyond the threshold are maintained. Based on the detailed scrutiny of the evidence, the team considered that staff at the provider fully understand the provider's approach to maintaining such standards and have opportunities for engagement with peers and external experts in teaching and assessment activities. The team considers the provider's plans for maintaining comparable standards to be appropriate, well-documented and understood by staff members.

34   The School demonstrated a strong working relationship with the RAU with regard to the maintenance of academic standards and has clear plans to afford students the opportunity to achieve beyond the threshold standards using a combination of its own policies and plans and those set by its awarding body. Clear guidelines of achieving beyond a pass and attaining a merit or distinction are clearly labelled in the RAU academic regulations and generic postgraduate grade descriptors. Additional information is given through clear learning outcomes in the programme and module specifications. While no assessment briefs or assessment rubrics were available to examine, the School has a good understanding of how these would be implemented using the RAU module assessment rubrics and the assessment brief template. The School has a range of documents and policies in place for maintaining standards including clear RAU grade descriptors, defined programme specifications, Assessment Validation Grading Moderation Policy, [005] the Quality Framework [003] and the Learning and Teaching Plan. [009] These are supported by the RAU's academic regulations and the MoA. The School has defined mechanisms in place to manage these policies including the Learning and Teaching Committee, the Academic Board and the Board of Directors. The team concluded that if implemented as planned, the School can be considered to have robust and credible approaches and clear and comprehensive academic regulations for maintaining comparable standards beyond the threshold level. The School's intended use of external examiners and processes included in the Assessment Validation Moderation and Grading policy and the Quality Assurance Framework provides further evidence to support the team's view.

35   At the time of the visit the team did not have access to any communications given to students on achieving beyond the threshold standards or any training material for UK staff in delivering and maintaining standards. However, the team agrees that there are structured and coherent plans in place for training and inducting staff, as confirmed by staff who demonstrated how these would be implemented, and comparable standards that are appropriate, well-documented and understood by staff members. Therefore, the team concludes, based on the evidence described above, that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers and this Core practice is met.

36   Given that the School is still at a relatively early stage in its preparation and delivery has not yet taken place, at the time of the visit the team was unable to examine any finalised student work, marked assessments, assessment briefs or assessment rubrics. External examiner and benchmarking reports for the UK were not available, although staff showed a good understanding of how these would be incorporated. The School additionally has extensive experience in delivering these programmes and modules at its other international campuses and in line with other regulatory bodies. Therefore, the team has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.

S3 Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them

37   This Core practice expects that where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them.

38   The QAA assessment team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers (March 2019).

What the evidence shows

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

40   The submission [001] identifies that the School has established a partnership with the RAU, the detail of which is articulated in the RAU MoA. [038] The submission [001] and agreement [038] state that oversight and maintenance of academic standards of the awards made under the partnership are the responsibility of the RAU.

41   The MoA [038] is comprehensive, as it sets out clearly the responsibilities of each partner and details the roles that are to be established to manage and oversee the operation of the agreement. The MoA is unambiguous in stating that the RAU has responsibility for the oversight and maintenance of academic standards and that these responsibilities will be exercised through the RAU Academic Quality and Standards Committee (AQASC), initially through validation and review processes but subsequently through the RAU's normal procedures. The agreement is very clear in setting out where responsibilities lie, who will discharge these responsibilities and which School and RAU committees will consider the academic standards and quality outcomes of the partnership. The MoA [038] shows that the School will deliver and manage the validated programmes in accordance with the academic regulations of the RAU. The team acknowledged that the agreement provides a robust framework around which academic standards will be assured within the partnership.

42   While at the time of the assessment visit the final approved version of the Memorandum of Agreement was not available to the team, the RAU link tutor and senior staff from the School [M1; M2] were confident that this draft memorandum would be approved without substantive change.

43   The Institutional Approval Report [037] shows that following an institutional approval event by the RAU in January 2022, the School was approved as an institutional partner of the RAU for a three-year period from May 2022 to April 2025. The RAU institutional approval process confirmed that academic quality and standards at SP Jain London School of Management meet or are likely to meet the requirements of, and are comparable to, those at the awarding body.

44   The report [037] is robust and detailed because it has been informed by extensive documentary evidence submitted by the School and by a formal approval panel meeting. The panel consisted of senior staff from the RAU, including the Senior Partnerships Manager, the Deputy Vice Chancellor and the Head of Enterprise who will act as the link tutor. Representatives from the School included the Directors of SP Jain Global and SP Jain London. The report demonstrates how the School has responded to the requirements placed

on it by the RAU in terms of academic standards, for example adapting the credit frameworks of its programmes to align with those of the awarding body. While institutional partnership approval was recommended by the panel a number of conditions were set. These included readiness of the site and preparation for the validation of programmes. At the time of the assessment visit, the School confirmed that progress had been made against the conditions which were due to be signed off by the RAU on or after 20 July 2022. [Request for additional evidence 087, M1]

45   Programmes that the School plans to deliver in 2023 were subject to RAU validation at a Validation and Review Panel held on 5 May 2022, [066 RAU Programmes Validation Report 5th May 2022] as part of the RAU's quality assurance process to ensure that academic programmes meet or exceed the threshold standards appropriate to the level of the provision and ensure the quality of the student experience. The panel consisted of senior staff from the RAU, senior representatives from the School and the programmes were proposed by the RAU Head of Enterprise who acts as the link tutor.

46   The validation event was thorough, having received extensive documentation in advance and examining in detail a wide range of aspects relating to the proposed programmes, including staffing and resources, student recruitment and support, curriculum, learning, teaching and assessment and programme quality management. The review panel gave approval for the proposed programmes for three years with six conditions set which included amending programme documentation to reflect comments from the RAU on the programme specifications; amending the School's attendance policy to align it with the RAU's and reviewing the assessment elements to align with the RAU's pedagogic framework. As with the institutional report, at the time of the assessment visit, the conditions of the validations were waiting to be signed off with final approval by the RAU on or after 20 July 2022. [Request for additional evidence 087, M1]

47   In accordance with the MoA, [038] the School has [Submission – 001 - para 14] established an Academic Board to act as the principal academic governance forum for the partnership and to review the quality of the student experience. The Board will also ensure that operating practices of the School conform to the MoA [038] and the procedures and responsibilities of the two partners. Membership of the Board includes the RAU link tutor. The detailed terms of reference for the Academic Board are set out in the MoA [038] and illustrate a sound basis for the role of the Board. This is demonstrated in the minutes of the Academic Board held on 15 June 2022 [088] which the team found show due consideration of key aspects of partnership, such as how the awarding body will conduct examination boards and how the School's Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) policy must align with that of the RAU.

48   The RAU has appointed a link tutor, who is the Head of Enterprise, to oversee the programmes on the RAU 's behalf in accordance with the requirements of the RAU's Policies and Regulations. [Submission 001 – para 14] [MoA 038 – page 3] In terms of reporting, it is planned that the link tutor will produce an overall annual monitoring report for the Partnership, informed in part by the annual Programme Manager's report(s). Additionally, the School will designate a Partner Institution Manager to act as the key point of contact with the RAU. Details of the role are clearly set out in the MoA. [038]

49   The MoA also shows that each programme or group of cognate programmes will have a Programme Manager designated by the School and requires the University's establishment of a Programme Committee whose terms of reference are clearly defined in the MoA. [038] The committee will monitor the delivery of the programme, including recruitment of students and teaching and curriculum. The Programme Manager will be required to submit to the RAU an Annual Programme Manager's report in accordance with the details set out in the RAU Teaching Quality Handbook Part 3a - Programme Validation

and Review. [Accessed 10.05.22] Initially the School plans to appoint one Programme Manager for all programmes but intends to extend this to one Programme Manager per programme as recruitment grows. [044 – point 1]

50   The roles of the Academic Board, [ToR -049] the RAU link tutor, the Partner Institution Manager, School Programme Manager and School Programme Committee are detailed and clearly described in the Agreement. [038] Therefore, the team considered that this constitutes a strong matrix for the robust management of academic standards in the partnership.

51   The team heard from the RAU Head of Enterprise, who acts as a link tutor with the School [M1] that a strong relationship built on trust and mutual respect had been established between the partners. The Head of Enterprise confirmed that the School had worked positively with the RAU to develop programmes and ensure that they meet the standards set by the RAU.

52   Given the duration and extent of engagement between senior staff at the School, a broad range of senior staff at the RAU and, in particular, the RAU Head of Enterprise, the team formed the view that the parties had a clear understanding of their responsibilities with regard to the setting and maintenance of academic standards within the partnership. For example, the Head of Enterprise described [M1] how senior staff from the School had worked productively to adapt existing programme specifications (from SP Jain Global) to meet the requirements of the RAU's credit and assessment framework. Overall, the team found that there are clear and comprehensive regulations and policies developed by both parties to the partnership. The team considered that these demonstrate a robust and credible approach to securing standards within the partnership.

53   The submission [001] states that the School is in the process of developing an articulation agreement with the RAU in respect of the School's 'multi-city model' whereby the School's students may study at the School's other international campuses. However, the School confirmed [087 – Request for additional evidence post FTM – point 29] and the team heard [M1] that these plans are not yet to be taken forward. International students wishing to study on SP Jain UK programmes will be admitted on the basis of recognition of prior learning (RPL) regulations, overseen by the RAU, rather than through an articulation agreement.

54   The programme specifications [GMBA – 054; MGB – 055; MFT – 056] show that students will be required to undertake an internship as a formal assessed element of their studies. In this regard the School has plans to work in partnership with a range of internship providers and details of the operational arrangements for this can be found in Q8 (paragraphs 234-245).

55   The team examined how academic standards would be maintained with regard to the internship module. The module specifications [GMBA – 054; MGB – 055; MFT – 056] show that the module has a credit value of 30 and that the module will be assessed on a pass or fail basis. This is the only module on the programmes with a 30-credit value and the team noted in the specifications that assessment is by means of a presentation and a 3,000 word report. The team explored this with School senior staff and with the RAU link tutor [M1] given that the volume of assessment could only lead to a pass or fail outcome and that no rubrics were used when assessing this module. Staff confirmed that, in this regard, the School was following RAU regulations, where internship modules were allocated a 30-credit value and that the RAU did not use a rubric for this type of module and they had adapted the internship module specification accordingly. This was confirmed by the RAU link tutor. The team noted the School's intentions to manage the module and continue discussions with the RAU before delivery in 2024 as noted in S1 (paragraph 12). As a consequence, the team

was assured that the academic standards for the internship module were in line with RAU regulations and were likely to be assured if assessment practices are followed and implemented in accordance with RAU requirements. The Work-Based Learning Policy [025] shows that the Academic Tutor is required to liaise with the internship provider and the student to ensure that the work experience opportunities align with the learning outcomes of the internship module, as set out in the programme specifications, [040;041;042] which the team agreed would further strengthen the School's approach to assuring academic standards across the internship experience.

Conclusions

56   As described above, the assessment team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the assessment team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other assessments and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

57   The principal partnership is between the RAU and SP Jain UK and is fully documented in the draft MoA and the Institutional Approval Panel Report. The RAU has the responsibility for setting and maintaining academic standards. As such, the School policies, procedures and committee structure for higher education are largely determined by the MoA and academic regulations of the RAU.

58   The key partnership agreement is the MoA between the RAU and SP Jain UK. While the agreement is yet to be formally approved, the team found that, given the very detailed and comprehensive nature of the Memorandum, it provides a robust framework around which academic standards will be assured within the partnership.

59   Collectively the policies and regulations of both parties form a robust matrix that should secure academic standards delivered by the partnership. Staff from both the School and the RAU demonstrated a clear understanding of their respective responsibilities and were at pains to emphasise the extent to which they had worked productively in a spirit of trust and mutual respect to ensure that the School can meet the standards set by the awarding body.

60   The team heard how the RAU and School senior staff have worked together and in detail over an extended period to ensure that the School's academic policies, regulations and programmes fully align with and meet the standards set by the awarding body, which in turn meet sector-recognised standards. Evidence scrutinised by the team confirms that approaches to securing standards are enhanced by the active engagement of the awarding body and the full compliance of the School with requirements set by the RAU. Standards of the proposed internships are underpinned by the internship module specifications and by the internship assessment requirements set by the RAU and will be overseen by an appointed Academic Tutor. The team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.

61   Because the School has yet to commence delivery it was not possible for the team to scrutinise external examiner reports, third party endorsements (such as PSRB reports) or assessed student work. The team also found that conditions set by the Institutional Approval Panel and the RAU Validation and Review Panel were not yet confirmed as having been met as they are due to be formally approved by the RAU Academic and Quality Standards committee and by the School's Academic Board by the end of July 2022. Therefore, the team has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.

S4 The provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent

62   This Core practice expects that the provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent.

63   The QAA assessment team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

What the evidence shows

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

65   The responsibilities checklist [043] identifies that the School has the responsibility for assessment development and setting, first marking of student work, and for giving feedback to students on their work. The moderation or second marking of student assessed work and the use of external expertise in maintaining academic standards is a shared responsibility between the School and the RAU. The RAU has responsibility for the appointment of external examiners.

66   The programme specifications [039; 040; 041; 042] and sample module specifications [058; 059; 060; 061; 062; 064; 065] clearly define learning outcomes of programmes and modules and how they will be assessed. These specifications will be used by the School to provide transparent and readily accessible information to students about the overall assessment strategy for the programme and this will be supplemented by assessment briefs as detailed below. [Submission 001 – 39; Meeting 1] The team heard [M1] that, in alignment with the approach adopted by the RAU, the School will use module specifications rather than module handbooks to inform students about assessment and classification which the team found to be an adequate approach.

67   The School's submission, [001] MoA [038] with the RAU, and Assessment, Validation, Grading and Moderation Policy [005] all describe in detail how assessments will be developed by the School's academic staff, namely the module team and that, in the first year of delivery, the RAU link tutor will assist School staff with this activity. All summative assessments are required to be issued to students in the form of a standardised assessment brief [RAU Assessment brief template - 103] which details the learning outcomes to be assessed, what the student is expected to do and the timeframe for submission, marking and feedback. For example, there is a 15-working day requirement for the return of grades to students on their assessed work.

68   The team found that the School's Assessment, Validation, Grading and Moderation Policy [005] is detailed and comprehensive as it refers to both summative and formative assessment, and sets out the processes for assessment design, validation, grading and moderation.

69   The policy confirms that proposed assessments will be validated by the School prior to being set for students and that this must be evidenced through completion of an internal validation form. [005 – appendix A page 9] Validation will be undertaken by the Programme Manager or by an alternative Programme Manager or Academic Dean where there is a potential conflict of interest. [044] The Programme Leader is required to keep a copy of all completed forms for all assessment briefs and/or examinations given to students.

70   Additionally, the School's Policy, [005] in accordance with the RAU's academic

regulations, shows that examination papers and answer scripts must be submitted to the external examiner for approval before they are given to students and that the external examiner may also be consulted on other assessment briefs.

71   As the School is yet to commence development and delivery of assessments, the team was not able to assess external examiner reports. However, the team heard [M1] that there will be one external examiner per programme, appointed by the RAU, and that the external examiner will be afforded access to student assessed work through the School's VLE. Additionally, the external examiner will be provided with standard rubrics for assessment at Level 7, against which assessed work will be graded.

72   Together, the detailed and comprehensive plans set out in these steps in the development and validation of assessments prior to them being set for students, the support for the School from the RAU and the planned external examiner input provide a robust approach to ensuring that assessments are fair and reliable.

73   With regard to the marking of student assessed work, the submission [001] and MoA [038] and the Assessment, Validation, Grading and Moderation Policy [005] show that School staff are responsible for the first marking of student assessed work and that, in the first year of delivery and assessment, they will be supported in this by the RAU link tutor. A sample of 10% of student assessed work will be submitted to the RAU link tutor for guidance on assessment practice, grading and feedback to students. In the longer term, the School plans to subscribe to Advance HE and the National Teaching Fellow Scheme to enable the School to further support staff development in assessment and other practices. [044 point 30; M1] Additionally, the team heard [M1] how the School plans to support its staff in their assessment practice based on its Staff Development Policy [015] which outlines, in general, the School's approach to staff development.

