



Designated Quality Body
in England

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

Paris Dauphine
International, London



Review Report

November 2021

Contents

Summary of findings and reasons.....	1
About this report.....	15
About Paris Dauphine International, London.....	15
How the assessment was conducted	16
Explanation of findings.....	18
S1 The provider ensures that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks	18
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	31
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.....	40
S4 The provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent.....	47
Q1 The provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system	55
Q2 The provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses	62
Q3 The provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience	70
Q4 The provider has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience.....	78
Q5 The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience	85
Q6 The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students	91
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.....	95
Q9 The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.....	102
Annex 1.....	109

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	High	<p>From the evidence provided, the review team considers that the standards PDI has set are in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS's regulatory framework. The evidence scrutinised by the team demonstrates that the standards described in the approved course documentation are set at levels that are consistent with these sector-recognised standards and the provider's academic regulations and policies should ensure the setting and maintenance of academic standards at the relevant threshold level which are consistent with the FHEQ in the UK.</p> <p>The team considers that the standards that will be achieved by PDI's students are expected to be in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS's regulatory framework, based on evidence provided as part of this review. The review team considers that the evidence seen demonstrates that the provider's academic regulations and policies should ensure that these standards are maintained. The review team considers that staff fully understand PDI's approach to maintaining these standards and are committed to applying this approach.</p> <p>The lack of moderation and external review of continuous assessment elements, while in line with PDI's regulations and policies, means that the maintenance and application of academic standards through internal marking practices could not be tested across all elements of assessment. However, the review team was satisfied, following a review of a sample of continuous assessment elements, that standards are consistent because staff are supported in understanding and</p>

				<p>applying marking criteria, and overall module performance is subject to scrutiny and review as part of the harmonisation process. In addition, senior staff were able to articulate that PDI has credible and robust future plans for further enhancing its approaches. Therefore, the review team concludes that this Core practice is met.</p> <p>The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, except for third-party endorsements, and leads the team to have a high degree of confidence in this judgement.</p>
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	High	<p>The review team, based on the evidence presented, determined that the standards PDI has set for students to achieve beyond the threshold are reasonably comparable with those set by other UK providers. The review team considered that the standards described in the approved course documentation and in PDI's academic regulations and policies ensure that such standards are set and maintained appropriately.</p> <p>PDI's approach to setting and maintaining comparable standards is robust and credible through its deliberative committee structures. Assessed student work demonstrates that credit and qualifications are awarded only where relevant standards have been met and that PDI's approach to classification affords students the opportunity to achieve beyond the threshold. External examiner reports seen by the team confirm that external examiners agree that standards beyond the threshold level are reasonably comparable with those in other UK providers, and credit and qualifications are awarded only where those standards have been met. Students understand what is required of them to reach standards beyond the threshold. Staff know their responsibilities in respect of maintaining comparable</p>

				<p>standards and the requirement to comply with the regulations and policies of UPD-PSL and what is required to help students achieve beyond the threshold.</p> <p>The review team's concern is that the translation of the 20-point scale to the UK classification system is potentially preventing students from being recognised as having achieved a first-class honours award. This concern, coupled with a lack of evidence to test whether PDI's approach to classification beyond the threshold is comparable with other UK providers, means that the effectiveness of PDI's approach to ensuring that students have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers could not be fully tested. However, the review team was satisfied by confirmation from external examiners that standards beyond the threshold level are reasonably comparable with those in other UK providers and that markers use the full range of the marking scale. Although PDI does not currently benchmark award and classification data with other UK providers, senior staff were able to articulate an evolving approach to undertake this activity and an ongoing review of the issue by Academic Board, which provided reassurance to the team that they were aware of this issue and the Board was reviewing the approach. Therefore, the review team concludes, based on the evidence described above, that this Core practice is met.</p> <p>The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix for this Core practice. Therefore, the team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

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	High	<p>The team concludes that PDI has clear and comprehensive regulations or policies for the management of partnerships with other organisations to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure. PDI has credible approaches to secure standards in provision delivered in partnership, but the lack of moderation and external review of continuous assessment elements, while in line with PDI's regulations and policies, means that the maintenance and application of academic standards through internal marking practices could not be tested across all elements of assessment. However, PDI acknowledged that the provision was in development under the UK higher education systems with plans in place for improvement, and the team agreed that these plans especially around the use of external examiners was credible.</p> <p>Partnership agreements are clear and comprehensive, up-to-date and reflect PDI's regulations and policies for the management of partnerships. External examiner reports and the assessed student work confirm that the standards of awards delivered within the partnership are credible and secure. The staff from both PDI and UPD-PSL understand their respective responsibilities for academic standards. The review team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.</p> <p>The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of the evidence, apart from the third-party endorsement, described in the QSR evidence matrix, the review team therefore has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.</p>
----	--	-----	------	--

S4	The provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent.	Met	Moderate	<p>PDI's regulations and/or policies describing its requirements for using external expertise in setting and maintaining academic standards are comprehensive but not clear because the procedures for using external expertise (external examiners, corporate partners, alumni) in relation to course approval and review are absent. The plans for using external expertise in both setting and maintaining academic standards and assessment and classification are credible but not robust because the involvement of the external examiners is not embedded fully in the process for continuous assessments.</p> <p>The assessed student work confirms assessment and classification are carried out in line with PDI and course requirements. The external examiner reports and PDI's responses to them confirm the use of external expertise and that PDI does give the external expertise due consideration. The external examiner reports confirm that PDI's assessment and classification processes are reliable and fair. However, the internal moderation process and second marking was not consistent currently, but PDI does have a constructive plan to address different issues. Records of course approval and review confirm that the external expertise is used according to PDI's regulations.</p> <p>The staff understand the requirements for the use of external expertise and PDI's assessment and classification processes. The students confirm that PDI's assessment and classification processes are reliable, fair and transparent. The review team concludes, on balance, that the Core practice is met.</p> <p>The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all the evidence, apart from third party endorsements described in the QSR evidence matrix. Although PDI staff were able to</p>
----	--	-----	----------	--

				<p>articulate in meetings how they will improve their practice in using the external expertise (eg, external examiners, external consultants, others) in setting and maintaining academic standards, the team's understanding of the plans for meeting the Core practice relies partly on oral testimony from the staff. The review team therefore has moderate confidence in this judgement.</p>
Q1	The provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system.	Met	High	<p>The team found that, overall, PDI has a clear policy for the recruitment and admission of students which is currently reliable, fair and inclusive. This is because the recruiting criteria are clear and decisions are made based on that criteria, its policy and on the website, it is fair because the decisions that are made within that criteria apply to all students and it is robust because the Selection Committee has oversight of the selections following a set algorithm that is evidenced and recorded.</p> <p>The team found that PDI's approach to admissions is reliable, fair and credible. PDI has a clear Admissions Policy for awards and courses aligned to its scope and mission which is reliable, fair and inclusive. PDI ensures that fairness and reliability are embedded principles within admissions and recruitment. PDI's current reliance on the French Parcoursup system means that inclusivity is integrated into an anonymous grades-based automated system. Governance and reporting of admissions exist through the institution's committee structure.</p> <p>PDI adheres to the practice of having clearly articulated and transparent processes for handling complaints of prospective students that are accessible to all stakeholders. However, admissions decisions cannot be appealed, although there is a formal mechanism for feedback of rejected applications.</p>

			<p>The Admissions Policy and practice takes into account academic attainment, individual circumstances, applicant background, and applicant characteristics. PDI is committed to its Access and Participation Policy, and its Scholarship and Bursary approach to support individual students, which may include 100% funding. However, PDI acknowledges that the approach is a work in progress and is aware that OfS Registration and recruitment through UCAS will require modification of scholarships and bursaries to promote widening participation.</p> <p>Candidates from Paris who apply for study in London, are made an unconditional offer based on their personal qualifications, personal statement outlining their motivation to study in London, and certified competence in English. Should there be uncertainty on the candidate's competence in English, the final decision is made by the Academic Lead, English and Communication. The team could find no evidence of candidates being rejected on this basis. Staff involved in admissions in London understand their role, and PDI confirmed that the Academic Lead, English and Communication is appropriately skilled and trained with career experience working with English testing organisations.</p> <p>Through the sample of the admissions records, the team has been able to determine that students meet the academic threshold the institution requires, through academic transcripts, personal statements and certified qualification in the English language.</p> <p>Information provided to applicants is clear, accessible (to all applicants) and fit for purpose and students report the process was straightforward and did not lack for information which prepared them for study in London.</p>
--	--	--	---