74   The moderation or second marking of student assessed work will be a shared responsibility between the School and the RAU, where the latter will sample assessments from all modules. [001; 038; 005: M1] The link tutor from the RAU commented [M1] that the awarding body adopts a standard rubric for assessments at Level 7 [057] which can be differentiated across modules, and staff from the School confirmed that they will adopt this approach. The team heard [M1] that the School's Head of Teaching and Learning will evaluate all rubrics.

75   The Assessment, Validation, Grading and Moderation Policy [005] provides valuable detail on the marking and grading process and identifies the following stages for summative assessments: standardisation; marking; internal moderation; programme leader approval; University moderation; and external examiner consideration. The policy [005] confirms that marking and grading is anonymous and details what is expected and by whom at each stage. For example, adopting different approaches to second marking with respect to assessments which contribute more or less than 30 credits. The policy [005] also describes how all results of assessed work and examinations will be considered and confirmed by the RAU University Examination Board, chaired by a member of University AQSC or nominee. Grades will be inputted to the University student record system by the School and the RAU will process and administer examination boards. Student transcripts will be provided to the School by the RAU for distribution to students. The policy [005] makes brief reference to academic misconduct and to mitigating circumstances; however, the approach of the School to both aspects is further detailed in the School's Academic Integrity Policy [011] and Mitigating Circumstances Policy. [027] Notwithstanding the issues identified with the internship module as identified in S1 and S3 (paragraphs 12 and 56), collectively, the team found that these policies [Assessment, Validation, Grading and Moderation Policy 005; Academic Integrity Policy 011; Mitigating Circumstances Policy 027] which align with the MoA [028] demonstrate clear and comprehensive plans by the School to ensure that

assessments are reliable, fair and transparent.

76   The team heard [M1] that staff had a good understanding of the RAU's approach to assessment and grading and how the School would adopt and adapt these processes to the needs of the programmes they plan to deliver. Additionally, the School will be supported in assessment activity by named staff from the RAU as set out in the MoA. [028] Furthermore, external examiners will contribute to the assessment process [005] prior to assessments being set for students and in the marking and grading of student assessment work. These processes too will help to ensure the reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment.

77   The responsibilities checklist, [043] the MoA [038] and School submission [001] show that the RAU is responsible for the appointment of, and administration related to, external examiners for each of the programmes that the School plans to deliver in 2023, but that the School is responsible for considering and responding to the external examiner reports. The School's Academic Board, [049 – ToR Academic Board] established in accordance with the MoA, [038] will receive and consider all external examiner reports and its subcommittees, the Examination Board and the LTQAC will respond to specific matters raised in external examiner reports. [001]

78   The School has a track record of using an Industry Advisory Board (IAB) at its existing campuses [College website - https://www.spjain.org/discover/leadership accessed 11.05.22] and has plans to establish an IAB for its UK School. [044 – point 2] The terms of reference for the IAB [045 – ToR IAB] show that the Board will provide strategic industry advice to the School, foster industry partnerships and connections, provide advice that contributes to new course development areas and the review of existing courses, and provide feedback about graduate employability, course alignment with current industry practice and the relevance and currency of the School's courses.

79   Minutes of the School's Board of Directors meeting [046 BoD meeting 25.04.22] confirm due consideration of plans to establish and expand membership of the IAB with an intention to increase membership from five to 10. Details are given of members which show that they represent the key sectors to which the School's proposed programmes will relate, specifically Fintech, entrepreneurship, consultancy and strategic leadership. As such, the team considered that it is likely that the IAB will be able to make a valuable independent and expertise based contribution to the development and review of programmes to ensure that they meet and continue to meet industry expectations and intended learning outcomes. The first meeting of the IAB is scheduled for mid-July 2022.

80   The team spoke to [M1] a current member of the School's UK IAB who is an active business owner and investigated their understanding of their role in the context of the curriculum as a whole and assessment in particular. They were able to effectively articulate their role in terms of contributing to ensuring that course content was current through consistent testing of the quality of teaching and learning material and that assessments were relevant. Furthermore, by engaging in the provision of internships, they could ensure that students applied their theory to practice and vice versa.

81   To increase the input of external independent expertise, the School has appointed to the Board of Directors a professor from another longstanding university and is seeking to appoint one additional independent member of the Board, which is to be confirmed at the Board meeting on 11 July 2022. [044 point 27: M1]

82   The submission [001- para 29] and response to additional evidence request [044 point 13] shows that the School has plans to commission an independent expert panel to conduct a five-yearly external review of programmes. The team explored this [M1] and heard that, given the first review would be at least five years away, these plans are not yet fully developed. However, School staff were able to explain how such a review would integrate

with ongoing quality assurance processes and were clear in their understanding of how engagement with independent external experts would enhance their curriculum and assessment. [M1]

83   School staff also emphasised [M1] that they are able to draw upon wide ranging expertise from its SP Jain Global network and considered that this too would provide valuable input to ensure that the curriculum is current and that assessment is relevant.

84   The team agreed that the School has clearly defined and broad-ranging plans for using independent external expertise to inform its course development and review and its assessment practices. Such expertise is derived from industry in the case of the Industry Advisory Board and from academia in the case of the RAU link tutor, external examiners and the independent members of the Board of Directors. Collectively these approaches are likely to ensure that course content is current and that assessment is reliable and fair and that both aspects are informed by independent, external expertise.

Conclusions

85   As described above, the assessment team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the assessment team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other assessments and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

86   Clear and comprehensive regulations and policies describe assessment practices that are in accordance with the academic regulations of the RAU and detailed in the programme and module specifications and in the School's Assessment, Validation, Grading and Moderation Policy. These approved specifications will be used to inform students of the School's approaches to, and expectations for, assessment. The specifications have been developed with the input of external experts and have been subject to a rigorous approval process led by the awarding body.

87   The School's approach to assessment of the mandatory internship modules aligns with the assessment regulations of the awarding body, which in turn align with sector-recognised standards informing the team's view that assessment of these modules is likely to be fair, reliable and transparent.

88   The School's approaches for assessment and classification are strongly supported by the awarding body link tutor. They include validation of assessments prior to them being set for students, the use of first and second markers, sampling by the link tutor, moderation and review. School staff and the RAU link tutor had a good understanding of their roles in terms of ensuring that assessments are reliable and fair.

89   The School has clearly defined and broad-ranging plans for using independent external expertise to inform its course development and review and its assessment practices. The team heard from senior staff a strong conviction of the value of ensuring that there is input from independent external experts both from an academic and a sector-specific background. The assessment team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.

90   The School has in place a wide range of appropriate policies, which the team was able to examine, and staff understanding of their roles in implementing these policies was tested in meetings which included not only School staff but also the RAU link tutor and a member of the Industry Advisory Board. School staff demonstrated a strong commitment to

the use of external independent expertise to inform course development and review and assessment and classification, in addition to the planned input from external examiners. However, at the time of the assessment, the team was not able to examine external examiner reports or any other external input on actual assessment practice and outcomes as the School is yet to commence delivery and assessment of programmes. Therefore, the assessment team has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q1 The provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system

91   This Core practice expects that the provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system.

92   The QAA assessment team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

What the evidence shows

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

94   The RAU's MoA [038] indicates that the School is required to admit students in line with policies and procedures agreed at institutional approval and as specified in programme specifications. The MoA allows students with advanced standing to be admitted, provided that the procedures are compatible with the RAU's. [038] It expects Programme Committees to be responsible for monitoring admissions, which are also reviewed at the School's annual HE Academic Boards that a representative of the School's admissions process is expected to attend. [038] Operationally, the School is expected to interview and admit students while informing them of their contractual terms and conditions, and register students at admission and enrolment. [038]

95   The School plans to admit students in accordance with the RAU academic regulations, [QSR submission paragraph 45] which have provisions that support reliable, fair and inclusive admissions. These include setting admission criteria, which provide a consistent meritocratic standard that students must meet for entry to the programmes, which are publicly available, and include English language requirements for international students. [RAU academic regulations, p 9-10]

96   The team was informed that while RAU is responsible for approving admissions criteria, [Request for additional documents response 044, 34] and while these criteria and English language requirements are clearly articulated in the School's Admissions Policy, [Original draft 002; updated version 089] the team noted that the School's finalised Admissions Policy continues to note that the Admissions Unit is responsible for working with the Academic Unit to set entry criteria. [002, 089] Notwithstanding this, the RAU's academic regulations have sufficient safeguards that provide for a fair admission system since there are established and fixed admissions criteria to allow for reliable decisions to be made, and the criteria are transparent as they are shared with applicants. Admissions processes are inclusive in their design since it is possible for students to be admitted with advanced standing and recognition of prior learning for experienced professionals that might be applying to the School.

97   The School has an Admissions Policy approved by its Academic Board which clearly articulates the responsibilities of applicants and staff in their engagement with the admission process. The School's policy expects staff to deliver information and professional advice to applicants, and the timely processing of applications in compliance with School requirements. [002, 089] More specifically, the Admissions Unit will be responsible for providing information, advice and guidance to applicants; assessing applications; and deciding upon offers based upon recommendations from the Academic Unit. [002, 089] Other specific duties will fall to the RAU link tutor and Programme Manager who are specifically responsible for informing students of the terms and conditions of admissions, which reveals how the School's Admissions Policy has been tailored to the RAU context and

expectations. [002, 089]

98   The School's Admissions Policy sets out the admissions criteria for each course and the English language requirements [002, 089] which supports the reliability of admissions decisions and the criteria have been updated to align with RAU requirements. [089] The School recognises its responsibility to provide an inclusive culture and admissions process where quality and diversity are promoted and individuals with protected characteristics (such as gender or race) are treated with dignity. [002, 089] It says it does this through 'policies, strategies and action plans'. [002, 089] The team asked for these plans and was told that the School would create a policy for this area. [044] It is not clear then the action that the School will take to ensure that admission is inclusive. In meetings, staff reiterated their intention to be inclusive and provide substantial support in the admissions process, noting that admissions decisions never rested with a single member of staff and so were moderated decisions. [M2] The team considered that the School would take steps to admit students according to transparent criteria, but that it had not yet formalised its approach to mitigating unconscious or other bias in the admissions process.

99   The School's Admissions Policy describes how applicants will be shortlisted against the admissions criteria based on their academic records, work experience and outcomes of aptitude tests before being invited to interviews, and for some courses additional tests (for example, the MBA (Global) and the Master of Global Business which may require completion of an essay). [002, 089] According to the School's Admissions Policy, admissions decisions are made by the Admissions Unit based on a recommendation from the Academic Unit; [002, 089] however, the QSR submission suggests admissions decision are made by the Admissions Unit alone. [001 paragraph 48] The team explored this in meetings and the School explained that academic staff are always involved in admissions decisions. The team explored concerns about the role of the Head of Admissions in admissions decisions if the Head of Admissions were also to receive recruitment incentives, but the School described how recruitment incentives would only be offered to the Head of Marketing and Recruitment, not the Head of Admissions to protect the latter from conflict of interest. [M2] The School plans to notify students within a week of the interviews of the outcome of their application. [002, 089] The team was satisfied that the admissions process as detailed in the Admissions Policy would enable admissions decisions to be made based on academic judgement and included safeguards to avoid conflicts of interests.

100   The School's Access and Participation Plan (APP) sets a high level aim to 'attract a diverse intake of learners, including those from under-represented backgrounds, disadvantaged and Black, Asian and minority ethnic students'. [031] It has three targets which are specific to undergraduate students although the team had understood from the QSR submission that the School's plans had recently changed, and it did not plan to recruit undergraduate students while in its 'first phase' of operation. [001] This suggests that the APP targets will need to be deferred or reviewed. While lacking APP targets for postgraduate programme recruitment, the School nevertheless wishes to provide opportunities for disadvantaged and under-represented students through 'generous scholarships and support programmes including hardship funds for those from lower income households or care' [031] and further details are noted in Q4 (paragraph 181).

101   The APP commits to a local and national outreach strategy, a facilitated applicant journey and a welcoming 'transition-in', and plans to have a full applicant journey model mapped by the start of 2023-24, with particular consideration for target groups. [031] While the team did not fully understand whether all parts of the APP remained relevant in light of its altered recruitment plans, the APP reveals the School's intention to use deliberative action to improve the volume of applications from underrepresented groups.

102   The School plans to establish an Access and Participation steering group to

oversee the APP's monitoring in addition to an Access and Participation Committee responsible for providing updates on the progress of the plan, for monitoring expenditure and data as part of the programme monitoring cycle, and identifying if further actions are needed. [ToR 070] The Board of Directors will oversee access and participation activities and evaluation outcomes and will receive reports from the Access and Participation Committee biannually. [031]

103   The School has an approved Student Equity and Diversity and Fair Treatment Policy which articulates its aim to attract students from a diverse range of backgrounds facilitated by supportive admissions practices and recognises the need to treat those with protected characteristics fairly and inclusively. [032; 094] The team explored why the scope of the School's policy and the expectations about behavioural conduct applied only to students, not staff [032; 094] and was advised that the School articulates its expectations that staff promote equity and diversity separately through staff contracts. [Additional document request response 044]

104   The School's Student Equity and Diversity and Fair Treatment Policy provides limited detail on how the School will secure equal treatment for diverse groups, but it does commit to developing 'plans and programmes to increase access and promote success for designated under-represented groups in order to overcome disadvantage', [032; 094] described principally in the Access and Participation Plan. Further, the policy commits to providing services and reasonable adjustments for disabled students, and to educating the School community on equal opportunities. [032; 094] While processes and measures to monitor the policy's success and confirm the fair treatment of students are not detailed, it does commit to developing 'processes that support the systematic implementation, monitoring, reporting and management of equal opportunity'. [032; 094]

105   The School's Students with Disability Policy outlines the School's commitment to identifying and removing barriers to learning and ensuring its education is as inclusive as possible. The policy notes disabled students are encouraged to declare their disability upon application so it can make tailored adjustments, with examples given. [032; 095] In meetings, staff stated that any applicants declaring a disability would be given extra support through the admissions process and they would be invited to speak directly to faculty members with any queries. [M4]

106   The School's Admissions Policy commits to the practice of contextual admission which it describes as assessing an applicant's prior attainment with respect to the applicant's circumstances relating, for example, to their education, geo-demographics and socio-economic background. [002; 089] The APP reiterates this commitment. [031] Similarly, and while it is not mentioned in the School's Admissions Policy, [002; 089] the School's Student Equity and Diversity and Fair Policy reveals that there can be a 'special admissions' process for applicants who do not meet the admissions criteria, which are considered on a case-by-case basis. [032; 094] The team asked for detail on how special admissions would work but the School was unable to provide further detail other than that in the APP, noting that it 'will be considering it once we have data on UK recruitment retention and achievement'; it noted too that since it had deferred its first in-person intake to September 2023 it would not use a special admissions process until 2024. [087] In meetings with staff the School agreed that it wished to provide a contextual admissions process but that it had not yet developed the operational detail, which it hoped the Head of Admissions would design upon their appointment. [M2]

107   The School's Admissions Policy allows students to appeal an admissions decision. [002; 089] The grounds and timescales for appeal are reasonable, based on absent material information or procedural error. There are clear timescales for the appeal outcomes which can include admitting the student on to the intended course. [002; 089] Students and

applicants are clearly eligible to use the School's Student Complaints Policy [002; 089; 090 paragraph 8] and students will be informed that they can appeal when they receive their application outcome letter. [044 QSR doc request item 7; Template Student applicant rejection letter 105; M2]

108   The team considered the School's draft Admissions Policy which appeared to allow the consideration of applications for recognition of prior learning (RPL) and the School had originally intended to use it to permit students from SP Jain Global's programmes overseas to join their programmes in London with advanced standing. [002 7] The team was informed, however, that this had not yet been agreed with the RAU and the School was no longer working to develop arrangements for admission with advanced standing at this time, noting that decisions on each application for recognition of prior learning would rest with the RAU. [Request for additional information response 044 Item 22; M1]