				<p>The team concludes that the admissions system is reliable fair and inclusive and found that staff involved in admissions are appropriately skilled. The admissions requirements set out in approved course documentation are consistent with the institution's policies and procedures. The review team concludes that PDI has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system and that the Core practice is met.</p> <p>The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects the majority of the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix. Therefore, the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.</p>
Q2	The provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses.	Met	High	<p>The team concludes that PDI designs and delivers high-quality courses. This is because PDI has in place credible processes for the design and delivery of high-quality courses. Approved course documentation indicates that the teaching, learning and assessment design enables students to meet and demonstrate module and course learning outcomes. External examiner reports confirm that the courses are of a high quality. Feedback from students confirms that they regard their courses as being of high quality, in particular the interdisciplinary nature of the course, emphasis on small group teaching, the varied nature of assessments, the numerous opportunities for personalised feedback and the quality of feedback received. Staff are able to articulate what 'high quality' means in the context of PDI and demonstrate how the provision meets that definition. Observations of teaching demonstrate good planning and organisation, a sound approach, strong delivery, appropriate content, effective use of resources and student engagement. The review team concludes, therefore, that PDI has in place credible, robust and evidence-based arrangements to design and deliver high-quality academic courses and that the Core</p>

				<p>practice is met.</p> <p>The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix. Therefore, the team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.</p>
Q3	The provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience.	Met	High	<p>The team concludes that PDI has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience. This is because the number of staff currently employed, including professional support staff, permanent academics and hourly paid lecturers directly involved in course delivery is proportionate to the number of courses delivered and the number of students enrolled to meet the learning and support needs of students and supports students to successful outcomes. Staff CVs demonstrate that those employed in key roles are well qualified and skilled. Students express satisfaction with the skills of teaching staff and with the support that they provide. Observations of teaching sessions and review of learning materials on the VLE, indicate that teaching staff are appropriately skilled. PDI is in the process of reviewing its existing approach to staff induction and development and articulated clear plans for achieving and implementing a more formalised approach. Staff feel well supported by PDI in terms of induction and opportunities for informal and formal staff development. The team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.</p> <p>The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix and leads the team to have a high degree of confidence in this judgement.</p>

Q4	The provider has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience.	Met	High	<p>The team concludes that PDI has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience. This is because its strategies and approaches for facilities, learning resources and student support services are credible, realistic and demonstrably linked to the delivery of successful academic and professional outcomes for students. The student submission and the student meeting confirm that the students regard facilities, learning resources and student support services at PDI as sufficient and appropriate, and facilitating a high-quality academic experience. Relevant staff understand their roles and responsibilities in using resources to provide a high-quality academic experience to students. The review team's own assessment of particular facilities and learning resources confirms that facilities, learning resources and student support services are sufficient and appropriate. The review team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.</p> <p>The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, with the exception of the third-party endorsements. Therefore, the team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.</p>
Q5	The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.	Met	High	<p>The team found that PDI seeks to actively engage students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience, using both formal and informal approaches. The BEM Course Handbook promotes this to students in sections including The Student Life Committee, Societies and Clubs, and Welfare and Wellbeing. Student ambassadors and student representatives ensure the student voice is represented at all levels of institutional governance, and it is captured in the formal annual review processes, and</p>

			<p>informally through the relationship with academic and support staff.</p> <p>PDI has developed a clear and effective approach, which provides appropriate mechanisms to facilitate students with opportunities to provide feedback, individually and collectively, on their experiences. Feedback from students is considered as part of course monitoring and review and the student voice is a standing item on the Academic Board Meeting Agenda. Student surveys are a central mechanism for actively engaging the student voice for the institution, but students confirmed that the institution received and responded to both formal and informal feedback from students to enhance the learning environment. While the institution does not currently engage with the National Student Survey, it has aligned its student feedback mechanism to the NSS.</p> <p>The institution's approaches to the engagement of students are credible and robust because they are clearly understood by students and staff and are supported by appropriate resource and infrastructure. Students who met the review team confirmed the impact of these approaches, reporting that they had a range of channels for providing feedback and provided examples where changes had been made to provision as a result of student engagement. The team concludes that PDI actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience and therefore this Core practice is met.</p> <p>The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix. Therefore, the team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.</p>
--	--	--	--

Q6	The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students.	Met	Moderate	<p>PDI's approach to complaints and appeals is through its Appeals and Complaints Policy, which is fair, transparent and accessible as it clearly outlines the different stages and timelines for each stage of the complaints and appeals process and who to contact. The policy is readily accessible to the students through handbooks and students confirmed they thought it was a fair, consistent and transparent approach.</p> <p>As the provider had no complaints or appeals for the team to sample, the team could not test the robustness of the approach. In addition, PDI's approach to monitoring appeals and complaints through its committee system and oversight arrangements was underdeveloped. However, on balance the review team concludes that because PDI has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students, the Core practice is met.</p> <p>The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, with the exception of examples of any complaints and appeals handled under the current procedures. As the main approach to the handling of complaints and appeals remains untested for the team and as PDI could articulate a plan for the monitoring of complaints and appeals as none had been received, the team had a moderate degree of confidence in this judgement.</p>
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	Met	High	The review team concludes that PDI partnership agreements with UPD-PSL, and with UCL-CLIE are clear and comprehensive, up-to-date and reflect the provider's regulations and policies for the management of partnerships. It has clear and comprehensive regulations and policies for the management of the partnership between

	how courses are delivered and who delivers them.			<p>PDI and UPD-PSL to ensure that the academic experience is high quality. PDI's approaches to ensure a high-quality academic experience for provision delivered in partnerships with others are evidence-based and credible. External examiners' reports agree with the student views that the courses are effective and academic experience is high quality, but elements of its internal moderation process were under-developed. The staff from both PDI and the UPD-PSL understood their roles in the partnership arrangements, and their respective responsibilities for quality. The team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.</p> <p>The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix. The team therefore has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.</p>
Q9	The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.	Met	High	<p>The team found that the institution actively supports all students through formal learning and extracurricular opportunities to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes, backed by policies, processes and infrastructure in place to facilitate successful academic and professional outcomes. These mechanisms include a tutorial system, provision of Education Coaches, focus on employability through employability modules and the inclusion of professional experience. The team found that these mechanisms are comprehensive and robust, with an appropriate infrastructure of staff supporting students in place.</p> <p>The institution has a number of internal reporting mechanisms and structures that enable it to formally monitor and evaluate student academic achievement. Board Terms of Reference describe monitoring to scrutinise student performance, though the review team did not find minutes recording data points to affect such monitoring.</p>

			<p>There is evidence of timely feedback that helps students to understand how they can improve or maintain performance levels, but there is concern that this feedback could be more structured and systematic across all the provision, and to be less reliant on a personal tutorial approach. Academic and support staff understand their roles in supporting student achievement and the various approaches used for this. Students reported that they were satisfied with the support mechanisms available, in particular personal tutors, and that they received comprehensive, helpful and timely feedback. The review team therefore concludes that PDI supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes and that the Core practice is met.</p> <p>The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix for this Core practice. Therefore, the team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.</p>
--	--	--	--

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 November 2021, for Paris Dauphine International, London. The assessment included a visit which was conducted online.

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: Rong Huang
Institution: University of Plymouth
Role in assessment team: Institutional assessor

Name: Simon Jones
Institution: Buckinghamshire New University
Role in assessment team: Institutional assessor

Name: Tracy Scurry
Institution: University of Newcastle upon Tyne
Role in assessment team: Subject assessor, Business and Management

The QAA 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 courses 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 Paris Dauphine International, London

Université Paris Dauphine - PSL, London Campus (PDI) was established in London in 2015. It is one of several overseas campuses of the French Université Paris Dauphine (UPD-PSL). The London campus is a registered company and charity named Paris Dauphine International. UPD-PSL sets and validates the awards delivered at PDI which are currently:

- Bachelor's in Economics and Management (BEM) which leads to the award of the 'Licence Sciences des Organisations' from UPD-PSL.
- BEM one semester Law Track - a study abroad opportunity for UPD-PSL students on the Bachelor's in Organisation Sciences.

- Finance Summer School - a three to six week course that leads to the award of 3 to 6 ECTSs credits.
- International Management Summer School – two to three week development course (this course does not lead to an academic award but students can achieve ECTS credits [044])
- Executive master's in Business Administration (EMBA) which leads to the award of the Executive MBA of UPD-PSL (due to begin in 2022).

At the time of the visit, PDI had 210 full-time students enrolled on the Bachelor's in Economics and Management (BEM). Both summer schools did not run in 2020. In 2021, the summer schools ran on a blended mode with some students attending online and others on site. In June 2021 UPD-PSL approved the development of the Executive master's in Business Administration and the development of this course is ongoing for a launch to enrol students at PDI for April 2022. UPD-PSL is accredited by Haut conseil de l'évaluation de la recherche et de l'enseignement supérieur (HCERES) which is a French independent body whose aim is to evaluate the higher education institutions and Public Sector Research Establishments (PSRE), research units, as well as staff in France. UPD-PSL also receives accreditation from EQUIS (an institutional accreditation system for business and management schools and recognised worldwide). All courses delivered in London are delivered in English.

PDI has a partnership agreement with University College London (UCL) who deliver language classes on PDI's behalf that are part of the BEM course. The agreement also allows PDI students access to some of UCL's facilities and library resources. This agreement has been in place since 2015 but has been curtailed recently for some students as noted below until after the registration with the OfS has completed.

Due to the recent changes in legislation following the UK's withdrawal from the European Union, PDI's status regarding the sponsorship of full-time student visas for European students has been limited until registration with the OfS has been achieved. Until that happens PDI is limited by the UK Government Home Office to delivering 50% of the BEM to the 2021 enrolled students, and the same students will not have the same access to UCL facilities as the current students at Levels 5 and 6. In preparation for registration, PDI established and implemented certain elements of quality assurance which were not requirements of the French higher education systems, such as external examining and formal complaints and appeals procedures. Further details are explored in the Core practices below.

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 PDI does not offer a research degree course. 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, the team 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, the assessment team sampled the following areas for evidence for the reasons given below:

- Using the random sampling calculator which delivers a sample which is statistically significant, the team analysed one sample of assessed student work of 90 students from 208 students identified which were completed in the 2020-21 academic year. This was to test whether the work reflects the relevant threshold standards; that marks and awards given to students are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers; that standards of awards are credible and secure, thus confirming the effectiveness of the underpinning arrangements; and to establish whether students are given comprehensive, helpful and timely feedback.
- Using the random sampling calculator which delivers a sample which is statistically significant, the team analysed a sample of 51 admissions records from the 63 first year registered students from the 2020-21 academic year. This was to assess whether reliable, fair and inclusive admissions decisions were made for the applicants sampled.

The team visit was carried out online. The team carried out five observations of both online and face-to-face teaching and learning across all subject areas and levels, to test whether course delivery is high quality and whether academic staff deliver a high-quality learning experience. The team conducted an online tour of facilities, learning resources and support services to test that PDI delivers a high-quality academic experience.

There were no students from the law course or the summer schools available to meet with the team as these courses were not running at the time of the visit, so the team only met with students from the BEM course.

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).

The evidence the team considered

4 The QAA team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The assessment team utilised that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other assessments and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a Board of Directors Terms of Reference [000]
- b Academic Board Terms of Reference [001]
- c BEM Course Board Terms of Reference [002]
- d Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting [004]
- e 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules [007]
- f BEM Aims Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map [011]
- g 2021-22 BEM student handbook [012]
- h BEM1_Macroeconomics_Module Handbook [013]
- i BEM1_101 English and Communication_Module Handbook [014]
- j BEM2_Management Accounting_Module Handbook [015]
- k BEM2_Digital Sciences_Module Handbook [016]
- l BEM3_Basics of Strategy_Module Handbook [017]
- m BEM3_Current Issues in Sociology_Module Handbook [018]
- n 2021-22 BEM staff handbook [019]
- o 2020-21 Business and Management_External Examiner Annual Report [022]
- p 2020-21 Economics_External Examiner Annual Report [023]
- q 2020-21 Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report [024]

r EMBA Aims and Learning Outcomes [037]
 s Quality Management System Policy [038]
 t Additional information for QAA [042]
 u October 21 Academic Board Agenda [043]
 v June 20 Academic Board Minutes [044]
 w 21-22 Quality annual cycle [045]
 x June 21 BEM Course Board Minutes [046]
 y 2020-21_Standardisation evidence for English and Communication [050]
 z 2019-20_Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report [059]
 aa Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring [060]
 bb June 21 Academic Board Main Supporting Document [064]
 cc 2021 Finance Summer School Completion Report [065]
 dd 2021 International Summer School Completion Report [066]
 ee 2021 Summer Course Board Main Supporting Document [067]
 ff Translation of Décret 2004-186 [070]
 gg Translation of Arrêté 2015-1168 [071]
 hh Appendix to the Assessment Rules 2021-22 Licence Sciences des Organisations
 Year 1 to 3 [072]
 ii 2020-21 Annual Examination Board Minutes BEM1 and 2 [073]
 jj 2020-21 Annual Examination Board Minutes BEM3 [074]
 kk 2019-20 Annual Examination Board Minutes BEM1 and 2 [075]
 ll 2019-20 Annual Examination Board Minutes BEM3 [076]
 mm External Examiners Action Plan [088]
 nn February 2021 Board of Directors Minutes [104]
 oo 2019-20_Standardisation evidence for English and Communication [112]
 pp Responsibilities checklist [124]
 qq Evidence English Consultancy Work Record [125]
 rr 2019-20_Management_External Examiner Annual Report [131]
 ss 2019-20_Economics_External Examiner Annual Report [132]
 tt 2019-20 S1_BEM3_Introduction to Marketing module handbook [147]
 uu 2020-21 S1_BEM2_Microeconomics module handbook [148]
 vv 2020-21 S2_BEM2_GCI module handbook [149]
 ww 2019-20 S1_BEM1_English and Communication module handbook [150]
 xx 2019-20 S1_BEM1_Computer Science module handbook [151]
 yy HR and Quality Manager_Job description [157]
 zz 2019-20_English and Communication_Module Leader Annual Report [158]
 aaa 2020-21_English and Communication_Module Leader Annual Report [159]
 bbb BEM Examination Board Procedure [161]
 ccc 2019-20_Marketing_External Moderation [162]
 ddd 2019-20_Macroeconomics_External Moderation [163]
 eee 2020-21_Global Contemporary Issues_External Moderation [164]
 fff 2019-20_Computer Science_External Moderation [165]
 ggg 2020-21_Linear Algebra_External Moderation [166]
 hhh BEM Marking Criteria for Presentations [167]
 iii BEM Marking Criteria for Course Participation [168]
 jjj BEM Marking Criteria for Essays Reports [169]
 kkk PROGRAMME FINAL LIVRET V4 SEMINAIRE 2019 [192]
 ll Jury Points Statement 11.11.21 v1 [212]
 mmm Continuous Assessment Feedback Monitoring [213]
 nnn Assessed student work [ASW]
 ooo Students meeting [M1]
 ppp Meeting with UPD-PSL staff [M2]
 qqq Meeting with staff to discuss assessment, grading and harmonisation [M3]
 rrr Meeting with senior staff at PDI [M4]
 sss Meeting with academic staff at PDI [M5]

ttt Meeting with professional staff at PDI [M6]
uuu Final meeting at PDI. [M7]

5 Some of the key pieces of evidence, outlined in Annex 4, were not considered by the assessment team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this assessment are outlined below:

6 The team was not able to consider other organisations' views about threshold standards for PDI's qualifications as although the provision falls under the UPD-PSL EQUIS accreditation, no documentation from EQUIS was provided in the evidence. The review team did request any evidence of third-party endorsement - for example, EQUIS reports after the initial desk-based analysis 24/09/21 and was directed by the provider to the 057_EQUIS_2020_SAR_Universite_Paris_Dauphine Self-Assessment Report which is authored by the provider rather than EQUIS as the third-party accrediting body and submitted as part of the accreditation process. [057] As this is authored by the provider and not EQUIS, the team requested an EQUIS Accreditation Board Report or any other reports from EQUIS and received the following response from the provider: 'We made a request to the EQUIS department from the Université in Paris. Please note they are currently on annual leave; we should get an answer later this week. In the meantime, please refer to the document 057 we included in the October submission'. The EQUIS Accreditation Board Report was not received.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

7 The team randomly selected 90 pieces of assessed student work from 208 which were completed by students on the BEM course in the 2020-21 academic year.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

8 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the assessment team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the assessment team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the assessment team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below:

9 To identify institutional approaches to course and assessment design, marking and moderation, requirements for awards and approaches to classification as the underlying basis for the standards of awards, the review team considered the Board of Directors Terms of Reference, [000] Academic Board Terms of Reference, [001] Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting, [004] 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] Plagiarism Policy, [008] BEM Aims Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map, [011] 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] BEM1_Macroeconomics_Module Handbook, [013] BEM1_101 English and Communication_Module Handbook, [014] BEM2_Management Accounting_Module Handbook, [015] BEM2_Digital Sciences_Module Handbook, [016] BEM3_Basics of Strategy_Module Handbook, [017] BEM3_Current Issues in Sociology_Module Handbook, [018] 2021-2022 BEM staff handbook, [019] Quality Management System Policy, [038] Additional information for QAA, [042] 2020-21_Standardisation evidence for English and Communication, [050] EQUIS_2020_SAR_Universite_Paris_Dauphine, [057] Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring, [060] Translation of Décret 2004-186, [070] Translation of Arrete 2015-1168, [071] 1st mark checklist BEM 1 Computer Science, [78] 2nd marker checklist BEM 1 Computer Science, [79] 1st marker checklist BEM 2 Probability and statistics, [82] 2nd

marker checklist BEM 2 Probability and statistics, [83] 2019-20_Standardisation evidence for English and Communication, [112] module handbooks, [147 – 151] HR and Quality Manager_Job description, [157] 2019-20_English and Communication_Module Leader Annual Report, [158] 161_BEM Examination Board Procedure, [161] BEM Marking Criteria for Presentations, [167] BEM Marking Criteria for Essays Reports, [169] Jury Points Statement 11.11.21 v1, [212] Continuous Assessment Feedback Monitoring, [213] Meeting with UPD-PSL staff, [M2] Meeting with staff to discuss assessment, grading and harmonisation, [M3] and meeting with senior, academic and professional staff at PDI. [M4, M5, M6 and M7]

10 To interrogate the robustness and credibility of the College's plans for ensuring threshold standards, the review team considered the Board of Directors Terms of Reference. [000]

11 To test that specified threshold standards for courses sampled are consistent with relevant national qualifications' frameworks, the team considered Board of Directors Terms of Reference, [000] EMBA Aims and Learning Outcomes, [037] Appendix to the Assessment Rules 2021-22 Licence Sciences des Organisations Year 1 to 3, [072] and module handbooks. [147 – 151]

12 To check that external examiners or verifiers confirm threshold standards are consistent with national qualifications' frameworks, and that credit and qualifications are awarded only where those threshold standards have been met, the team considered 2020-21 Business and Management_External Examiner Annual Report, [022] 2020-21 Economics_External Examiner Annual Report, [023] 2020-21 Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report, [024] 2019-20_Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report, [059] 2019-20_Management_External Examiner Annual Report, [131] 2019-20_Economics_External Examiner Annual Report, [132] 2019-20_Marketing_External Moderation, [162] 2019-20_Macroeconomics_External Moderation, [163] 2020-21_Global Contemporary Issues_External Moderation, [164] 2019-20_Computer Science_External Moderation, [165] and 2020-21_Linear Algebra_External Moderation. [166]

13 To test that students' assessed work reflects the relevant threshold standards, the review team considered the Marker's report form_BEM1 Computer Science, [077] 1st marker completion checklist_BEM1 Computer Science, [078] 2nd marker completion checklist_BEM1 Computer Science, [079] Markers' report form_BEM2 Probability and Statistics, [81] 1st marker checklist BEM 2 Probability and statistics, [82] 2nd marker checklist BEM 2 Probability and statistics, [83] 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] and met with students. [M1]

14 To test that staff understand and apply PDI's approach to setting and maintaining threshold standards, the team met with UPD-PSL staff, [M2] met with PDI and UPD-PSL staff to discuss assessment, grading and harmonisation (Thematic Meeting), [M3] and PDI senior and academic staff. [M4, M5]

What the evidence shows

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

16 All courses delivered by PDI lead to the awarding of degrees and/or ECTS academic credits from the Université Paris Dauphine - PSL (France) (UPD-PSL) which is recognised both as a university and as a selective Grand Etablissement (public institutions, of which there are currently 17, under ministerial charter with the Ministry of National Education and Research) by the French Ministry of Higher Education. [Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring 060] All of the courses offered at PDI are taught in English and have been approved for delivery by UPD-PSL.

17 All awards from French higher education institutions are governed by the 'Education Code' (code de l'Education) which unites all legislative and regulatory provisions relating to the French educational system. Under the French regulatory system, the state has a monopoly on university degrees. The state approves the degrees or titles that an institution can award, and these are drawn up by decree [Translation of Arrete 2015-1168 071] and approved on advice of the National Council for Higher Education and Research following an assessment of the institution and the courses. As stated in the Additional information for the attention of the QAA document, [042] the French higher education system is governed by 'detailed public regulations formalised in the Code de l'Education, which take the form of circulaires and décrets that apply to all the public accredited Higher Education Institutions'. This provides the overall framework for institutions' approaches to course and assessment design, marking and moderation, requirements for awards and approaches to classification.

18 PDI takes into account the regulatory and other requirements of the relevant national qualifications' frameworks and sector-recognised standards of both the UK and French higher education systems [Additional information for QAA 042, EQUIS_2020_SAR_Universite_Paris_Dauphine 057, Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring 060] through design and development of courses (see paragraphs 33 and 34 for more details) and Academic Board as noted below. The terms of reference for the Board of Directors and Academic Board [000, 001] and the Quality Management Systems Process [038] demonstrate that the institute is aware of key external reference points for the design and development of provision. This is because the team found that learning outcomes for different levels of study as presented in course handbooks [2021-2022 BEM staff handbook 019] are consistent with the FHEQ. For example, Level 5 learning outcomes align with FHEQ Level 5 expectations that at this level students will have developed a sound understanding of the principles in their field of study and will have learned to apply those principles more widely and learned to evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems.

19 Since 2019 PDI has developed and continues to develop additional quality processes to align with the Core practices of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education to strengthen approaches to quality assurance. [Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring 060] Senior staff, including members of the Academic Board [M4] and staff with responsibility for developing provision, [M3] understand the importance of external reference points, including the FHEQ, and explained how the FHEQ was used to guide the design and development of the BEM course for delivery in London and in the development of the new Executive master's in Business Administration (EMBA) course. [M3, M4] A Quality Manager [Job Description 157] is responsible for ensuring PDI's policies and procedures are accurate and in line with relevant guidance and legislation and for the provision, review and regular update of all policies, handbooks, guides, procedures, forms, templates and records through the Quality Management System process. [038] The Quality Manager is also a member of Academic Board. [001]

20 PDI's approach to support the setting and maintenance of academic standards at the relevant threshold level is credible and robust because PDI has established an Academic Board which reports to the Board of Directors. [Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting 004] The Academic Board is the principal body for ensuring standards of academic provision and quality assurance across the PDI courses [ToR 001] and ensuring that the academic standards of the courses meet the requirements of the relevant UK qualifications' frameworks. [M2, M4] The Academic Board terms of reference state that it has responsibility for approving academic policies, procedures and protocols, evaluating provision and student experience, student disciplinary hearings and oversight of new course and module development. [ToR 001] Minutes from the Academic Board confirm that the Terms of Reference (ToRs) are implemented in practice. [044, 047] Oversight for the management and implementation of quality assurance and ensuring standards of academic provision is

monitored by the Board of Directors but delegated to Academic Board as its principal academic committee. The terms of reference for the Board of Directors outline the requirement for Academic Board to provide updates of its meetings at each meeting of the Board of Directors and the Chair of the Academic Board attends the Board of Directors meetings. [ToR 000]

21 PDI's approach to course and assessment design, marking and moderation, requirements for awards and approaches to classification as the underlying basis for the standards of awards, are detailed across a number of different documents including the provider submission, staff and student handbooks for the BEM course, [012, 019] 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] Plagiarism Policy, [008] Organisation and committee structure, [004] Terms of reference for Board of Directors, [000] Academic Board [001] and Course Boards, [002] Policy and procedures for Annual Review, [060] External Examiners Action Plan, [088] Additional information for the attention of QAA document, [042] BEM Examination Board Procedure, [161] and Jury Points Statement. [212] The team considers that these documents are clear and comprehensive because they provide detailed guidance on course approval processes, assessment requirements, the use of external expertise, operation of examination boards and requirements for progression and classification of awards.

22 The 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules [007] clearly outline the various stages for the award of degrees including the role of the examination board, the classification of awards, validation requirements (semester and academic year), and award criteria. The 2021-22 BEM student handbook [012] clearly articulates the threshold requirement to pass for students and refers them to the 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules [007] for an overview of general assessment guidelines. The marking criteria are referred to in the BEM student handbook with a link to the generic assessment criteria for continuous assessment elements (presentations, course participation and essays/reports) [167-169] on PDI's virtual learning environment (VLE). [012]

23 The staff and student handbooks for BEM [012, 019] and the 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules [007] define the underpinning structure of courses, specifying the minimum credit requirements for the award of the BEM. As the 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules [007] outline, students are not required to pass all modules. Module grades can compensate for one another during a semester and a student will validate (pass) a semester if their average grade after applying all relevant coefficients is 10 or more (out of 20), providing that they have not received an eliminatory final grade for any module. An eliminatory final grade is strictly equivalent to or below 6/20 in year 1 and year 2 or 7/20 in year 3. Electives in year 1 and year 2 are exempt from this rule for 2021-22. If a semester is validated, students will obtain academic credit which translates into 30 credits in the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) for the semester. [007] These requirements are all consistent with the typical credit values given in the Illustrative table of credit, Annex C of the FHEQ.