109   The team noted, however, that RPL remained an important process for the School to enact its multi-city teaching model [QSR submission 001 paragraph 49 p13] and the School's Recognition of Prior Learning Policy acknowledges the relevance of prior certificated learning and prior experiential learning. [028; 096] The policy describes clearly an appropriate process for applications, where those applying must complete a form to provide details with supporting evidence of how they have met certain learning outcomes. The Admissions Unit will assess applications and submit decision recommendations to RAU. [028; 096] In meetings, staff described how they considered RPL an appropriate and useful process and opportunity for some of the types of mature professionals that the School aimed to recruit as students, and indicated that they had designed their own RPL process to align with the RAU's. [M2]

110   The team explored plans for admissions staffing. In the School's staff recruitment plans, the appointment of the Head of Admissions was considered a priority and the School hoped to have a post-holder in place by September 2022 to allow the Head to develop the School's admissions and recruitment strategy. The Head of Admissions would be responsible for providing training to staff on admissions, following guidance provided in the UK Quality Code and best practice from the RAU admissions team. [Request for additional information response 044 item 33] The School also planned a separate post for recruiting to the Executive MBA for its planned February 2023 intake. [Request for additional information response 044 item 36]

111   The team explored the School's plans for the monitoring and oversight of admissions. The School's Admissions Policy expects staff to provide information for managers as required to monitor intakes, equality impacts assessments and management information, [002 p3; 089 p3] which were considered to be the responsibility of the Head of Admissions. [Request for additional information response 044, item 31] Annexes of the RAU's template Memorandum of Agreement suggest that the monitoring of admissions is the responsibility of Programme Committees; [038] however, the Head of Admissions is not a member of Programme Committees. [038]

112   Reporting to the Academic Board, the School plans for an Access and Participation Committee responsible for monitoring the implementation of the Access and Participation Plan, and for formulating and reviewing policies and procedures that support delivery of the APP. Its membership includes staff in senior and strategic roles including the Chief Operating Officer, academic staff, external advisers and student representatives. [Access and Participation Committee Terms of Reference 070] In meetings, staff were able to describe the types of admissions data they would gather and be able to monitor at the Access and Participation Committee. [M2; 070]

113   The team considers that the School's plans would allow for a reliable admissions

system because it plans to provide clear admissions criteria which cover English language requirements. [001; 038; RAU academic regulations] It plans to ensure academic staff are deciding which students to admit so that decisions are based upon academic judgement against the criteria [002; 089] and because admissions decisions involve more than one decision-maker so they are moderated. [M2] Although the team found that there was some initial confusion about responsibilities regarding admissions decisions, the plans indicate steps to ensure the admissions system is fair, such as the obligation on the Admissions Unit to provide good information, advice and guidance to applicants, as articulated in policies and plans; [002; 089] the distinction in the roles of Head of Admissions and Head of Marketing and Recruitment to avoid conflicts of interest in admissions decisions; [M2] and the opportunity for students to appeal an admissions decision or make a complaint if they are not satisfied. [002; 089; 044 QSR doc request item 7; Template Student applicant rejection letter 105] Plans are inclusive because there is a clear commitment to providing opportunities for those who have been disadvantaged or under-represented in education set out in policies and plans, [031; 032; 094] supplemented by hardship funds, support for disabled applicants, plans to take deliberative action to recruit those from underrepresented groups, [031] and recognition of prior learning processes for some types of learners. [002; 028; 096] Plans for oversight and accountability systems for admissions within the School also suggest that the School will be able to monitor the reliability, fairness and inclusivity of its admissions processes. [038; 070]

114   The Admissions Unit is responsible for providing information, advice and guidance to applicants. [002; 089] The RAU's institutional approval report noted that the School would issue students with information about the roles of both the RAU and the School. [037] The team asked for the general information about the School and programmes that the School planned to give to students and was referred to the SP Jain Global's website for its existing programme listing for the Master of Global Business which it would use as a template. [Request for additional information response 044 item 32; https://www.spjain.org/programs/postgraduate/mgb] The template webpage provided detailed information on the programme's admissions requirements, duration, structure, intended qualification, internship requirement, core and optional modules, and learning outcomes for the modules. The template webpage refers applicants to the student handbook for some details, which is also available online and provides further detailed and comprehensive information, such as programme learning outcomes, graduate attributes, modes of assessment and the quality assurance arrangements for assessment, orientation and immigration information and student support arrangements. [126 weblink] Further, the same series of webpages for a Master of Global Business have a dedicated page for fees and admission procedures for the programme. The team considered this information sufficiently detailed to enable applicants to make an informed choice about the programme and the School but noted that the information had not yet been tailored to the London and UK operating contexts. The comprehensive level of information indicates that the School understands its responsibilities for giving applicants detailed information, not just about the practicalities of the course and joining the School, but about what they would achieve through the course.

115   General information will be provided for applicants to prepare them for their time with the School and for life in the UK where relevant. The School intends that the information covers application information, language requirements, general information on the academic year, information on induction week and social events, pre-sessional activities, methods of teaching, expectations of students and what students can expect from the School, wellbeing support , the role of personal tutors, study skills and disability support, health and wellbeing, finances and banking, accommodation information, visa and immigration information, life in the UK, and travelling within London. [Request for additional information response 087, item 22] This comprehensive list of types of information provides assurance that the School understands the informational needs of students and the types of resources it must provide

for a positive student experience and successful orientation and induction. The team considered that both the general and programme-level information would support a reliable admissions system because the admissions requirements including English language requirements are available to students, are clearly set and would support reliable decision-making of applications. The information supports a fair admissions system because it gives students a comprehensively detailed description of the programme so that students can make informed choices about applying. The information also enhances the inclusivity of admissions arrangements since it informs students of the types of support available, including support for disabled students and international students.

116   The team asked for details of arrangements with recruitment agents and how agents' activities will be monitored to ensure they adhere to School policies. It was informed that the School does not plan to use agents at this stage but that the wider School has experience of using them. [Request for additional information response 044, item 37] However, this was contradicted in a meeting with staff which noted plans to use agents. [M2] The team explored this ambiguity in a further meeting and found the School did not plan to use agents at this early stage but might in the future for the recruitment only of international, not domestic students. [M3]

117   The team explored the approach the School would take to using agents and was informed that they would build on existing practices for the management of agents used by the wider School. SP Jain Global uses a template for agent agreements outlining the responsibilities of agents to promote courses and disseminate material in an 'accurate and ethical' manner, provide accurate information and guidance to applicants regarding living in SP Jain locations, assist students with their applications, comply with SP Jain requirements, assist in developing the School's brand, act in the interests of students, declare any conflicts of interests, and take account of the relevant (Australian) regulatory framework. [107] It states clearly the agent's role is to help students apply, not to admit students on behalf of the School.

118   There are express restrictions in the template agreement which preclude advertising or promoting the School without its prior consent, delegating parts of the agreement, working in territories except those permitted, and putting forward students that would not comply with immigration requirements. [107] The agreement indicates that agents will be monitored regularly including through the use of educational outcome data such as non-completion and deferral rates. There are provisions in the template agreement for the School to investigate inappropriate conduct and require the agent to take remedial action. [107] The School sets out to pay fees, make available promotional materials and full details of courses, advise the agent when courses are filled, provide up-to-date marketing information, consider any student complaints about the agent, conduct an annual review of the agent, and take any remedial action for students that it considers necessary in the case of an agent's negligent conduct. [107]

119   The team also considered SP Jain Global's Education Agent policy which commits to using only agents that are competent and ethical to uphold the reputation of the School and that operate within the context of the relevant regulatory framework. It confirms that these policies apply to all agents of the Global School. [108] An application and selection process for agents is the responsibility of several senior role holders; upon receiving an application a member of staff completes a site visit and report before deciding whether to enter into an agreement with an agent. [108] According to the SP Jain Global's policy all agreements must align with the standard agent agreement. [108] Further, the policy notes that there will be processes for monitoring, review, renewal and termination of education agents [108] and the maintenance of an up-to-date register of agents in each of SP Jain's regional sites. [108] A significant proportion of the policy is dedicated to describing the types of dishonest and unethical conduct that would prompt remedial action from SP Jain Global,

including terminating the agreement. [108 8] The team examined further documents that provided evidence of these processes being operated in practice, including a report on the annual review of education agents sent to SP Jain Global's Academic Board, [111] and a comprehensive agent monitoring checklist and spreadsheet. [112] Notwithstanding the School in London's uncertain plans for the use of agents, the team was assured by the comprehensive policies and processes for the appointment, management, monitoring and review of agents which were clearly articulated and well understood by relevant staff who met with the team. Further, the School noted that students are invited to give feedback on agents, and recognised the need to train agents if they were to begin recruiting to its School in the UK. [M4] The team considered that the arrangements with recruitment agents, if they were to be used, would allow for a reliable fair admissions system because of the emphasis on providing students with full information before they apply and the expectation for a high standard of ethical conduct by agents, for which there are controls and safeguards. The role of agents enhances an inclusive admissions system because they are expected to support and assist applicants and help them with both their applications and arrangements to travel to the UK for academic purposes.

Conclusions

120   As described above, the assessment team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the assessment team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other assessments and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

121   The School has clear policies for the recruitment and admission of students set out in its own approved and clearly written policy documents which plan for an admissions process that is reliable, fair and inclusive because it clearly articulates roles and responsibilities, enables the admission of students according to a meritocratic standard and clear published criteria. Through the admissions process the School also plans to take steps to recruit students from under-represented groups, and supports those with additional needs through the admissions process.

122   The team concludes that the School's approaches for ensuring that admissions systems are reliable, fair and inclusive are robust and credible because they are specific and consistent in their detail about roles and responsibilities, are well understood by staff, and are based on plans that are logical in their sequence. They are inclusive because they make provisions for the diverse needs of students including those that may need support with their application or interview, those who might have had professional careers and who are returning to learning, or those who need advice on visas and arriving in a new country.

123   The team found that the School's plans for admissions will allow for the provision of information that is transparent, accessible and fit for purpose because detailed samples and templates for comprehensive admissions information already exist within the wider SP Jain Global School. The School recognises the types of information to be provided, and the need for such information to be detailed to cover academic, pastoral and financial information, and be carefully managed and quality assured.

124   While the School has not yet decided whether it wants to use recruitment agents, the team concluded that, where parts of the wider SP Jain organisation work with recruitment agents, these are managed effectively to ensure strict adherence to its policies and requirements because it has a comprehensive and detailed policy on the management of agents, the details of which are consistently replicated in the template agreement with

agents, and reports resulting from internal procedures reveal active monitoring of agents and actions taken in response to issues. Moreover, students are invited to give feedback on agents. Therefore, the team concludes that the Core practice is met.

125   The team found the plans for admissions to be detailed, credible, and consistently well understood by staff and supported by robust documentation including approved policies, an access and participation plan, and clearly articulated responsibilities for oversight and management of admissions. As the School has yet to commence delivery the team was unable to examine the views of students or to meet with those employed directly in admissions roles as they have yet to be recruited, and the team was unable to carry out a direct assessment of student records. It was also unable to check approved course documentation since the agreement with the RAU had not been finalised. In addition, since the School has not begun admitting students, the team was unable to test the admissions processes in practice and, as such, the team therefore has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q2   The provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses

126   This Core practice expects that the provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses.

127   The QAA assessment team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

What the evidence shows

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

129   The School submission [001] states that the School will be responsible for designing and delivering programmes. This is further validated in the draft MoA [038] and the responsibilities checklist. [043] The School currently delivers three of the programmes (specifications EMBA, [053] GMB, [054] MGB [055]) at their other campuses including Dubai, Singapore, Mumbai and Australia which have been running for at least several years.

130   The MFT [056] is a new programme and will be launched for the first time in the UK. There is evidence from the initial submission, [001] the Institutional Approval Report [037] and the SP Jain Global Website [College website https://www.spjain.org/programs, accessed 9/05/22] that the School has extensive experience in designing and delivering programmes and will be introducing programmes to the UK that have been embedded elsewhere.

131   The Institutional Approval Report [037] confirms that policies will not be transferred from other campuses to the London campus and new policies will be developed for the UK sector. A number of policies reviewed by the team clearly relate to other campuses and have not been adapted for the UK. For example, the Course Development Review, Assurance and Equivalency of Learning [050] and the Assurance of Learning [051] have specifically been designed for the Australian campus and make direct mention of TEQSA and quality codes in Australia. Staff [M3] confirmed all documentation would be adapted for the UK once the MoA was finalised. The team agrees that, while some documentation provided is still in a draft format and does not relate to the UK, the Senior Management Team demonstrated knowledge about designing and delivering high-quality courses because of the content provided in these documents and the range and structure of policies developed. For example, the Benchmarking Policies and Procedures document [013] states a range of internal and external benchmarking processes. The Course Development Review, Assurance and Equivalency of Learning Policy [050] sets out processes for the development and continual review of courses, and the Assurance of Learning Policy [051] details how learning outcomes are to be met through relevant knowledge and skills application. The team agrees that, if the School is able to adapt current policies and processes to better fit the UK Quality Code and align more closely with the RAU academic regulations, [001] its approach should enable the design and delivery of high-quality programmes.

132   Staff were able to demonstrate an in-depth understanding of programmes delivered globally and could highlight how their experience in delivery elsewhere would support and enhance delivery in the UK. [M3] For example, they mentioned how synergies could be leveraged between the same programme delivered internationally and in the UK through shared best practice, access to qualified staff currently teaching on the module and an awareness of quality codes internationally. The team found that, while the School is new to the UK higher education sector, it has relevant and substantial experience in designing and delivering these higher education programmes elsewhere and has access internationally to

resources to enable the School to design and deliver high quality courses.

133   The School has comprehensive internal processes for programme design and delivery as set out in the Quality Assurance Framework [003] and the Learning and Teaching Enhancement Policy, [009] RAU Annual programme monitoring template [035] (Programme Manager Report), RAU Partnership Annual Monitoring Template (AMR) Report [036] and Student and Staff Feedback Policy, [023] alongside the governance structure stated in The Quality Assurance Framework. [003]

134   The Quality Assurance Framework [003] details the arrangements for ensuring the quality of programmes. The management of programmes will be in accordance with the RAU academic regulations and therefore aligned with an established UK higher education awarding body. Every programme will have a Programme Manager designated by the School, an RAU link tutor and a programme committee to monitor programme delivery. However, in the initial stage of development the School has stated that one programme manager will be responsible for all four programmes. [M3] Continual monitoring of programmes is evident with the Programme Manager required to produce an Annual Programme Manager's report [035] which will feed into an overall Annual Monitoring Report for the partnership by the RAU link tutor. [036] While no examples of reports were available to the team, the report templates contain developed sections to monitor the quality of the programmes. For example, the RAU Annual Programme Monitoring template [035] displays comprehensive sections on reviewing progress with quality improvements from previous reviews, review of performance indicators such as mean marks, pass rates and progression, feedback responses, comments on graduate outcomes, curriculum validity, staff development and best practice among the key ones. The RAU Partnership Annual Monitoring Template [036] has sections for detailed information relating to the Internal and External Environment (such as good practice, staff development and student representation), Evaluation of partnership and compliance with process and Partner link tutor Comments.

135   The Learning and Teaching Enhancement Policy [009], focuses on the development and monitoring of the Learning and Teaching Plan which underpins the School's quality assurance and enhancement efforts in learning and teaching. Annual progress reports as developed by the programme leader [035] and the RAU link tutor [036] will be reviewed and monitored by LTQAC. The Student and Staff Feedback Policy [023] provides mechanisms to students, academic and administrative staff to provide feedback on the quality of programmes and is aligned in accordance with the RAU academic regulations. The Policy sets out methods for obtaining feedback at a module and programme level throughout the course, through the Student Council and committee meetings and from graduating students. Written feedback from staff is additionally sought for each module. The team agrees the School has thorough and well organised plans to ensure the delivery of high-quality programmes because it has clear policies for the continual monitoring of programmes and mechanisms to review the quality of programmes and provide feedback.