24 In addition to achieving an annual average grade of 10 or more out of 20, and not receiving a single eliminatory final grade, there are additional requirements for each year of the course to achieve academic year validation, which are clearly outlined in the BEM Assessment Rules. [007] They are clear because they explain the requirements for each stage/level. Year 1 students are required to validate (pass) the Soft Skills and Employability modules. Year 2 and Year 3 students are required to validate the Soft Skills and Employability module (unassessed compulsory not-for-credit module) and demonstrate completion of their Professional Experience (requirement to demonstrate completion of professional experience - employment and/or internship). [007] Students are informed of these requirements in the student handbook [012] and they are mapped to the learning outcomes. [BEM Aims Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map 011]

25 The 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules [007] indicate that all modules are graded out of 20 and that assessment comprises 50% continuous assessment and 50% final exam for all modules with a few exceptions. The selection of module handbooks from the BEM course [013 -018, 147-151] and the Appendix to the Assessment Rules [072] demonstrate that as per the learning, teaching and assessment strategy outlined in the staff and student handbooks, [012, 019] continuous assessment varies between modules and can comprise a number of different elements including course participation and individual tasks (presentations, exercises, tests, essays, videos, podcasts). [007, 072, 013-018, 147 - 151] This approach provides students with a range of assessments to demonstrate they are meeting the threshold standards for the appropriate levels as outlined in the FHEQ. The module handbooks reviewed provide students with the details of what the elements of continuous assessment will be, their weighting and when they will take place in the module; [module handbooks 013-018, 147-151] the Appendix to the Assessment Rules provides an overview of all assessment elements by module for the course. [072] The team considers the assessment rules accompanied by the module handbooks a credible and robust approach to assessment because they clearly show how assessments allow students to meet threshold standards.

26 The team found that PDI has clear and comprehensive regulations and procedures for the marking and moderation of final exams. These are explained in detail in the BEM Course Staff Handbook, [019] which presents a procedure for final exam marking and script handling. Marker checklists identify the key actions and outputs required for first and second markers, and those reviewed demonstrate that this process has been followed. [markers

27 checklists 78, 79, 82,83] Module leaders are required to undertake a process of standardisation which involves all markers on the module grading 3 final exam scripts to ensure best practice. The initial gradings are recorded on the Markers' report form and followed by a meeting to compare marking and consider issues raised during this process of standardisation. Academic staff who met the review team [M3, M5] confirmed that they understand and apply this process. Markers' reports reviewed [077,081] demonstrated that this process had been undertaken and that actions for addressing any issues and developing students' future performance were identified - for example the Markers' report form for BEM1 Computer Science lists an action to use old marking schemes in the class with students [077] and the Markers' report form for BEM2 Probability and Statistics indicates an agreed approach to marking in the case of small discrepancies and calculation errors. [081] The evidence of standardisation for English and Communication [112] demonstrates a considered approach to aligning practice of multiple markers across a module through discussing and clarifying marking criteria with colleagues and reviewing samples of assessed continuous assessment work from previous years' Standardisation evidence for English and Communication. [050, 112]

28 The regulations and procedures do not require that continuous assessment elements are moderated or subject to a process of standardisation. They are also not currently subject to scrutiny or review by external examiners. While none of these assessment elements individually account for more than 30% of a module's assessment, cumulatively they account for 50% of the assessment across the course. The lack of moderation and external review of continuous assessment elements, while in line with the PDI's regulations and policies, means that the maintenance and application of academic standards through internal marking practices could not be tested across all elements of assessment. However, the review team was satisfied, following a review of a sample of continuous assessment elements, [Assessed Student Work] that standards are consistent because staff are supported in understanding and applying marking criteria through the standardisation process, staff development workshops focused on assessment [2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules 007] and weekly team meetings, [M6] ensuring that feedback is returned within the required timeframes [Continuous Assessment Feedback Monitoring 213] and overall module performance is subject to scrutiny and review as part of the

harmonisation process. [2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules 007, M3, M4, M5] In addition, senior staff were able to articulate that PDI has credible and robust future plans for further enhancing its approaches. For example, in the senior staff and final review meetings, [M4, M7] it was confirmed that although continuous assessment elements are not required to be moderated under the existing policy, there are ongoing discussions amongst the team about developing this going forward, informed by the approach adopted in English and Communication modules, which already operate a process of second marking for presentations and moderation. [M7, 158]

29 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules [007] and the student handbook [012] refer to a process of harmonisation of final grades, between groups and campuses in the UPD-PSL network, through a process applied at the module level. This involves reviewing final grades of different groups of students and where a statistically significant deviation (5% or more) is noted then grades may be adjusted in line with UPD-PSL marking guidelines. The student handbook [012] outlines how, for each module, the average and standard deviation of the cohort on the Parisian campus (which have already been moderated) are communicated to PDI. A statistical method is applied to define an upper and lower band. If the average of the London cohort does not fall in this range, moderation of the grades takes place. [012] Staff involved in course delivery and assessment were able to confidently articulate the purpose of the harmonisation process as a means for UPD-PSL to ensure standards of delivery in London. [M3] The process involves a review of average performance on modules delivered at PDI to identify any difference in performance between students in London and Paris and to consider possible reasons for this. [M3] In the meeting with senior staff and the final review meeting it was confirmed that this process was under review as the provision matures and develops. [M4, M7]

30 The 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules [007] and the student handbook [012] outline that attendance at scheduled classes is mandatory. This applies to students on the BEM course and the BEM One Semester Law Track. [051] The student handbook [012] clearly states that attendance at all scheduled in-person and remote sessions is mandatory, that registers will be taken, and that absences and late arrivals may impact on grades. [012] The 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules [007] provide full details and state that if students miss approximately 15% of the hours of their module a penalty is applied ranging from a deduction of 0.5 to their continuous assessment to receiving a zero for all continuous assessment if 50% or more of the classes are not attended. Students absent for continuous assessment elements will receive a grade of zero for the test unless they submit mitigating circumstances which are approved. [007] The Staff Handbook [019] provides staff with details about this process and the mechanism for recording attendance/absence.

31 Attendance is reviewed and penalties decided by the Attendance Committee who, as detailed in the Undergraduate Programmes Attendance Committee Terms of Reference, [051] are responsible for receiving and considering attendance records of students, receiving outcomes of attendance appeals and absence justification documentation, making decisions on absence in accordance with BEM assessment rules and course participation criteria. [051] Membership comprises the Undergraduate Programmes Director, Academic Lead, one to three lecturers, an education coach (who delivers the Soft Skills and Employability modules and provides wellbeing support for students), the senior programmes administrator and a year group specific contact from courses administration. [051] The Attendance Committee meet during the last teaching week of each semester. Minutes from the BEM Attendance Committee [052, 054, 055] demonstrate that the penalty is consistently applied to students across the course for missing elements of continuous assessment through absence (taking into account mitigating circumstances where appropriate) and this is evident in the decisions. [053, 056] For example, the Decisions of the Attendance Committee for Semester One 19-20 [053] show that just two students in Year 1 did not receive a penalty deduction for absence across the eight modules considered. Decisions of the meeting are

recorded in online document storage system and communicated to students and relevant colleagues by email. [051] It is noted that the Attendance Committee meetings were paused in semester two of 2019-20 in light of the pandemic. [Response to Evidence Request]

32 PDI's plans for maintaining sector-recognised standards are robust and credible in that all of the approaches for ensuring that the academic standards of courses are reviewed to ensure that they meet the requirements of the UK national frameworks which govern higher education provision. [M2, M3, M4] Staff from London and Paris were able to clearly articulate PDI's approach to setting and maintaining standards and the ways in which they have developed new approaches to meet UK standards, [M3, M4] which are overseen by the Academic Board. [000] A clear example of this is the use of external expertise. Working with external examiners is not common practice within the French higher education system and therefore UPD-PSL does not have an existing policy or framework for the use of external expertise. [Request for additional information 042, M2] PDI London has recognised that external, impartial and independent academic and/or professional expertise is a key element of ensuring standards and quality of provision in the UK higher education context and has implemented processes to enable external examiners to review students' assessed work and comment on the maintenance and application of academic standards. [042] PDI has also developed an external examiners' action plan, approved by Academic Board in October 2021 [External Examiners Action Plan 088] to strengthen the way in which externality is embedded into quality assurance processes, and enable external examiner feedback to contribute to course design and approval and course review as well as the setting, maintenance and application of academic standards and the alignment of awards with UK recognised standards. [External Examiners Action Plan 088, M3, M4] The External Examiners Action Plan [088] states that this is due to be implemented from October 2021 and senior staff who met the review team were able to confidently articulate how and when these plans will be implemented, [M4] for example involving external examiners in the development of new courses. The review team concludes that the External Examiners Action Plan [088] demonstrates that PDI has credible plans for utilising appropriate external expertise to support curriculum development. This is because the External Examiners Action Plan [088] presents a clear approach for engaging with appropriate external expertise in the annual programme monitoring and periodic review processes. The review team was satisfied that senior staff [M4] understand the requirements for the use of external expertise in all aspects of delivering high-quality academic experiences, this is because senior staff who met the team [M4] competently articulated the requirements for the use of external expertise and the plans for how feedback from externals will be considered and responded to through the internal governance processes for annual programme monitoring and review as outlined in the External Examiners Action Plan. [088]

33 Academic Board, as stated in its terms of reference, [001] has governance oversight for the development of policies, procedures and protocols for quality assurance and ensuring standards of academic provision. The Academic Board's objective is promoting innovative quality enhancement initiatives in teaching and learning and ensuring a robust and rigorous quality assurance framework to support academic excellence at PDI consistent with the UK Quality Code. [001] These approaches are robust because they are detailed, framed within the wider rules and regulations of UPD-PSL Paris, the French higher education regulatory system, notably Haut conseil de l'évaluation de la recherche et de l'enseignement supérieur (HCERES). [042, Translation of Décret 2004-186 070, Translation of Arrête 2015-1168 071, PROGRAMME FINAL LIVRET V4 SEMINAIRE 2019 192, M2, M4] HCERES is an independent body, whose aim is to evaluate the higher education institutions and Public Sector Research Establishments (PSRE), research units as well as staff in France. HCERES's missions include the definition of quality assessment criteria, publication of evaluation procedures and ensuring the transparency and accountability of evaluations ([Office for Research and Higher Education Assessment \(HCERES\) - France in the United Kingdom - La France au Royaume-Uni \(ambafrance.org\)](https://www.ambafrance.org)). These approaches are credible

because they include scrutiny from external examiners' [060] collaboration with and input from UPD-PSL, [001, 004, 042] reflect clear lines of internal oversight and accountability within PDI and with UPD-PSL, [Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting 004] and they are consistent with wider practice in the UK higher education sector and demonstrate PDI's understanding of these practices.

34 The approach to design and delivery of courses is shaped by the national framework of the French higher education system with any new course or new module approval or substantial change being the responsibility of UPD-PSL as the awarding body. [Additional information for QAA 042] However, as confirmed in meetings with senior staff and those responsible for course development, UPD-PSL allows PDI autonomy within this structure to ensure that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the FHEQ. [M2, M3, M4] The Course Board, Academic Board and Board of Directors oversee the procedures for curriculum development and evaluate courses and modules against national qualifications' frameworks for the UK and French systems. [ToR Board of Directors of 000, ToR Academic Board 001, Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring.pdf 060] The Academic Board is responsible for ensuring that internal quality assurance meets institutional standards and for overseeing the development of new or adapted provision for London courses and modules. [001] The Board issues recommendations and reports regarding the development of new modules and courses for the consideration of the Course Boards and the Board of Directors. [001] The review team was satisfied that this approach is credible and robust because agendas and minutes from meetings confirm that this process occurs. For example, the Academic Board Agenda for 8 October 2021 has an item for approving the course aims and learning outcomes for the EMBA course. [043] In a meeting with the review team, senior staff and those with responsibility for course development also confirmed this approach and were able to confidently articulate how this had occurred for the development of the EMBA and the English and Communications offer, which is unique to the London provision. [M2, M3, M4]

35 Any proposals for adaption of the curriculum for the London provision is developed by the course director/head in collaboration with the Chair of the Course Board [Information for QAA 042] and is then taken to the Academic Board for discussion and approval. The minutes from the BEM Course Board on 15 June 2021 [046] demonstrate this approach where the Chair of the BEM Course Board from UPD-PSL worked with the Head of the BEM course in London to develop a revised structure for the course which was brought to the Academic Board for approval. Minutes from Course Boards, Academic Board and the Board of Directors demonstrate how curriculum development and delivery of courses and modules are discussed and evaluated in terms of alignment with UPD-PSL and appropriate alignment with the UK Quality Code, including the FHEQ. [June 20 Academic Board Minutes 044, June 21 BEM Course Board Minutes 046, 104] Meetings with senior staff and academic staff confirmed this process. [M2, M3, M4] Academic staff explained how there are regular opportunities to discuss course content and assessment strategy with colleagues in Paris and that there is an annual event, The Dauphine International Seminar [192] where all colleagues meet (virtually or in-person if possible) to review the course and consider future developments. [M5]

36 PDI seeks to ensure the maintenance of academic standards through annual monitoring procedures [060] and have a formalised calendar of annual monitoring and quality cycle activities. [045] Annual monitoring procedures are supported by the Quality Management System as outlined in the Quality Management System Policy. [038] Annual monitoring incorporates a range of activities including annual review reports from module leaders, [provider submission, 158, 159] internal evaluation and monitoring by Course Boards, Academic Board and the Board of Directors. [060, 000, 001, 002] The Course Board Terms of Reference state that the Course Board is responsible for receiving and considering annual course evaluations and student surveys, and for potential subsequent reporting to

the Organisation Sciences Bachelor's Board (Conseil Licence Sciences des Organisations). [002] The Academic Board has oversight for all internal quality assurance procedures [001] and the supporting documents from the June 2021 Academic Board meeting show that module reports are items on the agenda [064] and the minutes from June 2020 meeting of Academic Board document a review of the previous academic year. [044] While the emphasis is on the BEM course provision there is evidence of review for the other courses (Summer Course, Finance Course) [065 -67] and that these were considered at Academic Board [064] and the relevant Course Boards. [028, 067]

37 As part of annual review processes, module leaders are required to complete a module leaders' report reflecting on the operation and academic standards during the relevant academic session. They are required to consider how students have performed, reflect on student evaluations and feedback, consider areas for improvement and identify areas of good practice. [158] Review of two completed module review forms for English Year 1 2019-20 [158] and Year 1 English and Communication Modules 2020-21 [159] shows that module leaders detail any module developments that have taken place, reflect on student feedback and respond to external examiners. They also provide module-level statistics about performance in assessment and highlight how any previous actions identified during review have been responded to, and outline module action plans going forward. [158,159]

38 The review team therefore concludes that PDI has clear and comprehensive academic regulations and frameworks to support the setting and maintenance of academic standards at the sector-recognised level, through the development of its own deliberative committee structure (Academic Board) and policy (for example, External Examiners Action Plan) [088] and through continued engagement with the UPD-PSL quality assurance processes overseen by the Course Board. [004]

39 The approved course documentation provided demonstrates that the academic standards of the courses sampled meet the requirements of the FHEQ. [012, 037] This is because the course documentation in the evidence demonstrates that the qualifications and awards are positioned at the appropriate level. Course learning outcomes align with the relevant qualification descriptors. [012, 037] The structure of the course (the volume, nature, and assessment of learning) is adequate to achieve the outcomes indicated by the qualification descriptors. [072, 013-018, 147 – 151] The BEM Course Handbook [012] and the BEM Aims, Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map [011] demonstrate an alignment between the intended learning outcomes of the course and the expectations set out in the qualification descriptors of the FHEQ. The assessment briefs in the module handbooks reviewed [013-018] and Appendix to the Assessment Rules 2021-22 Licence Science des Organisations Year 1 to 3 [072] demonstrate that there is a sufficient volume of assessed study that will demonstrate that the learning outcomes have been achieved.

40 External examiners conclude that threshold standards are consistent with relevant national qualifications' frameworks and that credit and qualifications are awarded only when those threshold standards have been met. [022- 024, 059, 131, 132] The external examiner for Marketing [162] notes that they are unable to comment on the consistent application of the marking criteria as they had not been provided to the external examiners as part of the process [162] but did confirm that the full range of marks were used, that marks were awarded fairly, and that marking was fair and consistent. [162] Other examiners were able to confirm that the marking criteria or marking scheme (where module-level criteria do not exist) were consistently applied across all scripts in a sample. [163 -166] They also confirmed fair and consistent marking. [163-166] The review team concludes that the external examiners confirm that the academic standards are credible and secure.