136   Staff at the visit were able to clearly articulate mechanisms in place to monitor the quality of programmes. [M3] They explained in detail that, under the terms of the MoA, [038] there would be a programme committee to examine the quality of programmes and annual monitoring by module and programme leads. These reports would go to the RAU and the Learning and Teaching Committee and would be aligned to a teaching plan. The team agrees staff have a clear understanding of how programmes will be monitored to ensure high quality.

137   The Quality Assurance Framework further details a robust governance structure to ensure that high quality standards across programmes are maintained. The BoD has ultimate accountability for the overall quality of programmes and delegates authority to the

Academic Board to ensure the quality of programmes is maintained to a high standard and to implement the Quality Assurance Framework across the School. A Joint Board of Study with the RAU will be established to ensure operating practices conform to agreed procedures. While no evidence was available to the team on these mechanisms in practice, if implemented as outlined the team agrees that the plans will enable high quality programmes to be delivered because there is a well-developed governance structure in place to ensure high quality programmes are designed and delivered that will be continuously monitored.

138   The Industry Advisory Board (IAB) provides strategic industry advice and ensures programmes are relevant to industry as set out in the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the Industry Advisory Board. [045] The role of the Industry Advisory Board was further expanded upon in the request for additional evidence [087, pt9] where the School gave plans for the IAB to provide input into programme design. This point was further elaborated on by staff at the visit [M1] who were able to confidently discuss the role and value the IAB would bring to developing high-quality programmes. The President explained the value of the IAB in understanding industry trends and demands and how these have fed into programme design. [M1] The was further echoed by an IAB member and current business owner. As members of the IAB are currently involved in the industry sector they are well placed to share trends in the market and talent requirements and that input feeds into the programme design. Staff were able to share examples to show how the IAB has helped the School at a global level in designing cutting edge programmes and identifying key areas of importance to focus on. Currently the UK IAB has five members from sectors related to Entrepreneurship, and Fintech and may look at increasing this to 10 members. The team agrees the role and inclusion of the IAB is an asset to the School and is able to make a valuable contribution in contributing to the design of high-quality programmes.

139   Programme specifications [053,054,055,056] contain appropriate information to indicate a high-quality course because clear programme structures are provided with required module pathways for students and detailed learning outcomes are supplied which are categorised through Knowledge and Understanding, Intellectual, Professional, Key Skills and Programme Specific Skills. The Learning and Teaching Strategy is outlined and a range of activities are cited including individual and group exercises, case studies, simulations and the use of the Engaged Learning Online platform (ELO) and VLE. The assessment strategy section in the module specifications [058, 059, 060, 061, 062, 065] details the use of formative and summative assessments and an assessment mapping matrix is given providing an overview of the range of assessments on the programme. Assessments include exams, individual and group reports, essays and assignments, presentations, project proposals and reports. Module specifications further break down this information and overall provide clear guidance on assessment weightings and components and reflect the stated learning outcomes. Detailed content is generally given to students on topics of study and is divided across 12 sessions [module specifications 061, 062, 065] (with the exception of the individual projects) [063, 064, 058, 060] and contains relevant and up-to-date reading lists and resources.

140   While no assessment briefs were available to be examined by the team, the School's Assessment Validation Grading Moderation Policy [005] states that assessments will be validated internally before being given to students and overseen by the programme convenor. Assessment briefs would conform to templates as given in Appendix A, the Assessment Validation Grading Moderation Policy. [005] This includes the module details, word/time length, contribution to assessment (%), submission date, submission details, feedback date, requirements for assessment, learning outcomes and marking criteria. Assessments will be sent to the external examiner for approval before being released to students. This was further reinforced by staff at the visit. [M3] The team noticed no module handbooks were available to students but the School explained that they will be following the

RAU guidelines and information regarding modules will be made available to students in the module specification document. [123 Clarification comms from provider] The team is satisfied the omission of a module handbook will not negatively affect students as this information will be provided in the module specification documents. The team agrees the School is able to design high-quality courses because they have up-to-date programmes with input from the IAB and well-developed content topics, appropriate planned assessments and learning and teaching through the programme and module specification documents. In addition, assessments are clearly linked to learning outcomes which are explicitly stated at a programme and module level and would enable students to demonstrate the learning outcomes. [053-56, 058, 060-065]

141   The RAU's validation report [066] provides RAU's views about the quality of the programmes. Given that all four programmes are validated by the RAU, the team is assured of the School's ability to design high-quality programmes because the awarding body examined staffing and resources, curriculum, learning, teaching and assessment support for students and programme quality management and recommended validation of the four programmes for a period of three years from September 2022 until August 2025 subject to the completion of six conditions. The team reviewed the conditions which included amending programme and module specifications, reviewing assessment elements and showing a clearer differentiation between the GMBA and GBA (now referred to as the MGB) programme. The team agrees these conditions are reasonable to achieve and some amendments are already visible in the updated programme and module specification documents provided. The School confirmed that the conditions were due to be signed off by the RAU by the end of July 2022. [M1]

142   Staff [M3] showed a clear understanding of high-quality courses and mentioned contributing factors based on equipping students with skills at graduation through an up-to-date and well-resourced curriculum, good continuation rates, and a focus on employability alongside student support. Staff were able to articulate mechanisms in place to monitor the quality of programmes and were able to confirm policies in the Quality Framework [003] and the Assessment Validation Grading Moderation Policy. [005] Staff outlined under the terms of the MoA [037] the role of a programme committee, the annual monitoring of programmes through the programme leader and RAU link tutor and the inclusion of the LT&QAC in overseeing these processes to ensure the high quality of programmes. Staff additionally highlighted that alongside quality inputs of curriculum, teaching, faculty and support, the School focuses strongly on employability and the levels of high recruitment they have demonstrated at other campuses with the same programmes. The team agrees that staff have a clear understanding of high quality because they have experience of designing high-quality courses and have mechanisms in place to maintain high quality.

143   The team was not able to observe the delivery of any programmes. Staff were able to explain their process for designing and delivering high-quality programmes. [M3] Staff discussed how courses and training will be offered to teaching staff to deliver the programmes. There will be an expectation for staff to be members of the Higher Education Authority (HEA) and the School will give support in gaining these qualifications if needed. Additional training would be offered to staff on assessments through in-house training workshops. However, the School stated these have not yet been developed and it will be doing so in the near future. Staff also confirmed the same level of support would be provided to both permanent and adjunct faculty in terms of training and resources to deliver high-quality programmes. The School has an understanding of teaching observations and has a system of recording classes at other campuses in order to share best practice. The team found that the School has well developed training material to induct and support staff on using the ELO [081] and VLE. [082] The team agrees the plans to deliver high-quality programmes are credible and robust through design, continual monitoring and staff support

and, if implemented as outlined, would enable a high-quality experience for the students.

Conclusions

144   As described above, the assessment team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the assessment team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other assessments and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

145   The School has a clear understanding of high-quality programmes and has experience in designing and delivering high-quality courses at other campuses overseas. The new programme MFT has been developed in response to industry demand and has been designed in a similar manner to established programmes. The School has an active Industry Advisory Board which provides strategic direction in terms of programme design and is well positioned to inform the curriculum in terms of current industry demands, ensuring that programmes and content are up to date. The School has a number of mechanisms to ensure high-quality programmes are maintained through annual review processes both including feedback and action plans from the Programme Manager and the RAU link tutor. This is facilitated and overseen by the Learning Teaching and Quality Assurance Committee highlighting robust, credible and evidence-based approaches in designing and delivering high-quality courses.

146   Programme and module specifications are well developed because they contain detailed information on learning, teaching and assessment strategies and are closely aligned with learning outcomes, which would enable students to meet and demonstrate the intended learning outcomes through assessment. Staff plans to support teaching staff to ensure the smooth delivery of courses at a high standard include training sessions, workshops on assessments, presentations on using the VLE and ELO and support for gaining certifications with the HEA. Staff were able to articulate what high quality means in the context of the School. The team was unable to observe any teaching or delivery of these programmes and some training resources are still to be developed. However, the team found that the School has a strong track record of designing and delivering these programmes elsewhere and their current plans to do so in the UK are credible and would facilitate the design and delivery of programmes if those plans are implemented as outlined. Therefore, the team concludes that this Core practice is met.

147   The team was able to examine plans regarding the mechanisms that would be used to monitor the quality of courses including policy documents and templates. Staff were able to clearly articulate their processes for designing and delivering high-quality courses and the School was able to demonstrate it has extensive experience in delivering postgraduate programmes at other international campuses and has well-structured mechanisms in place for their delivery that would be able to be adapted for the UK. However, given the School is still at a relatively early stage in its preparation and delivery has not yet taken place, the team was unable to examine any evidence of programme delivery including teaching observations, student feedback, teaching staff feedback, external examiner feedback, examples of annual review documentation or meeting notes from the LT&QAC committee regarding the quality of programmes. Therefore, the team has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q3 The provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience

148   This Core practice expects that the provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience.

149   The QAA assessment team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers (March 2019).

What the evidence shows

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

151   Responsibility for recruiting staff is shared between the School and the RAU as stated in the responsibilities checklist [043] and the draft MoA. [038] The School has its own internal mechanisms for staff selection and approval as outlined in the School's Staff Recruitment Selection Induction Performance Review Policy and Procedures document. [010] The process is overseen by the General Manager Administration, the Human Resources Manager and the Dean. The policy details the use of criteria (essential and desirable) minimum qualifications and experience required for the role. These are further reflected in job descriptions provided. [Administrative Job Descriptions 007, Academic Job Descriptions 008] Candidates are shortlisted according to suitability and invited to interview, where a panel decision is made on appointments. The appointment of teaching staff is subject to approval by the RAU.

152   Additional guidelines are given in the School's Academic Staff Recruitment Policy [017] which highlights the three levels of academic appointments - Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor. Detailed criteria for each position are articulated in the academic job descriptions [008] and indicate the expectations of the roles in terms of academic qualifications, teaching and professional experience. [017] Candidates may be involved in presentations to show teaching delivery standards. Appointments at Professor level will include the Chairman of Academic Board (or their nominee) and require endorsement by the Board of Directors. Associate or Assistant Professors will be authorised by the Dean and reported to the Academic Board. The team agrees the recruitment policy is clear and comprehensive because it explains the process for recruitment and provides details on how and who will manage the process and oversee it. The job descriptions contain detailed requirements for the role including principal accountabilities and person specifications centred around qualifications, experience, skills, knowledge and abilities and business requirements which should ensure appropriately qualified and skilled staff are appointed.

153   Staff were able to detail the recruitment process at the visit [M2] and confirmed all appointments are subject to RAU approval. The Chair of the Academic Board and the Dean will be on the panel to interview candidates. Initial selection of candidates is based on CVs and will be made by the relevant supervisor(s). [Staff Recruitment Selection Induction Performance Review Policy and Procedures 010] Staff stated initial selection will use the SP Jain Global processes. The first stage will be a screening process against the job description criteria. Then a video of teaching will be examined and from that the next round of shortlisting will be undertaken to determine suitable candidates to interview. Decisions on appointments will be determined by the Chair of Academic Board and the Dean following the interview. Staff [M2] confirmed the process for recruiting adjunct faculty will also be the same. Additionally, staff were able to explain the rationale for recruiting on the professional practice track at professorial level and would be looking to recruit senior staff from industry

with a demonstrable leadership track record.

154   The team initially had concerns about the level and progress of recruitment as many key positions (including Head of Student Admissions, Head of Student Support, Programme Convenor, Head of Recruitment and Marketing) had not yet been filled at the time of the visit. For example, no faculty staff involved in teaching delivery had been recruited including the Programme Manager. The School was able to detail plans on the progress of recruiting and detailed these in the request for additional evidence. [087] The School confirmed that it is pursuing a strategy of staggered recruitment, with some key appointments currently in the process of being finalised, for example, the Head of Student Support (expected in August 2022) and the Head of Quality Assurance (expected in September 2022). Further information was given in the Project Plan, [113] which details a plan of recruiting staff with a target completion date of December 2022. Given commencement of online programmes is due to start in February 2023, if recruitment targets are met the team agrees programmes will be able to be delivered albeit within a tight schedule. Staff additionally discussed [M2] contingency plans if suitable staff could not be recruited and they would rely on existing staff at other campuses to deliver the online teaching in the short term to get the programmes running. The School stressed this would only be used as a contingency. The team agrees suitable plans are in place to mitigate any risks with recruitment issues.

155   The team was concerned about the high level of adjunct staff to be used to deliver programmes. The additional evidence [087] states the School plans to employ approximately 40-50% full-time academic staff and 50-60% adjunct staff. Staff [M2] explained the use and value of using adjunct staff and would be recruiting those with experience of teaching in the UK higher education sector. Academic Board would monitor the quality of recruitment and adjunct faculty would have the same induction and support as permanent staff with the same opportunities for continuing professional development (CPD) enabling them to deliver high-quality teaching. Staff additionally mentioned the use of one-to-one support if needed. The team agrees that, while the predominant use of adjunct staff could be a concern for delivering a high-quality academic experience, the School's plans for monitoring and support would serve to mitigate any risks.

156   The School has a range of resources to facilitate the induction for new staff. A draft Employee Handbook contains information on a range of policies, [071] including Joining the School, Standards and Safeguards. Induction material is presented through an online link showing a number of pre-recorded videos on orientation, learning, the ELO and a faculty dossier for GMBA and MGB programmes. The videos are developed with a focus on the Australian Quality Framework. Additional guidance and training are provided in ELO Training [081] and VLE training. [082] The School has stated in its response document for additional evidence [044, pt 47] that 'These will be updated for the UK environment'. The team agrees the quality and depth of information provided in these videos is well thought out and supportive and, if implemented to address the UK context, will contribute significantly to the induction and support of new staff. The School has designed a draft five-day induction plan [072] which covers primarily meeting staff across the school. Given not all staff have currently been recruited this document is provided in a draft format and will include staff names once recruitment is completed. Staff were able to confirm their approach to induction [M2] and confirmed the range of resources that would be available to staff and the structured approach they would adopt. The team agrees that while a number of these resources are still in draft format if they can be adapted to the UK and implemented as envisaged by the School this will result in clear induction processes and support to facilitate the delivery of a high-quality academic experience.

157   The review and monitoring of teaching staff will be based on teaching performance, feedback from student surveys, research output and other academic activities including course administration, leadership, course development and broader contributions. No

performance review document has been developed yet and, as stated in the response to additional evidence, [044] will be developed by the School with the guidance of RAU.

158   Opportunities for academic staff promotion are detailed in the School's Academic Staff Promotion Policy [016] and will be the joint responsibility of the Academic Board and the Board of Directors. Applications will be considered by a subcommittee known as the Academic Promotion Committee. Promotions may be considered after academic staff have been in role for five years or three years in exceptional cases. The faculty promotion form is provided in an appendix to the policy and criteria for promotions are given at three levels of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor. Staff were able to further confirm this [M2] and stated that promotion would be based on accomplishments related to scholarship, research and/or teaching and learning as well as general support for the School. The team found that the policy is clear because it provides details on the promotion processes and expectations to support staff in delivering a high-quality academic experience.

159   The Staff Development Policy [015] details the opportunities for professional development and the identification of training and development needs. It states the School will allocate 1% of the annual staff salaries to fund professional development activities for academic and non-academic professionals. Professional Development (PD) will take the form of Formal PD (technical meetings, conferences, short courses etc), Informal PD (scholarly activity) and be written into an individual development plan to be used in annual performance planning and development meetings. The Scholarship of Learning and Teaching Policy [014] articulates the approach in promoting a scholarly environment to inform teaching and learning. All academic staff are required to engage in scholarly activities that may include, but are not limited to, undertaking formal study in a higher degree programme including half-day release within a relevant discipline or a programme with outcomes designed to enhance teaching and learning or assessment. The team agrees the School has credible and robust and evidence-based approaches for recruitment which, if the School implements as planned, should ensure it has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality learning experience.