41 Sampled assessed student work reflects the relevant sector-recognised standards set out in the approved course documentation. There was some evidence of the internal

marking and moderation process for final exams in the sample of assessed student work; however, as per PDI's assessment rules [007] this is formally documented in Markers' report forms. [077 -079, 081-083] Students confirmed that they were happy with marking and feedback and informed the review team that feedback related to the relevant assessment criteria (for example, presentation, essay and so on). [M1] They valued in particular the opportunity for individual one-to-one discussions with staff. In addition, they confirmed that they received feedback on continuous assessment elements that helped to prepare and improve for future assessments. [M1] The review team took the view that assessed student work demonstrates that credit is awarded only where the relevant sector-recognised standards have been met and where students had demonstrated achievement of outcomes.

42 Members of Academic Board and other senior staff who met the team were able to describe their responsibilities in respect of maintaining sector-recognised standards and the requirement to comply with the regulations and policies of PDI Paris. Staff were also able to clearly articulate their future plans for improving the robustness of existing procedures, for example use of external expertise. [M3, M4, M7] Senior staff clearly articulated the use of the FHEQ in the development of existing and new courses, for example the EMBA and BEM courses. [M4] Staff at UPD-PSL [M2] considered that the PDI London senior staff have a good understanding of the different national contexts' requirements and ensuring that academic standards meet the requirements of both the French and UK national frameworks. Overall, staff were able to clearly articulate existing approaches to setting and maintaining sector-recognised standards and future plans to further develop these. [M2, M3, M4, M5] The review team was assured that staff understand and undertake their responsibilities in respect of maintaining threshold standards.

Conclusions

43 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.

44 From the evidence provided, the team considers that the standards PDI has set are in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS's regulatory framework. The evidence scrutinised by the team demonstrates that the standards described in the approved course documentation are set at levels that are consistent with these sector-recognised standards and the provider's academic regulations and policies should ensure the setting and maintenance of academic standards at the relevant threshold level which are consistent with the FHEQ in the UK.

45 The team considers that the standards that will be achieved by PDI's students are expected to be in line with the sector-recognised standards defined in paragraph 342 of the OfS's regulatory framework, based on evidence provided as part of this review. The review team considers that the evidence seen demonstrates that the provider's academic regulations and policies should ensure that these standards are maintained. The team concludes that staff fully understand PDI's approach to maintaining these standards and are committed to applying this approach.

46 The lack of moderation and external review of continuous assessment elements, while in line with PDI's regulations and policies, means that the maintenance and application of academic standards through internal marking practices could not be tested across all elements of assessment. However, the review team was satisfied, following a review of a

sample of continuous assessment elements, that standards are consistent because staff are supported in understanding and applying marking criteria, and overall module performance is subject to scrutiny and review as part of the harmonisation process. In addition, senior staff were able to articulate that PDI has credible and robust future plans for further enhancing their approaches; therefore the team concludes that this Core practice is met.

47 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, except for third-party endorsements, and leads the team to have a high 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

48 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.

49 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).

The evidence the team considered

50 The QAA team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The assessment team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other assessments and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a Board of Directors Terms of Reference [000]
- b Academic Board Terms of Reference [001]
- c Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting [004]
- d 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules [007]
- e BEM Aims Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map [011]
- f 2021-22 BEM student handbook [012]
- g BEM1_Macroeconomics_Module Handbook [013]
- h BEM1_101 English and Communication_Module Handbook [014]
- i BEM2_Management Accounting_Module Handbook [015]
- j BEM2_Digital Sciences_Module Handbook [016]
- k BEM3_Basics of Strategy_Module Handbook [017]
- l BEM3_Current Issues in Sociology_Module Handbook [018]
- m 2021-2022 BEM staff handbook [019]
- n 2020-21 Business and Management_External Examiner Annual Report [022]
- o 2020-21 Economics_External Examiner Annual Report [023]
- p 2020-21 Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report [024]
- q International Summer School Programme [035]
- r Additional information for QAA [042]
- s June 20 Academic Board Minutes [044]
- t 21-22 Quality annual cycle [045]
- u June 21 BEM Course Board Minutes [046]
- v 2019-20_Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report [059]
- w Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring [060]
- x Appendix to the Assessment Rules 2021-22 Licence Sciences des Organisations Year 1 to 3 [072]
- y 2020-21 Annual Examination Board Minutes BEM1 and 2 [073]
- z 2020-21 Annual Examination Board Minutes BEM3 [074]
- aa 2019-20 Annual Examination Board Minutes BEM1 and 2 [075]

bb	2019-20 Annual Examination Board Minutes BEM3 [076]
cc	2019-20-S1_Markers' report form_BEM1 Computer Science [077]
dd	2019-20-S1_1st marker completion checklist_BEM1 Computer Science [078]
ee	2019-20-S1_2nd marker completion checklist_BEM1 Computer Science [079]
ff	2019-20-S1_Exam cover_BEM1 Computer Science [080]
gg	2020-21-S1_Markers' report form_BEM2 Probability and Statistics [081]
hh	2020-21-S1_1st marker's completion checklist_BEM2 Probability and Statistics [082]
ii	2020-21-S1_2nd marker's completion checklist_BEM2 Probability and Statistics [083]
jj	2020-21-S1_Exam cover_BEM2 Probability and Statistics [084]
kk	External Examiners Action Plan [088]
ll	The 2020-21 S2 BEM UCL final grades [094]
mm	The BEM programme structure [129]
nn	2019-20_Management_External Examiner Annual Report [131]
oo	2019-20_Economics_External Examiner Annual Report [132]
pp	2019-20 S1_BEM3_Introduction to Marketing module handbook [147]
qq	2020-21 S1_BEM2_Microeconomics module handbook [148]
rr	2020-21 S2_BEM2_GCI module handbook [149]
ss	2019-20 S1_BEM1_English and Communication module handbook [150]
tt	2019-20 S1_BEM1_Computer Science module handbook [151]
uu	2020-21 S1_BEM2_Microeconomics final exam [153]
vv	2020-21 S1_BEM2_GCI final exam [154]
ww	2019-20 S1_BEM1_English and Communication final exam [155]
xx	2019-20 S1_BEM1_Computer Science final exam [156]
yy	Finance Summer School Booklet [160]
zz	BEM Examination Board Procedure [161]
aaa	2019-20_Marketing_External Moderation [162]
bbb	2019-20_Macroeconomics_External Moderation [163]
ccc	2020-21_Global Contemporary Issues_External Moderation [164]
ddd	2019-20_Computer Science_External Moderation [165]
eee	2020-21_Linear Algebra_External Moderation [166]
fff	BEM Marking Criteria for Presentations [167]
ggg	BEM Marking Criteria for Course Participation [168]
hhh	BEM Marking Criteria for Essays Reports [169]
iii	YR2_WORKSHOP - ESSAY FOR ANALYSIS with teacher notes [200]
jjj	YR2_WORKSHOP - ESSAY FOR ANALYSIS [201]
kkk	YR2_WORKSHOP - ESSAY FOR ANALYSIS [202]
lll	BEM applicants and students indicators [205]
mmm	136bis_BEM cohort indicators in number [206]
nnn	Jury Points Statement 11.11.21 v1 [212]
ooo	Continuous Assessment Feedback Monitoring [213]
ppp	Students meeting [M1]
qqq	Meeting with UPD-PSL staff [M2]
rrr	Meeting with staff to discuss assessment, grading and harmonisation [M3]
sss	Meeting with senior staff at PDI [M4]
ttt	Meeting with academic staff at PDI [M5]
uuu	Meeting with professional staff at PDI [M6]
vvv	Final meeting at PDI [M7]
www	Response to evidence request
xxx	Assessed student work (ASW).

51 Some of the key pieces of evidence, outlined in Annex 4, were not considered by the assessment team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this assessment are outlined below:

52 The team was not able to consider other organisations' views about the provider achieving standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers (see paragraph 6).