160   Staff [M2] were able to discuss in more detail plans for developing a scholarly environment. These centred around engagement with professional bodies, including AdvanceHE as well as more informal internal processes, for example, 'lunch and learn' to gain insights across the field of knowledge. While the team was not able to examine any evidence relating to staff development the team agrees that clear plans are in place, both formally and informally, for professional development because guidance on formal and informal professional development is given in the Scholarship of Learning and Teaching Policy [014] and staff were able to explain this approach, demonstrating their understanding of expectations and development opportunities available.

161   The team scrutinised a range of job descriptions for academic staff [008] including Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor; administration job descriptions; [007] plus additional job descriptions [101] including Head of Student Services; and amended job descriptions, [100] including senior management and administrative roles such as Chief Operating Officer, Dean, Registrar and Manager Admissions. The academic job descriptions [008] were clear and had a consistent format in that they included roles, accountabilities for learning and teaching, research and professional practice and person specification criteria based on essential and desirable. The exception to this was the role of Professor which only contained essential criteria. The additional job descriptions [101] had relevant information regarding roles and criteria but were not as consistent in terms of how the information was presented and formatted. The administrative job descriptions [007] and its corresponding update [100] give detailed information on key responsibilities but do not provide any criteria. The team agrees that, while greater consistency was required in

formatting and presenting information across all roles, overall, the job descriptions are detailed and suitable for recruiting appropriately skilled staff to deliver a high-quality learning experience because roles and responsibilities and criteria for academic roles are given and academic levels are clearly differentiated.

162   The administration job descriptions [007] contain a detailed list of administrative roles with developed role descriptions. The range of role descriptions and functions demonstrates a comprehensive and reasonable structure that once implemented will facilitate and support academic staff in delivering good quality teaching and academic provision. Roles and responsibilities are clearly laid out across different areas including strategy formulation and implementation; operations; people services; record keeping; IT/campus infrastructure; corporate relations; student experience; alumni relations; brand building; recognition and collaboration; and oversight of registrar. Staff [M2] confirmed the role of a professor for the ELO who would take all new tutors through the various functions of the ELO. Additional support for this is shown in the ELO Training Guide. [081] The team agrees this is an important position given some programmes are solely delivered online.

163   Staff explained the approach to recruiting and inducting professional staff. [M4] The School plans to put in key staff first and will purposely recruit senior and more experienced staff for these roles so they can shape the services as well as recruit to them. Professional staff will additionally be encouraged to join professional networks. The team agrees that, while senior roles for professional staff have not yet been allocated, the School has credible plans to do so because clear project plans are in place with timelines, and senior staff at the visit were able to articulate the strategy for subsequent recruitment once key personnel are in place.

164   The School has a high-level organisation structure that provides an overview of key management roles and where they fit in with reporting lines. [001] A detailed version of the organisation chart was not available and will be fully developed once all recruitment has been completed. The team agrees there is sufficient information in the high-level organisation chart to show the structure between the higher levels of management and the roles given are satisfactory and complete to facilitate the delivery of a high-quality academic experience. The team examined the range of CVs provided [073-080] and concluded the School has a strong senior management team with substantial experience of the higher education sector and the ability to deliver these programmes to a high standard. The School is able to draw on a pool of experienced and knowledgeable staff both from academic and administrative roles from its Global campuses, and from established UK higher education academics and practitioners. While the School has not previously delivered programmes in the UK, the team agrees the School is in a strong position to deliver these programmes given its extensive experience in other international higher education markets and its access to UK higher education academics who have substantial knowledge in developing and delivering programmes in the UK. The team also agreed that all staff at the visit were able to show a high level of knowledge and experience, [M2. M4] demonstrating understanding of the staffing resources needed to enable the School to deliver a high-quality academic experience to students.

Conclusions

165   As described above, the assessment team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the assessment team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other assessments and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

166   The School has clear plans to recruit, appoint, induct and support staff so that it meets the outcome. The School has detailed policies and processes regarding the recruitment and appointment of staff as outlined in the Staff Recruitment Selection Induction Performance Review. This is underpinned with clear academic and administrative job descriptions. While some job descriptions lacked consistent formatting, overall the team considered them suitable. Clear induction and support plans are in place. The School has robust and credible approaches for the recruitment, appointment, induction and support of sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff evidenced through the Staff Development Policy, the Academic Staff Promotion Policy, the Academic Staff Recruitment Policy and Scholarship of Learning and Teaching Policy. The School has a strong Senior Management Team which collectively has substantial experience in the HE sector globally and within the UK and extensive experience of recruiting appropriately skilled staff. The School has a high-level organisation structure that provides an overview of key management roles and where they fit in with reporting lines. The team does have concerns regarding the progress of staff recruitment as the School did not have key personnel in place at the time of the visit. However, plans are in place as shown in the project plan and the School has stated key appointments are currently on target. Overall, the School has within it good experience and tried and tested mechanisms of recruiting, managing and supporting suitably skilled and qualified staff and has detailed project plans. Therefore, the team concludes that this Core practice is met.

167   The team was able to examine plans and policies regarding the mechanisms for staff recruitment, appointment, induction and support, as well as staff development and promotions. Staff were able to clearly articulate these processes and how they would focus on recruiting and developing qualified and skilled staff to enable the delivery of a high-quality academic experience. However, given the School is still at a relatively early stage in its preparation and delivery has not yet taken place, at the time of the review meeting the team was unable to examine CVs of certain staff (including those involved in teaching delivery), staff experiences of recruitment and induction, student views on teaching staff, documented evidence of recruitment or be involved in any observations of teaching and learning. Therefore, the team has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q4   The provider has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience

168   This Core practice expects that the provider has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience.

169   The QAA assessment team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers (March 2019).

What the evidence shows

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

171   The RAU's MoA expects the School to provide appropriate resources for the programmes, including teaching rooms, equipment, libraries and computing facilities including a VLE. [038] The School is also responsible for providing student support services and arrangements supporting the health and safety of students. [038]

172   The School's plans are consistent and clear in articulating its aim to become an established UK higher education provider based at Harbour Exchange, London. [Business Plan 019] The team considered the RAU's evaluation of resources and its findings from the RAU's Institutional Approval Report. The RAU reported concerns about the School's underdeveloped premises and applied an approval condition related to premises and asked for mitigation planning. [037] As a result, the team asked for more details on the development of premises.

173   Detailed floor plans for the premises show that there are three large and three smaller classrooms planned, with the larger ones in lecture theatre style with lecture capture technology. [098 property floor plans; 001] Other physical facilities within the floor plan include break-out areas, reading rooms, recreation zones, a cafeteria, reception area, a library with more than 30 desks, offices and meeting rooms. [098] The floor plans show detailed consideration of the space available and its development into a teaching space. The development of premises is overseen by Academic Board, the School's most senior academic decision-making body, and minutes record that terms are signed for premises but that it needed refitting and change of use permissions (from office to education use), both of which had been factored into its development plans. [Academic Board minutes 088 p6; Signed Premises terms of lease 097; M4; Project Plan 113] The School is seeking change of use permission while also preparing tenders for the contractors to develop the space. [M4] The School has prioritised the spaces it needs to develop, in particular the audio-visual suites to support the delivery of its first online intake to the Executive MBA in February 2023. [M4] The team considered both of these actions to be prudent and appropriate and considered that the premises plans are well developed and would contribute to delivering a high-quality experience for the students if implemented accordingly.

174   The QSR submission [001] set out the School's commitment to providing library facilities for up to 40 students and quiet study areas, with 15 study rooms equipped with screen/projectors. [001] It also provides a list of the library subscriptions the School plans to use. [001] This commitment is embodied in the School's Library Resources Collection Development Policy which plans to develop and maintain 'relevant, current and appropriate information...to support the learning, teaching, research and scholarship endeavours'. [020, 091] This involves resources in both a 'rich collection' in print and predominantly electronic

media with subscriptions to over 10 online databases. [020, 091] In addition, electronic materials will be placed on the VLE. [020, 091] Acquisitions will be informed by academic staff and the library will hold copies of all prescribed and recommended texts and major purchases made in consultation with LTQAC. [020 4e; 4g; 091 4e-g; M3] The team found that the School's policy is clear in its ambition, sets out an appropriate process for the review of the library and its collection, and clearly articulates responsibilities for informational resources.

175   The School plans to use engaged learning online technologies to provide synchronous online classes and hopes to use enhanced functions including tracking eye contact between learners and teachers. [Business Plan 019, paragraph 2.3.3] The School considers this particularly important for supporting the quality of its online programmes, the Executive MBA and MFT. [Business Plan 019 paragraph 3.4] In addition, the School will use several types of management software including for exams management and proctoring, library resource management, video recording software, and a well-known customer records management system as its student records system. [QSR submission 001 paragraph 81; Business Plan 019 p23] The latter had been identified in the RAU's Institutional Approval Report as needing further development for recording data compatible with HESA reporting requirements and was a condition in the RAU's Institutional Approval. [037 p10] The School informed the team that while the conditions are yet to be signed off by the RAU this condition had been completed. [M3]

176   The School aims to provide a 'comprehensive VLE suite' which it considers 'vital for fostering continuous communication and collaboration between the students, tutors, program managers and the school'. A chat bot will help students find answers to common questions, for example about course resources, and collaborate and connect features will support engagement within the student community, for which the School recognises the need for a 'special emphasis on Inclusion and Accessibility'. [087 additional document request item 2]

177   The team accessed a sample virtual learning environment (VLE) configured for staff and students separately. The students' version provided a well-developed sample of two courses showing a comprehensive range of resources and functionality. For courses to which they were assigned, students would receive unit outlines with details of delivery modes and learning hours, course learning outcomes, weightings of different assessed components and assessment rubrics. Students are given access to documents and reading material they will need for use in taught sessions, and they are also given various Q&A on topics, cases and articles, session pre-reading, flowcharts on topics (for example budgets, cost behaviour), slides, quiz practices, video, and group project details. Course sites are configured with discussion forums, samples of exam papers, profiles of course teaching staff, and a means by which to submit assignments. The sample VLE had an active calendar with due dates to remind students of their assignment deadlines to help them remain organised. There is also a section dedicated to providing students with their grades. [VLE sample site] The team considered the range of resources and functions valuable for effective engagement with learning and a helpful repository of core course information with features that would enable students to engage with their learning and their course and would support a high-quality academic experience.

178   The VLE sampled showed that staff assigned to courses would have access to edit sites and pages, add files, grades and assessment to the site. Staff also have access to the same active calendar with due dates for students to help them keep track of course milestones. A marking section presents staff with the work they need to assess, keeps a record of assessments and flags students with assessments missing. It also gives access to several supplementary tools, such as setting programme goals. [VLE sample site] The School discussed with the team its plans to assign a member of senior academic staff to lead the development and implementation of the VLE, including training and supporting

academic staff in its use and development. [M2] The team considered the range of VLE functions appropriate and would enable the active management of the course, cohort, and the virtual learning space.

179   The School plans to recruit faculty locally and globally. It anticipates that full-time academic staff will amount to not more than 40-50% of the faculty. [Business Plan 019 p7] With respect to professional services staff, the School aims to have core relevant post-holders in place by the time it starts delivering courses in person in September 2023. It plans to recruit a Head of Student Support and a Head of Student Recruitment and Marketing by August 2022, and a Librarian, Learning Technologists, a Head of Finance, Registrar, a Head of Quality Assurance, a UKVI officer, a CAS Compliance Officer, a Head of Careers, a Head of Alumni engagement, and school office support staff subsequently. [Request for Additional Evidence Response 087, item 22] The identification of these priority roles for recruitment are reflected in the School's planning documents. [113 Project Plan] The timings for recruitment were realistic and would allow for key staff to be in place ahead of enrolling a first cohort in early 2023. The team also considered sensible the logic of prioritising recruitment of these senior post-holders to enable them to develop the underpinning operational teams and systems. The team noted that the School will also benefit from the economies of staffing support from SPJ Global with respect to HR, finance and business development services. [044 Doc request item 53] This approach to shared services has the potential to be efficient and result in greater investment in students.

180   The team considered a series of job descriptions for key roles, including the Chief Operating Officer [100] and the Head of Student Services, Student Counsellors, Careers Advisors, and librarian. [Administration job descriptions 007; job descriptions 101] As noted in Q3 (paragraphs 161 and 166) the job descriptions had some formatting issues but they were appropriate, tailored to a higher education context, and the team considered them evidence of advanced planning for staffing which would be consistent with the delivery of a high-quality learning experience.

181   The School has a Student Support Policy which commits to the provision of timely and targeted support for students. [022 paragraph 3a; 093 paragraph 3a] This is a broad-ranging policy encompassing student orientation, services for international students, learning resource including library and IT services, counselling services, careers advice and language support. [022 paragraphs 4a-g; 093 paragraphs 4a-g] It recognises the importance of giving students comprehensive information about the School and its programmes and notes student handbooks will be given to each student, and available on the VLE and School website. [022 paragraph 3 b ii and 3k; 093 paragraph 3 b ii and 3k; M1] While the RAU's Institutional Approval Report noted that students would have access to financial support, this is not captured in the School's Student Support Policy. [037 p10; 022; 093] The Access and Participation Plan describes scholarships and support of up to £4,000 for students from lower income households or care backgrounds, plans which are further supported by full costings for financial support. [031 p20; Financial costing student support 069] However, these plans refer to undergraduate students only, and the team was informed that the School has deferred its plans for delivering undergraduate programmes. [QSR submission 001 paragraph 7]

182   The School's language support includes free English language workshops, and additional support for students identified as needing it at the admission stage. [022 paragraph 4g; 093 paragraph 4g; 044 doc request item 9;] Staff described how students' English language abilities would be rated and coded to determine the support they would need and students would be monitored by coaching, metrics and dashboards to oversee their linguistic improvement. [M3] The team noted that this pointed to an active management of students' development but that language support might be outsourced in the first instance. [M3]

183   The School's Students with Disability Policy articulates the School's commitment to supporting disabled students and removing barriers to learning. It recognises the importance of inclusive design and discusses a range of available academic adjustments available. [030; 095] In meetings, the team found that staff were familiar with the entitlements of students to apply for a Disabled Students Allowance, the need to provide assistive technologies and develop individual learning plans. It noted that it did not anticipate physical access problems to its modern premises. [M3] The School recognised that these plans needed further development and implementation and hoped to recruit a Head of Student Support as a priority. [M3]

184   The School plans for students to have access to a personal tutor as a regular source of support in addition to academic managers, lecturers and programme directors. It recognises that student support needs can be diverse and provides for wellbeing and financial support. It says, however, that students can meet academic staff by appointment only. [093] When the team explored this, it was told that students would always have access to an 'Academic Manager' as a first point of contact for academic queries and the Academic Manager would be able to help them with their learning. [M3]

185   The School's plans for monitoring learning resources are highly dependent upon student feedback which will inform programme annual reports. [QSR submission paragraph 116] A template for student surveys confirms that students will be asked about the quality of learning materials, their views on the facilities team, libraries, accommodation, information technology, the availability of faculty, and the management of internships. [083] The frequency of these surveys and their breadth is sufficient to enable valuable data to be gathered that would inform the continuous improvement of programmes. Students with immediate concerns about resources or any aspect of a programme would have access to a Student Experience Manager. [QSR submission paragraph 108] The team agrees that this approach allows for students' needs to be met while also providing an appropriate monitoring framework which generates annual programme reports for the RAU; this also provides for third-party oversight of the programmes and resources by people who are removed from, and not directly involved in, the delivery of the programmes.

Conclusions

186   As described above, the assessment team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the assessment team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other assessments and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

187   The team concludes that the School has strategies and approaches for facilities, learning resources and student support services that are credible because they are described across several comprehensive and approved policies and formal business plans, are consistent in their details and wording and timescales, are feasible, and are well understood by staff. The plans are realistic and credible because they are tailored to the phased operationalisation of the School and key events and activities are prioritised. The plans are linked to the delivery of successful academic and professional outcomes for students because they demonstrate serious consideration of the diversity of students' needs, how they will be met, and how feedback will be sought from students.

188   From an assessment of planned facilities and learning resources, the team confirms and concludes that the School will provide a high-quality academic experience because facilities and learning resources would allow for a rich learning experience supported by a

sufficient volume of academic and professional support staff, and be facilitated by appropriate physical and electronic resources and professional support. The approach to learning resources demonstrates the School's plans to tailor them to students' needs and support personalised learning.

189   Evidence from the partner University reveals some concern from the RAU about facilities and learning resources recorded nearly six months prior to the visit, but the team found that, in the time since, plans for premises and software had become more advanced, developed, and detailed such that they are credible, and the prioritisation and timescales within them assured the team that they were realistic. The team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.

190   As the School has yet to commence delivery the team was unable to examine any third-party endorsements or the views of students through surveys or course evaluations. The team was unable to meet with those employed directly in student support roles, as they have yet to be recruited, and was also unable to carry out a direct assessment of facilities, learning resources and support services. However plans for resources and facilities are advanced in their development, policies had been approved and staff the team met understand their approach to resourcing and facilities. The team was unable to test whether these plans were effective in their implementation and, as such, it has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q5   The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience

191   This Core practice expects that the provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.

192   The QAA assessment team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

What the evidence shows

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

194   The RAU's MoA expects the School to facilitate 'general staff/student liaison, including meetings between committees and students' and obtain feedback from 'present and immediately past students' as articulated in the standard terms of reference for a Programme Committee which the School must operate. [038 Annex 2 paragraph 1) a) iv)] Further, the Memorandum is specific in expecting 'up to' two student representatives to be elected to the Committee from each relevant year group, and this is reinforced in RAU academic regulations. [038 Annex 2 paragraph 1) b) iv); RAU academic regulations paragraphs 19 and 115]

195   The School's Student and Staff Feedback Policy sets out its commitment to gathering and using student feedback. [023] It acknowledges the role student feedback can have in monitoring and improving programmes, allowing students to participate in identifying improvements, and informing improvement plans. [023 paragraph 1] Through the policy, the School will seek student feedback through surveys, focus groups, town halls, informal comments, individual student meetings, and Student Council/student committees. [paragraphs 5b ii, 5d, 6b I, 6b ii] Student feedback will be handled anonymously and reports prepared by staff; the School plans to inform students of changes to courses made as a result of their feedback but does not specify how they would be informed or if students would be involved in deciding changes that could be made to courses. [Student Feedback Policy 023] Further, the policy distinguishes between how academic and non-academic feedback will be handled, with the Dean, General Manager, course/programme managers and the Registrar reviewing academic feedback and identifying improvements each term. The General Manager, the student experience managers and other relevant administrative staff will consider non-academic feedback and use it to inform improvements at the end of each semester. [Student Feedback Policy 023] The team considered that these arrangements provide several and sufficient means for students to be engaged individually in the quality of their courses.

196   The valuable role of students in the management of quality is recognised in the School's Student Representation Policy. [024 paragraph 1] The policy expects democratically elected student representatives to explore the views of students and participate in the School's academic governance. [024 paragraph 4] Through the policy the School commits to supporting the democratic election of student representatives, training student representatives, taking action in response to issues raised by them, and providing feedback on the actions taken, although no timeframes for feedback are specified. [paragraphs 5 and 7] The School's policy indicates that two student representatives will be elected for each course at the start of each term. [024 paragraph 7] If a student representative is weak in their duty to engage with students there is provision for them to be replaced and a more effective student representative sought. [024 paragraph 7] The School also confirmed in meetings that all students, including online students, would be able to

become student representatives and the team noted this inclusive approach. [M4]

197   Academic Board allows for two student members on the Board of 12 meaning that the student voice makes up a good proportion of the membership. Minutes of Academic Board indicate that the importance of student representation on subcommittees is understood and in discussing the design of its subcommittees it noted the need to have student representatives, such as on LTQAC. [088 p2] The School plans to identify student representatives for membership of Academic Board through student-led elections. [M4]

198   The draft Terms of Reference of LTQAC indicate that it reports directly to Academic Board and is responsible for monitoring and supporting learning and managing student development and resources. [084] It will be directly responsible for a Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Plan, the monitoring of student feedback and the orientation of new faculty members. [084] The team found that responsibilities for using student feedback have been designed into the School's deliberative committee structures, but the commitment is undermined since this committee has no student members, and two representatives will be invited to 'participate' in at least two of four meetings a year. [084] In contrast, the School's Access and Participation Committee allows for two student members to support oversight of the Access and Participation Plan, albeit its terms of reference remain in draft. [070] The team found the difference in approach to student members of these two committees inconsistent. Staff who met with the team were eager to emphasise that student representation on committees at all levels would enable students to directly inform the monitoring of the quality of programmes, adding that action plans would be scrutinised directly at Academic Board, and action taken in response to students reported to RAU in annual returns. [M2] The team agreed that the membership of students on Academic Board would allow for students to be involved in the monitoring of quality of programmes, even if students were not to be members of all committees.

199   The draft terms of reference for the Student Council show that it reports directly to Academic Board and aims to provide a forum for student representatives to discuss and identify suggestions for improvement of the 'student learning experience' and the approach to student representation. [085] They also indicate that the Student Council is responsible for monitoring the student representative system, identifying opportunities for improvement, considering the outcome of student surveys, and sharing the outcomes of meetings with fellow students. [085] The School plans to provide administrative support for the Council, although this is at odds with the membership which comprises only student representatives, and members of staff by invitation only. [085]

200   The School's Business Plan indicates that it plans to have students on the School's Academic Board but not its Board of Directors. [019] However, it plans for its Board of Directors to hold a single annual meeting with student representatives to discuss the School's strategy and approach to enhancing the student experience. It plans to give students full representation on the Board of Directors when the School has 'matured'. In meetings with the team the School was unable to articulate how they would know the School had matured sufficiently to allow this to happen, while recognising that students are well represented on Academic Board. [M2] The team agreed that the membership of students at Academic Board was sufficient to involve them in academic governance but the School could be clearer in its plans on when and under what circumstances it would believe if appropriate to add students to its Board of Directors.

201   The Business Plan also suggest that students will have access to staff through the 'academic committee' and the 'corporate placement committee', and a monthly town hall meeting for each programme. [019] The School subsequently clarified that by 'academic committee' and 'corporate placement committee' they referred to the School Council although School Council membership is limited to students only and staff attend by invitation,

so it did not appear to the team to be an optimal forum for making staff accessible to students. [087] Notwithstanding this, the Business Plan also refers to a 'Student Representative Group' which will meet with Academic Board every six months and provide a presentation annually. [019] The team could not distinguish between plans for a Student Council and a separate Student Representative Group and the difference in terms pointed to inconsistencies in plans. However, despite these anomalies the team concluded that there were sufficient opportunities at all levels throughout the School for students to collectively engage in the quality of their educational experience.

202   The engagement of students individually will be predominantly through student surveys. The School's Student Feedback Policy requires student surveys to be run twice for each unit, once in the interim, and once at the end. In addition, there will be surveys each term on both academic and non-academic matters, and graduate surveys. [023] Course and Programme Managers are expected to consolidate and disseminate survey feedback to senior colleagues and Programme Committees; there are specific responsibilities for senior members of staff to review and respond to student surveys and the Dean's quarterly reports to Academic Board must include student survey data and analysis. [Student Feedback Policy 023] The student survey templates show that the School plans to ask students questions about the level of knowledge and quality of learning materials, teaching effectiveness, how well students are enabled to develop their skills and creative thinking, the role of their mentor and the administrative organisation of the course. [083] There is also a separate series of survey questions about non-academic provision including guest lectures, facilities, library and information technology services. The survey templates refer to SP Jain Global's Dubai campus suggesting it has been adapted from another SPJ operating context. While the team found that the breadth of the surveys is adequate and appropriate to generate some useful data for course and School improvement, there are no questions about whether students are aware that the School has responded to student feedback, or whether students considered the course engaging and whether they were able to ask questions. There are also no survey questions related to assessment although there is an open field for survey participants to complete on areas of their learning experience. [083] While staff told the team that students are invited to indicate whether they want feedback on their feedback, this was not evident on the survey template. [083] Despite this, the team formed the view that the current plans relating to the mechanisms for seeking individual students' views on their learning were appropriate.

203   The RAU's Institutional Approval Report notes that the School will use learning analytics to monitor engagement including student attendance and library interactions. [037] In discussion with staff, the team found that plans for gathering and using learning analytics were embryonic and general but would have potential as a tool to supplement the monitoring of students. [M2]

Conclusions

204   As described above, the assessment team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the assessment team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other assessments and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

205   The School has clear and comprehensive plans to engage students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience. This is set out in clear and appropriate policies and frameworks including the RAU's MoA, academic regulations, the School's Student Feedback Policy, and Student Representation Policy. Further, the terms of

reference of committees that operate at both programme and School level make clear and unambiguous commitments to engaging with students as members, but with the exception of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Assurance Committee, although the team was satisfied that student representatives are involved in programme quality assurance through their membership of Academic Board. Notwithstanding this, committees aim to consider and act upon student feedback to improve courses and the School's provision.

206   The team found that the School's plans to actively engage students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience were robust and credible. Documentation showed arrangements to elect student representatives as soon as the School starts delivering courses, and that it had already determined on which committees to locate student representatives. Its plans for student surveys throughout courses were clearly determined and their reporting processes set out. In light of the plans for engaging with student representatives, and for running surveys, and the School's high-level commitment to using student feedback, the team considered that the Core practice is met.

207   Because the School is yet to commence delivery, the team was unable to examine students' views or examples of the School changing or improving provision as a result of student engagement. It was also unable to meet students to assess whether they consider they are engaged in the quality of their educational experience. While the team considered the School's plans for student engagement to be appropriate and credible, it was unable to test whether these plans were effective in their implementation and, as such, it has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q6 The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students

208   This Core practice expects that the provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students.

209   The QAA assessment team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the [Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers](#) (March 2019).

What the evidence shows

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

211   The School has separate processes for complaints and appeals and recognises the distinction between each. Within the context of the RAU's MoA, the School is expected to operate a complaints process directly that its students must use in the first instance. [038]

212   The School's Student Complaints Policy [006; 090] clearly describes both a formal and informal procedure. The scope of complaints according to the policy are limited to those about the School and complaints cannot be made about other students under this policy; for the latter, students can use the School's Student Misconduct Policy. [034] Those eligible to make a complaint to the School under its Complaints Policy would be applicants, currently enrolled students, and students who have exited within a month, making the policy inclusive. [006; 090] The policy sets a one-month time limit on complaints. [006; 090] Students are encouraged to make informal complaints under an 'Early Resolution' process because they have the 'best chance of being resolved quickly and efficiently'. [006; 090] To do this, students should approach one of several staff, including the Head of Student Support, their personal tutor, Academic Managers or the Registrar, which is a sufficient number of optional staff to contact to ensure that someone is accessible to initiate the process. [090]The informal complaints process uses a conciliatory and early resolution approach resulting in a written outcome after 14 days which is a reasonable and realistic timeframe. [006; 090]

213   Staff recognised that to secure fairness in the process, conflicts of interests might need to be managed carefully when handling informal complaints given the small nature of the School and its cohorts in its first few years of operation and noted that, in order to secure the impartial handling of complaints, they might call on colleagues from the wider SP Jain Global network for independent adjudication. [M2] Staff also noted that there would be independent oversight of its complaints handling via the monitoring of a complaints annual report to the RAU, and recognised that complaints can provide a valuable means of student feedback. [M2] The complaints process is likely to be effective because it is clear in its scope, identifies clearly the roles and processes involved, and has elements that mitigate the risk of bias in handling complaints and therefore promote fairness of the process.

214   The School's draft Student Misconduct Policy provides a means by which a student might make a complaint about another student. [034] It covers inappropriate behaviour and harassment such that it would appear to be useful to students who considered themselves subject to inappropriate behaviour from other students. [034] The process allows for representations from both the complainant and the subject of the complaint which would ensure that key relevant parties are fairly and directly consulted as part of the process. [034] Students who are the subject of a complaint from another student under the Student Misconduct Policy can appeal the outcome; [034] if the student who originated the misconduct complaint is dissatisfied they can use the School's Complaints Policy. This

handling is in line with the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) Good Practice Framework on disciplinary procedures and is fair because there is a means of recourse for both parties. [clarification email from QSR Facilitator 13/07/2022]

215   The team agreed that the School's procedures for handling complaints in its relevant policies will be fair and transparent as the stages of the process are clearly defined and take account of OIA guidance. The process had not yet been tested as the School had not yet admitted any students.

216   As an outcome of the School's complaints process, and according to the School's Complaints Policy and the Memorandum of Agreement with the RAU, students that remain dissatisfied may escalate their complaint to the RAU. [006; 090; 038] RAU Academic Regulations clearly articulate a three-stage complaints procedure for which students will receive a completion of procedures letter after stages two and three, the first formal stage and second formal stage respectively. The Completion of Procedures letter and associated information will enable students to escalate an unresolved complaint to the OIA. [RAU Academic regulations paragraphs 65-66] The team considered the handling of the formal complaint by the RAU, and the optionality of escalating a complaint to the OIA, provides assurance of a process adjudged independently of staff at the School and is fair.

217   The RAU's MoA notes the University reserves the right to make a final judgement on complaints and expects the School to abide by the outcomes of any complaints to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator, and to provide to the RAU an annual report on complaints for monitoring purposes. [038] The School also plans to provide an annual report on complaints to its own Academic Board as set out in the School's Complaints Policy which shows that internal monitoring of complaints will extend to the highest level within the academic governance framework of the School. [006; 090] The School recognises its own responsibility to register with the OIA as set out in its Project Plans. [113]

218   The RAU's MoA makes clear that it will receive and adjudge all academic appeals directly, [038] and the School will operate within the framework provided by the RAU's academic regulations. [038; responsibilities checklist 043] These regulations specify with respect to appeals that students must write to the RAU Academic Registrar with the grounds for their appeal which must align with either procedural irregularities in the assessment process or exam board, circumstances which affected the candidate's performance, or the bias of examiners. Appeals on the basis of academic judgement are not allowed. Appeals that meet these criteria are referred to an Examinations and Assessment Appeals Committee which allows for students to make direct representations, and can determine the outcome of the case or refer it back to the relevant Programme Board for reconsideration; this should happen within 10 days. [RAU Regs 124] The team agreed that this provides for an appeals process for students that is fair and timely in its design with realistic timeframes. The handling of appeals by the RAU, and the optionality of escalating a complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator, provides assurance of a process adjudged independent of staff at the School and is fair.

219   Students are also able to appeal other academic and decision-making procedures that may affect them during their studies, including academic misconduct proceedings. The School's Academic Integrity Policy provides an appropriate definition of academic misconduct and as a statement of policy commits to training students in positive academic conduct and taking action when academic misconduct is identified. [011] It sets out a framework for minor and major misconduct, processes for the determination of misconduct, with major breaches involving a panel decision and students able to make direct representation, and a series of available penalties and a written outcome. [011] Students can appeal any determination that they have engaged in misconduct and can bring with them a representative to proceedings, which builds into the process a level of fairness and support

for the student's participation in it. [011 sections 6 and 7] At the appeal stage, the Chair and two members have no prior experience in that case which allows for it to be conducted with impartiality. [011 section 7]

220   In its submission, the School noted its plans to inform students about complaints and appeals at a general level of policies and procedures via its website, the Learning Management System and the Student Handbook, and their location in multiple places makes them accessible. [QSR submission paragraph 95] A draft student handbook shows that information about appeals is included and the School's Complaints Policy is drawn to the attention of students, which the team found to be accessible because all students would receive the handbook. The practice at other SP Jain sites suggests that handbooks are also readily available online. [086 Sample student handbook from SP Jain Global] While this refers to general student complaints, students are also informed that they are specifically entitled to complain about the use of their personal information and data as set out in the School's Student Information Provision Policy. [086] Staff in meetings were consistent in describing how information on complaints and appeals will be available in multiple locations including via the website, and via RAU which made their plans credible. [M2]

Conclusions

221   As described above, the assessment team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the assessment team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other assessments and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

222   The School has plans for handling complaints in a manner that will be definitive, fair and transparent, and deliver timely outcomes. This is because it has already approved a Complaints Policy that is definitive, clear and, subject to the signing of the Memorandum of Agreement with the RAU, will be fair to all students because the process is designed to include the independent and impartial consideration of complaints, and students are allowed representation and written outcomes within a process operating in a timely way. Complaints of students against students are also designed to be handled fairly because both parties will be allowed to make representations, and both parties can either appeal or raise a complaint against the outcome, which will be delivered in a timely process.

223   The School has plans for handling appeals in a manner that will be definitive, fair and transparent, and deliver timely outcomes according to RAU's appeals procedure. This is because the students will use an appeals process that is managed by the RAU and will not involve staff involved in the direct delivery of their programme; the appeals process also has clear criteria. The outcomes of appeals will be delivered via RAU's procedures in a timely fashion and with further escalation to an independent ombudsman available to students.

224   The School's plans to develop accessible complaints and appeals procedures are robust and credible since they plan to locate this information in multiple places and this plan was articulated at the start of the QSR assessment, and remained consistently well-articulated to the team throughout the assessment process by staff. Because of this the team is assured that, if implemented according to the School's plans, the School will operate fair and transparent procedures for complaints and appeals that will be accessible to all students. Therefore, the team concludes that the Core practice is met.

225   The team found sufficient evidence of an agreed and approved complaints process, and a robust agreement with the RAU which, subject to its signing, will provide a fair and

transparent appeals process. The plans the School presents for making information about complaints and appeals accessible to students were realistic and credible. However, as the School is yet to enrol students, the team was unable to consider the numbers and types of complaints and appeals received, and any outcomes (including time to outcome) or any examples of specific complaints and appeals. It was also unable to meet with students. Ideally, the team would have liked to have examined the School's plans and associated documentation at a more advanced stage in their development, for example after some consideration of complaints and appeal outcomes by the School's committee structure. Therefore the team has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q8 Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them

226   This Core practice expects that where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them.

227   The QAA assessment team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers (March 2019).

What the evidence shows

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

229   The arrangements between the School and the RAU in ensuring the academic experience are of high quality and have been agreed following a robust institutional approval process [Institutional Approval Report [037] and programme validation and review by the RAU. [066 RAU Programmes Validation Report] The MoA [038] arising from these processes is comprehensive and detailed, clearly setting out the respective responsibilities of each partner and defining the roles that are to be established by the School to manage and oversee the operation of the agreement. More detail about the roles of individuals and committees involved in the partnership can be found in S3. [paragraphs 48-53] The monitoring of the partnership will take place through an overall Annual Monitoring Report for the Partnership developed by RAU's link tutor informed in part by the Annual Programme Manager's Report(s). In the view of the team the arrangements between these two principal partners, the School and the RAU, are likely to ensure that students enjoy a high-quality academic experience on the School's programmes.

230   The responsibilities checklist [043] shows that the School is responsible for managing relationships with partner organisations, for example internship providers. However, the principal relationship is with its parent company, SP Jain Global.

231   The team sought clarification on the statement in the submission [001] that the School is in the process of developing an articulation agreement with the RAU in respect of the School's 'multi-city model' whereby the School's students may study at SP Jain Global international campuses. However, the School confirmed [087 – Request for additional evidence post FTM] and the team heard [M1] that these plans are not yet to be taken forward. International students from SP Jain Global campuses wishing to study on SP Jain UK programmes will be admitted on the basis of application through RPL regulations rather than through an articulation agreement with the RAU.

232   The programme specifications for the Global MBA, [040] the Master of Financial Technology [041] and Master of Global Business [042] show that there is a core internship module on each programme with a 30-credit value at Level 7. The internship will be subject to pass or fail grade. The internship module specification [063] provides further detail on the nature of the internship and how it will be managed. Together the team found that these documents will provide clear and useful information to the students about their potential internship experience in terms of intended learning outcomes and credit frameworks.

233   The School's Work Based Learning Policy [025] outlines how it manages Work Based Learning (WBL) for its students where WBL is a compulsory, integrated and assessed

requirement of a programme of study.

234   The policy identifies the following types of work-based learning that may be adopted by its programmes, for example internships, where the student participates in the work of the internship provider and is required to use the experience to fulfil the learning and assessment requirements of the programme they are studying. Students can also complete an applied research project/data collection exercise, which are focused pieces of work that require students to spend time within a workplace for the purposes of undertaking a specific project or elements of a project.

235   The programme specifications [EMBA – 053; GMBA – 054; MGB – 055; MFT – 056] set out which type of WBL is required in each programme and this is supplemented by detailed module specifications for the Applied Research Project [058] and Internship. [063] The internship is to be undertaken in term four, after completion of taught modules and comprises a 16-week compulsory, graded internship, which can be undertaken within or outside the UK. The specifications [040; 041; 042] show that the internship is intended to allow students to gain first-hand experience in a real business environment to enhance their future employability. The team heard [M2] how senior staff at the School value highly the role of internships in terms of enabling students to apply theory to practice and vice versa. Students will be expected to work on an agreed project relevant to their degree, with support from both a corporate and academic mentor. At the end of the internship students will be required to submit a business report which addresses the learning outcomes of the module as well as a critical reflection of their workplace experience.

236   The School's work-based learning policy [025] shows how the School will manage such internships and clearly describes the roles of the parties involved, namely the School, the internship provider and the student. The policy [025] identifies that each student undertaking an internship will be assigned an academic mentor from the School and a corporate mentor from the WBL provider. The team found that clear details are given in the policy [025] of the roles of each and how they will work in a tripartite manner with the student to ensure a high-quality student experience and to regularly monitor the placement during the internship period and to review the experience afterwards.

237   The policy [025] shows that the academic tutor is required to liaise with the internship provider and student to ensure that the work experience opportunities align with the learning outcomes of the internship module as set out in the programme specifications. [040;041;042] The tutor will be supported in this through the use of a standardised internship visit report. [SPJL tutor visit report 114] Points for consideration at the internship visit are detailed in the report and include matters related to health and safety, progress with the required logbook/critical reflection, business report and correlation between the internship and the student's aspiration as they align with programme and module specifications. The team found that the policy along with the report would ensure that internships are of a sufficient quality to allow a high-quality learning experience.

238   Additionally, the policy [025] requires the internship provider to ensure a safe working environment and offers the student equivalent work facilities and amenities as those provided to other employees, to report any accidents or incidents to the School, to provide equal opportunities to the students without any discrimination against students from different backgrounds, and provide a formal induction to the students at the time of starting the placement.

239   To ensure appropriate arrangements for the health, safety and wellbeing of students, the policy [025] states that the Dean of the School will undertake a risk, health and safety assessment of every internship or project. The School will [044 – point 9: 100 Amended JD for Dean] include in the job description for the Dean a requirement for the

Dean to be trained in undertaking such risk assessments and that this will be included in the staff development plan for the Dean. In a meeting with the team [M2] those responsible for managing internship arrangements were able to fully and clearly express how they would discharge this role and recognised the importance of ensuring that such internships were of value and that the student's wellbeing was assured.

240   The School has in place a raft of documentation that it plans to use to enable the School to undertake effective risk, health and safety assessments of each provider and to approve the internship. [118 SPJL Placement approval form] These include risk assessments related to the place of internship itself, [117 SPJL Risk Assessment Form] overseas travel risk assessment, [116 SPJL Overseas travel risk assessment] insurance details, [115 SPJL Insurance disclaimer letter – student; 119 SPJL travel insurance notification] and a declaration of health document. [120 SPJL Declaration of health form] The team heard [M2] how these documents were submitted to the awarding body as part of the Programme Validation and Approval process. [053 – EMBA; 054 – GMBA; 055 – MGB; 056 – MFT, programme specifications revised RAU validation]

241   The policy [025] also shows that the School, through its academic mentor, plans to review the quality of and outcomes from the internship in partnership with the student and the internship provider and that should a student wish to complain about the internship they can do so through the School's Student Complaints Policy. [006] Overall, the team found that the School's Work-Based Learning Policy provides a sound basis for the effective management of internships.

242   The WBL handbook [067] which aligns with the policy [025] provides comprehensive and useful detail for students, internship providers and staff and sets out clear lines of responsibility. For example, it clearly defines an internship as an intentional, organised, supervised and assessed educational activity that integrates theoretical learning with its applications in the professional/industry workplace. It describes plans for a written agreement between the student, the provider and the School for every WBL placement/ internship or project. These agreements are to include the expectations of all parties and to describe the objectives and outcomes of the placement/internship with reference to the relevant programme learning outcomes as set out in the related programme and module specifications.

243   The handbook [067] includes a clear and concise Internship Agreement template which serves to capture key information about the internship and further serves to describe important aspects of the internship. These include confidentiality, a code of ethics, corporate interactions, an agreement for work-based projects and, in common with the policy, [025] how a student may raise a concern or submit a complaint about an internship.

244   The team found that there is a clear alignment of the programme [040; 041; 042] and module [063] specifications with the WBL policy, [025] the latter being further detailed and operationalised in the WBL handbook. [067] The School has in place plans and supporting documentation to enable it to manage internships. Collectively, the team considers that these represent coherent and detailed arrangements by which the School will work in partnership with its students and internship providers to ensure that students enjoy a high-quality learning experience in a safe environment.

245   Staff from the School were able to clearly define their roles and responsibilities for internships and a member of the School's Industry Advisory Board also spoke positively about arrangements for internships. [M1, M2]

Conclusions

246   As described above, the assessment team considered all of the evidence submitted

[Annex 1] to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the assessment team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other assessments and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

247   The principal partnership is that between the RAU and the School and the team found that both parties have worked productively over an extended period to ensure that students at the School will enjoy a high-quality academic experience which is at least comparable with that of the awarding body. This has arisen from the awarding body's rigorous institutional and programme approval processes and is captured in the extensive Memorandum of Agreement between the two parties which clearly details their respective roles and responsibilities and how these will be discharged. The team considers that the active role of the RAU link tutor with senior School staff has been pivotal in the development and likely success of the partnership and the team found that all have a good understanding of their respective roles for quality.

248   The team found that the School has a clear and coherent set of policies and processes to secure student internships which are safe, and which allow students to meet the intended learning outcomes of the programmes and of the internship module, and ensures that the academic experience is of high quality. There are clear lines of responsibility for the School, the internship provider and the student, which were fully understood by the staff. Information that will be provided to students about placements is likely to enable students to fully understand how their internship relates to the programme as a whole and how they will be assessed and will lead to a high-quality experience. The assessment team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.

249   The team was able to examine a wide range of policy and process documentation, including the MoA with the awarding body, programme and internship module specifications and numerous documents to be used by the School to ensure the quality and safety of internships. However, as internships had not yet been established the team could not test the effectiveness of their management in relation to the quality of the experience or speak to students about their views on the internships. Therefore, the assessment team has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.

Q9 The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes

250   This Core practice expects that the provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.

251   The QAA assessment team completed an assessment of this Core practice in line with the principles and outcomes that are detailed in the Quality and Standards Review for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students: Guidance for Providers (March 2019).

What the evidence shows

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

253   The School's Access and Participation Plan (APP) [031] which aligns with the School's Student Equity, Diversity and Fair Treatment Policy [032] sets out in detail its plans to ensure that students from widening participation backgrounds are supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. However, the School acknowledges that there are very few students from areas with the lowest participation rates (POLAR4 Quintile 1) in its immediate catchment. Progress with and reporting on the APP will be undertaken by the APP committee which will report directly to the School Board of Directors and will be linked to the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee. [APP - 031]

254   The plan identifies two areas of focus which relate to the academic and professional outcomes of students from widening participation backgrounds and these are:

- Teaching and learning: excellence, flexibility and inclusivity in teaching, learning and curriculum, which promotes academic success for all learners and equips graduates with the expertise required to excel in a global business setting.
- Student support: effective student support to promote positive and successful student experiences both academic and non-academic.

255   The School's plans with regard to the teaching and learning focus are further articulated in its Learning and Teaching Enhancement Policy [009] for which LTQAC will be responsible. [ToR 084] The plan applies to all students and outlines, for example, how learning and teaching will be monitored with regard to student participation, experience and attainment. A key aspect of the monitoring of the quality of teaching and learning will be the annual Programme Manager's report which is submitted to the RAU and includes sections regarding learning, teaching, the curriculum and infrastructure for learning and teaching.

256   Additionally, the School's Assurance of Learning Policy, [051] which aligns with the Learning and Teaching Enhancement [009] and Staff Development [015] policies, sets out a wide range of appropriate mechanisms to ensure that teaching will be of a high quality and lead to successful academic outcomes. These include staff pedagogic and subject-specific professional development to enhance teaching practice and to inform learning, classroom management, feedback on assessment and the identification of 'at risk' students in accordance with the Students At Risk Policy. [026]

257   Plans with regard to the student support focus are detailed in the School's Student Support Policy, [022] which includes plans to provide all students with career advice, counselling and language support. The policy [022] also sets out plans to support students with scheduled access to support and guidance from academic staff. Staff will be allocated three hours of student support time per week during periods designated as 'faculty hour meetings' for which students must make an appointment to meet academic staff.

258   The team considered that the alignment of these policies [009; 022; 032] with the School's APP [031] demonstrates a coherent approach to the support of all students with specific reference to those from a widening participation background to achieve successful academic outcomes.

259   More generally, in terms of the School's plans to support all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes, the Student Support Policy [022] sets out overarching principles and specific plans for student support. For example, the School plans to support student transition to their studies through an orientation period, with an additional programme for international students. The School plans to use its library and its VLE to provide students with face-to-face study support and online study support resources, for example, supporting students in developing their skills in research, academic writing, referencing, presentation, revision and examinations.

260   The School plans to offer a wide range of support services to students to complement support offered by academic staff. Examples cited by staff [M2] include counselling services using a counselling and coaching team staffed with professionally qualified student counsellors on the campus and where necessary supplemented by access to external counselling services, [022] free [044 – point 9] as well as English language support workshops that will be available for all students where the need is identified prior to or at enrolment or on programme.

261   The Student Equity, Diversity and Fair Treatment Policy [032] outlines the School's commitment to ensure that all students are treated fairly and with equity, and is commensurate with its Student Support Policy [022] which also commits the School to support all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.

262   The School also has plans [022; The Student at Risk policy - 026] to identify and to support students who are at risk of non-continuation, as evidenced by the extent of student engagement in and progression on their studies. Specifically, the School will monitor attendance levels on modules where there is prescribed attendance and will intervene to support students where attendance levels are below the required level. Similarly, for those students who do not meet the rules of progression for a term or semester, the School plans to engage with them to support them in their studies. The Student at Risk Policy sets out in detail where responsibilities lie for identifying at risk students and what intervention and support measures may be instigated. For example, the Student Experience Manager will undertake to meet those students identified as being at risk to explore the issues and to agree support measures, including, for example, referral to the student counsellor. The team heard [M2] that the same approach would be adopted for the School's online students, the first cohort of which is anticipated in February 2023.

263   The team heard [M2] and programme specifications [039; 040; 041; 042] show that the School plans to allocate all students to a personal academic tutor to support them to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. This is planned to be achieved through guidance with knowledge and understanding; skills development and assessment requirements; supporting them to identify their learning needs and develop appropriate strategies to achieve them; helping students to make the most of the learning resources and other forms of learning support available to them; supporting students in academic, professional and career planning, including mentoring them in projects; advising and guiding students on issues or problems arising and directing them to the broader range of support services.

264   The School's Quality Assurance Framework [003 currently draft] which aligns with its Students At Risk Policy [026] shows how the School plans to monitor and analyse student performance in order that it can implement strategies to enhance student achievement, for

example through using data relating to student performance in modules and on programmes, attendance and attrition rates and assessment performance. Allied to this the School plans to use benchmarking [Benchmarking policy and procedure – 013] to enable it to evaluate its performance against similar institutions or groups of institutions in terms of student outcomes, using parameters such as student satisfaction, progress and achievement rates and graduate outcomes. The team explored this further [M3] with staff and heard that these plans are not yet fully developed but will be based on models used by SP Jain Global. Staff suggested that aspects such as admissions criteria and assessment outcomes would form part of the benchmarking exercise.

265   The School recognises the key role of staff in supporting all students to achieve successful professional outcomes [001 – para 117] and its Staff Development Policy [015] outlines its approach to ensuring that staff are appropriately skilled and have up-to-date industry experience to support students. For example, the policy [015] shows that the School will support staff to engage in academic staff exchanges and to attend a short course or conference that is directly relevant to the employee's work or career or professional development. The team noted that the School's plans for student support were heavily dependent on securing the services of appropriately qualified staff, both academic and professional support.

266   The team explored this dependency with staff [M2:M3] and heard that the School plans to recruit senior staff in the first instance, for example the Student Experience Manager, who would then determine the recruitment, induction and management of staff for whom they have responsibility. The team also examined the School's plans for staff recruitment. [087 request for additional evidence, post FTM – point 22] [113 Project plan SPJL] This evidence aligned with statements made by staff, and the team formed the view that the School does have credible plans for the recruitment of staff to support students. Further details around the recruitment of staff appointed to support students can be found in Q3 (paragraph 154).

267   While the School anticipates that most students will be practising professionals, it seeks to support them to enhance their professional outcomes. The team heard [M1] from senior School staff, the RAU link tutor and from a member of the School's Industry Advisory Board, a strong commitment to supporting students to achieve successful professional outcomes, through curriculum development and review and through assessment, with external input to ensure currency of content and relevance of the assessment model.

268   Programmes [Programme specifications 039, 040, 041, 042] have been developed to enable the acquisition of relevant workplace knowledge and skills enabling the participants to have a value adding impact on their organisations. To this end all programmes involve either an applied research project or a mandatory core internship. Programme modules will also incorporate work-based learning projects. For example, on the Master of Financial Technology [Programme specification – 041] students will be required to develop a simulated artificial intelligence learning application which will be presented to an industry panel while students on the Master of Business Administration (Executive) [Programme specification - 039] will strategically analyse a global company and present their findings to senior executives of their chosen company.

269   A key component of the School's plans to support students to achieve successful professional outcomes are the core internship module on the Global MBA, [040] the Master of Financial Technology [041] and Master of Global Business [042] programmes. Arrangements for internships are detailed in Q8 (paragraphs 234-245).

270   The programme specifications [040; 041; 042] show that the internship is intended to allow students to gain first-hand experience in a real business environment to enhance

their future employability. Students will be expected to work on an agreed project relevant to their degree, with support from both a corporate and academic mentor. At the end of the internship students will be required to submit a business report which addresses the learning outcomes of the module as well as a critical reflection of their workplace experience.

271   The team heard [M3] of plans to implement the Professional Readiness Programme [121] that is in operation at SP Jain Global campuses. While the plans for this at SP Jain UK are not yet fully developed, the programme delivered elsewhere consists of a series of one-to-one and group interactions, with elements including sector intelligence and industry trends, business case studies, CV development, smart communication and mock interviews. The team considered that, if the programme were fully implemented as intended, it would contribute to supporting students to achieve successful professional outcomes.

272   The team also found [001 Submission] and heard [M3] that the School plans to offer careers advice through its on-campus Corporate Relations Team. Furthermore, the team heard [M3] and saw details of [031 – APP Strategic measure 3 – page 17] plans to provide information and support for on-campus recruiting and local advice on contacts to assist students to make career connections as detailed in the School's Access and Participation Plan.

273   The responsibilities checklist [043] states that the School is responsible for giving feedback to students on their assessed work. The School's Assurance of Learning Policy [051] confirms that assessment feedback will take the form of written feedback to students as well as collective oral feedback through classroom discussions and individual feedback during student consultation hours. Further, the Assessment Validation, Grading and Moderation Policy [005] directs that students should receive purposeful and systematic feedback and includes formative and summative feedback, with the formative feedback given in time for students to reflect on and help to improve performance before the final assessment. Summative feedback should be provided to the students within 15 working days of submission which adheres to RAU's timescales. The policy provides guidance on how relevant and meaningful feedback should be constructed using the marking criteria, learning outcomes and focused comments highlighting both positive aspects and improvements to be made. Staff [M1; M2] confirmed that they will be working with the RAU in the first instance to ensure that staff produce effective feedback to students to align with RAU's framework and expectations. Staff [M1; M2] also confirmed that the effectiveness of feedback should be reflected in continuation and graduation rates while Academic Board will have a role to play on the monitoring of any feedback plans. While no sample of assessed student work was available to the team, it agreed that the policies in place and staff knowledge and plans for student feedback would ensure students are given comprehensive, helpful and timely feedback, if implemented as intended.

Conclusions

274   As described above, the assessment team considered all of the evidence submitted [Annex 1] to form a judgement as to whether the provider meets this Core practice. In making this judgement the team followed the process set out in Guidance for Providers and took account of the key statements outlined in Annex 5. In so doing the assessment team ensured that its judgement was consistent with all other assessments and remained outcomes focused. The team's conclusions, based on the evidence considered, are detailed below.

275   Staff demonstrated a clear understanding of their role in supporting student achievement. There is a broad range of plans (policies and procedures) which collectively forms a coherent and comprehensive approach to support all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. The School has sound plans to recruit both the

academic and professional support staff who will undertake student support, through roles such as that of the academic personal tutor, the counsellor and language support. The team found that the School has a strong commitment to supporting students to achieve successful professional outcomes and this commitment is supported by comprehensive and credible plans to bring this about, for example through its core internship programme and emerging proposals for a Professional Readiness Programme. The School plans to implement an effective approach to comprehensive, helpful and timely assessment feedback with staff demonstrating understanding of those plans. The assessment team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.

276   The team was able to test this Core practice in meetings with staff and in consideration of a range of relevant policies and procedures, including the School's Access and Participation Plan, the Assurance of Learning Policy, the School's Quality Assurance Framework, the Student Support Policy and the Professional Readiness Programme. However, the team was unable to consider assessed student work or speak to students and test the effectiveness of the plans and policies for achieving successful academic and professional outcomes. Therefore, the assessment team has a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.

Annex 1

Evidence List
Initial submission 5 May 2022
001-QSR-SUBMISSION.pdf
002-ADMISSION-POLICY.pdf
003-QUALITY-ASSURANCE-FRAMEWORK.pdf
005-ASSESSMENT-VALIDATION-GRADING-MODERATION-POLICY.pdf
006-STUDENT-COMPLAINTS-POLICY.pdf
007-ADMINISTRATION-JOB-DESCRIPTIONS.pdf
008-ACADEMIC-JOB-DESCRIPTIONS.pdf
009-LEARNING-AND-TEACHING-ENHANCEMENT-POLICY.pdf
010-STAFF-RECRUITMENT-SELECTION-INDUCTION-PERFORMANCE-REVIEW.pdf
011-ACADEMIC-INTEGRITY-POLICY.pdf
013-BENCHMARKING-POLICY-AND-PROCEDURES.pdf
014-SCHOLARSHIP-OF-LEARNING-AND-TEACHING-POLICY.pdf
015-STAFF-DEVELOPMENT-POLICY.pdf
016-ACADEMIC-STAFF-PROMOTION POLICY.pdf
017-ACADEMIC-STAFF-RECRUITMENT-POLICY.pdf
019-BUSINESS-PLAN.pdf
020-LIBRARY-RESOURCES-COLLECTION-DEVELOPMENT-POLICY.pdf
021-HEALTH-AND-WELLBEING-POLICY.pdf
022-STUDENT-SUPPORT-POLICY.pdf
023-STUDENT-AND-STAFF-FEEDBACK-POLICY.pdf
024-STUDENT-REPRESENTATION-POLICY.pdf
025-WORK-BASED-LEARNING-POLICY.pdf
026-STUDENTS-AT-RISK-POLICY.pdf
027-MITIGATING-CIRCUMSTANCES-POLICY.pdf
028-RPL-POLICY.pdf
029-STUDENT-CODE-OF-CONDUCT-POLICY.pdf
030-STUDENTS-WITH-DISABILITY-POLICY.pdf
031-ACCESS-&-PARTICIPATION-PLAN.pdf
032-STUDENT-EQUITY-DIVERSITY-&-FAIR-TREATMENT-POLICY.pdf
033-FITNESS-TO-STUDY-POLICY.pdf
034-STUDENT-MISCONDUCT-POLICY.pdf
035-RAU-ANNUAL-PROGRAMME-MONITORING-TEMPLATE.pdf
036-RAU-PARTNERSHIP-ANNUAL-MONITORING-TEMPLATE.pdf
037-INSTITUTIONAL-APPROVAL-REPORT.pdf
038-RAU-MOA-TEMPLATE.pdf
039-EMBA-PROGRAMME-SPECIFICATION.pdf
040-GMBA-PROGRAMME-SPECIFICATION.pdf
041-MFT-PROGRAMME-SPECIFICATION.pdf
042-MGB-PROGRAMME-SPECIFICATION.pdf
043-RESPONSIBILITIES-CHECKLIST.pdf
Additional evidence 7-9 June 2022
044- QSR-REQUEST-FOR-ADDITIONAL-EVIDENCE-SPJAIN-RESPONSE.pdf
045-TOR-INDUSTRY-ADVISORY-BOARD.pdf
046-BOD-MEETING-MINUTES-25-04-2022.pdf

047-AB-MEETING-MINUTES-28-01-2022.pdf

048-BOD-MEETING-MINUTES-25-02-2022.pdf

049-TOR-ACADEMIC-BOARD.pdf

050-COURSE-DEVELOPMENT-REVIEW-AND-APPROVAL-POLICY.pdf

051-ASSURANCE-OF-LEARNING-POLICY.pdf

052-EQUIVALENCY-OF-STUDENT-LEARNING-AND-EXPERIENCE-POLICY.pdf

053-EMBA-PROGRAM-SPECIFICATIONS-REVISED-RAU-VALIDATION.pdf

054-GMBA-PROGRAM-SPECIFICATIONS-REVISED-RAU-VALIDATION.pdf

055-MGB-PROGRAM-SPECIFICATIONS-REVISED-RAU-VALIDATION.pdf

056-MFT-PROGRAM-SPECIFICATIONS-REVISED-RAU-VALIDATION.pdf

057-RAU-GENERIC-MARKING-CRITERIA.pdf

058-EMBA-APPLIED-RESEARCH-PROJECT-DRAFT.pdf

059-EMBA-MANAGING-SELF-AND-OTHERS-DRAFT.pdf

060-GMBA-APPLIED-RESEARCH-PROJECT.pdf

061-GMBA-STRATEGY-AND-BUSINESS-LEADERSHIP.pdf

062-MFT-BUSINESS-RESEARCH-AND-DATA-ANALYTICS.pdf

063-MFT-INTERNSHIP.pdf

064-MGB-INTERNSHIP.pdf

065-MGB-ANALYTICS-FOR-MARKETING-DECISIONS.pdf

066-RAU-PROGRAMMES-VALIDATION-REPORT-5-MAY-2022.pdf

067-WORK-BASED-LEARNING-HANDBOOK.pdf

069-FINANCIAL-SUPPORT-FORECAST.pdf

070-TOR-ACCESS-AND-PARTICIPATION-COMMITTEE.pdf

071-EMPLOYEE-HANDBOOK-DRAFT.pdf

072-SAMPLE-INDUCTION-PLAN.pdf

073-CV-███████████████

074-CV-███████████████████

075-CV-████████████████

076-CV-██████████████████

077-CV-███████████

078-CV-██████████

079-CV-███████████

080-CV-█████████████

081-ELO-TRAINING.pdf

082-VLE-TRAINING.pdf

083-STUDENT-SURVEY-TEMPLATE.pdf

084-TOR- LTQAC.pdf

085-TOR-STUDENT-COUNCIL.pdf

086-STUDENT-HANDBOOK- DRAFT.pdf

2nd additional evidence request 5-6 July 2022

087-SPJAIN-QSR-REQUEST-FOR-ADDITIONAL-EVIDENCE-POST-TPM.pdf

088-AB-MEETING-MINUTES-15-06-2022.pdf

089-ADMISSIONS POLICY-APPROVED-15-06-22.pdf

090-STUDENT-COMPLAINTS-POLICY-APPROVED-15-06-22.pdf

091-LIBRARY-RESOURCES-COLLECTION-DEVELOPMENT-POLICY-APPROVED-15-06-22.pdf

092-HEALTH-AND-WELLBEING-POLICY-APPROVED-15-06-22.pdf

093-STUDENT-SUPPORT-POLICY-APPROVED-15-06-22.pdf

094-STUDENT-EQUITY-DIVERSITY-&-FAIR-TREATMENT-POLICY-APPROVED-15-06-22.pdf

095-STUDENTS-WITH-DISABILITY-POLICY-APPROVED-15-06-22.pdf

096-RPL-POLICY-APPROVED-15-06-22.pdf

097- SIGNED-HEADSOFTERMS-JUNE 22.pdf

098-PROPERTY-PLANS-DELIVERY-SITE.pdf

099-TEACHING-EXCELLENCE-PLAN.pdf

100-AMENDED-JD-JULY-2022.pdf

101-ADDITIONAL-JD-JULY-2022.pdf

102-MFT-PROGRAM-SPECIFICATIONS-REVISED-30TH-JUNE.pdf

103-RAU-ASSESSEMENT-BRIEF-TEMPLATE.pdf

104-RAU-INTERNAL-MODERATION-TEMPLATE.pdf

Evidence submitted during visit 11-13 July

105-SPJL-REJECTION-LETTER-TEMPLATE-DRAFT.pdf

106-VISIT-REQUEST-FOR-ADDITIONAL-EVIDENCE-12072022.pdf

107-EDUCATION-AGENT-AGREEMENT-TEMPLATE.pdf

108-EDUCATION-AGENT-POLICY.pdf

109-Self-Assurance-Monitoring-of-Education-Agents.pdf

110-Agent-Monitoring-Report.pdf

111-Review-of-Education-agent-report.pdf

112–Agent-Self-assurance-Audit-Checklist-Final.xlsx

113-PROJECT-PLAN-SPJL.xlsx

114-SPJL-Tutor Visit Report.pdf

115-SPJL-Insurance Disclaimer Letter-Student.pdf

116-SPJL-Overseas Travel Risk Assessment.pdf

117-SPJL-Risk Assessment Form.pdf

118-SPJL-Student Placement Approval Form.pdf

119-SPJL-Travel Insurance Notification.pdf

120-SPJL-Declaration of Health form.pdf

121-Professional-Readiness-Program.pdf

122-Online-Orientation-EMBA.pdf

123-Clarification comms from provider

124 – RAU Academic Regulations:

125 - https://www.rau.ac.uk/
sites/default/files/rau/courses/ACADEMIC%20REGULATIONS%20V4.0%20FINAL.pdf

126 - https://www.spjain.org/_hubfs/Brochures_and_Handbooks/MGB-Handbook.pdf

M1: Meeting to discuss academic standards with the School's Senior staff, SP Jain Global staff, RAU link tutor and IAB member

M2: Meeting to discuss admissions, staff recruitment, student engagement, complaints and appeals and partnerships with the School's Senior staff and SP Jain Global staff

M3: Meeting to discuss the design and delivery of courses, resources and facilities and student support with the School's senior staff and SP Jain Global staff

M4: Final Meeting with the School's senior staff and SP Jain Global staff