How any samples of evidence were constructed

53 The team randomly selected 90 pieces of assessed student work from 208 which were completed in the 2020-21 academic year.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

54 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the assessment team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the assessment team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the assessment team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below:

55 To identify institutional approaches to course and assessment design, marking and moderation, requirements for awards and approaches to classification as the underlying basis for the standards of awards, the team reviewed Staff Programme Handbook, [019] the Terms of Reference for the Academic Board, [001] the Terms of Reference for the Board of Directors, [000] the 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] and the Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring and Review. [060] The approach to marking, moderation and plans for external verification are outlined in the 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] Appendix to Assessment Rules, [072] Plagiarism Policy, [008] 2021-22 BEM staff handbook, [019] 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] and the Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring Review, [060] 21-22 Quality annual cycle, [045] 161_BEM Examination Board Procedure, [161] and Jury Points Statement 11.11.21 v1, [212] the BEM applicants and students indicators, [205] and the BEM cohort indicators in number, [206] 2020-21 S2 BEM UCL final grades, [094] 2019-20_Marketing_External Moderation, [162] 2019-20_Macroeconomics_External Moderation, [163] 2020-21_Global Contemporary Issues_External Moderation, [164] 2019-20_Computer Science_External Moderation, [165] and 2020-21_Linear Algebra_External Moderation. [166]

56 To interrogate the robustness of the provider's approach to setting and maintaining comparable standards and to ensure that this approach is credible and evidence-based, the team considered Staff Programme Handbook, [019] the Terms of Reference for the Academic Board, [001] the Terms of Reference for the Board of Directors, [000] the 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] the Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring and Review, [060] the 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] Appendix to Assessment Rules, [072] Plagiarism Policy, [008] 2021-22 BEM staff handbook, [019] 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] BEM Examination Board Procedure, [161] Jury Points Statement 11.11.21 v1, [212] module handbooks, [013 -018, 147-151] Annual Examination Board Minutes BEM, [073 -076] BEM Examinations Board, [044] BEM Course Board, [004] Exam covers, [080, 084] BEM programme structure, [129] Additional information for QAA. [042] The team also discussed PDI's plans with senior staff [M3] and staff responsible for programme development and delivery. [M2, M3, M5]

57 To test that specified standards beyond the threshold for courses sampled are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers, the review team considered assessed student work, [ASW] 2021-2022 BEM staff handbook, [019] and Continuous Assessment Feedback Monitoring. [213] The team also spoke to senior staff

about assessment feedback. [M7]

58 To check that external examiners or verifiers confirm that standards beyond the threshold for courses sampled are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers, and that credit and qualifications are awarded only where those standards have been met, the team considered the External Examiners Action Plan [088] external examiners' reports, [022-024,059.131,132] and Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring. [060]

59 To test that marks and awards given to students are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers, the team considered 2021-2022 BEM staff handbook, [019] Markers' checklist, [078,079, 082,083] Markers' report form, [077, 081] 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] Finance Summer School Booklet, [160] International Summer School Programme, [035] module handbooks, [013 - 018, 147-151] BEM Marking Criteria for Presentations, [167] BEM Marking Criteria for Course Participation, [168] BEM Marking Criteria for Essays Reports, [169] Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map, [011] Assessment Rules, [072] 21-22 BEM programme structure, [129] Year 2 Workshops, [200-202] Final exams, [153-156] External examiner reports, [022-024,059.131,132] and 2019-20_Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report. [059] The team also met staff from PDI [M3, M4, M5] and students. [M1]

60 To assess whether students understand what is required of them to reach standards beyond the threshold, the team considered the student handbook [012] and the assessment rules. [007] The team also met with students from the BEM course. [M1]

61 To test that staff understand and apply the provider's approach to setting and maintaining comparable standards, the team met with senior staff, [M4, M7] staff from UPD-PSL, [M2] academic staff [M3, M5] and professional staff. [M6, M7]

What the evidence shows

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

63 The institutional approach to course and assessment design is outlined in the Staff Programme Handbook, [019] the Terms of Reference for the Academic Board, [001] the Terms of Reference for the Board of Directors, [000] the 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] and the Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring and Review. [060] The approach to marking, moderation and plans for external verification are outlined in the 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] Appendix to Assessment Rules, [072] Plagiarism Policy, [008] 2021-22 BEM staff handbook, [019] 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] the Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring Review, [060] 21-22 Quality annual cycle, [045] 161_BEM Examination Board Procedure, [161] and Jury Points Statement 11.11.21 v1. [212] The team found that these regulations and policies include comprehensive and clear detail about all aspects of course design, delivery and approaches to classification and assessment.

64 The 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules [007] state that all grades for modules at PDI are expressed out of 20. [007] The 20-point marking scale matches that of UPD-PSL, is common in the French system and, while less common in the UK, is adopted by some higher education institutions, for example the University of St Andrews Common reporting scale (st-andrews.ac.uk - accessed 18/11/21) and Warwick University (UG Mark Scale 2017 - Education Policy and Quality Team (warwick.ac.uk) -accessed 18/11/21). Senior staff explained that they have taken the French classification system and implemented this against the UK classifications. [M3, M4] The 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules [007] and meetings with senior staff [M4] confirm that honours awards from PDI are calculated as follows: for example, a first-class UK honours award corresponds to an annual average grade equal to or greater than 16, which is the highest honour (or très bien) in French

classification. A third UK honours award corresponds to an annual average grade equal to or greater than 10 but below 12, which is a standard pass (or passable) in French classification.

65 In the thematic meeting (which focused on assessment and award classification) with academic staff involved in course development and delivery [M3] and the meeting with senior staff, [M4] it was acknowledged that it was very difficult for students to achieve an overall average of 16 or above. This seems to be reflected in students' overall classifications. The BEM applicants and students indicators [205] and the BEM cohort indicators in number [206] show that at each level very small percentages of students are achieving an overall average of 16 or above. For example, just 1% of the 2019-20 Level 1 cohort achieved an average of 16 or above, no students have achieved this average for Level 2 or Level 3 since the beginning of the course. [205] While the cohort indicators show that for those students completing the whole of the final stage in London over the past three years, none have achieved an average of 16 or above, 21% (13 students) have achieved an average of 14-16 (Upper Second Class), 57% (35 students) between 12 and 14 (Lower Second Class), 18% (11 students) achieved an average of between 10 and 12 (Third Class) and 3% (two students) failed. [205,206]

66 The review team had some concern that the translation of the 20-point scale to the UK classification system is potentially preventing students from being recognised as having achieved a first-class honours award and that this may not be comparable with the outcome classification descriptions for FHEQ level outlined in Annex D of the FHEQ. This concern is reflected in the conversion of the grades received for language modules taken at UCL (grades received from UCL are marked out of 100 and these are converted into a grade on the 20-point scale of PDI). The 2020-21 S2 BEM UCL final grades [094] shows the mark awarded for the module from UCL and the equivalent 'Dauphine Mark'. Only students with marks of 80% or above were mapped onto marks of 16 or greater, with marks between 70% and 80% being mapped between; so for example, for a student achieving 79.48 on a Level 2 Spanish module this was calculated to be equivalent to 15.90 and a student achieving 70.65 on a Level 3 Spanish module received a 14.13 as the PDI equivalent. [094]

67 When the team raised this in the Thematic meeting [M3] and meeting with senior staff, [M4] it was noted that in France, a 13.5 from a Grande École would be recognised as equivalent to a 16/ très bien classification, and therefore students going on to master's study in France would not be negatively impacted but did recognise that this may be disadvantaging students looking to have their award recognised by employers in the UK. [M3, M4, M7] Although they do not currently benchmark award and classification data with other UK providers, senior staff were able to articulate an evolving approach to undertake this activity. [M7] In addition, the Chair of the Academic Board had already begun discussions with senior staff about this and outlined plans to propose a remapping of the scale to UPD-PSL. The review team considered these plans to be credible as they were raised in three separate meetings by different staff members in which all were able to corroborate the proposals. [M3, M4, M7]

68 The team was reassured by the credibility of these plans along with confirmation from external examiners that standards are reasonably comparable with those in other UK providers, and credit and qualifications are awarded only where those standards have been met. [022-024,059.131,132] The external moderation for final exam forms completed by external examiners confirm that the full range of marks was being used, and that marking was fair and consistent. [2019-20_Marketing_External Moderation [162] 2019-20_Macroeconomics_External Moderation [163] 2020-21_Global Contemporary Issues_External Moderation [164] 2019-20_Computer Science_External Moderation [165] 2020-21_Linear Algebra_External Moderation [166]].

69 The team took the view that PDI has clear and comprehensive regulations and

frameworks to support the setting and maintenance of academic standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers. This is because the Staff Programme Handbook, [019] the Terms of Reference for the Academic Board, [001] the Terms of Reference for the Board of Directors, [000] the 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] the Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring and Review, [060] the 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] Appendix to Assessment Rules, [072] Plagiarism Policy, [008] 2021-22 BEM staff handbook, [019] 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] 161_BEM Examination Board Procedure, [161] and Jury Points Statement 11.11.21 v1 [212] outline how grading bands, second marking and moderation, standardisation, and external verification procedures fully support PDI's approach to course and assessment design, marking and moderation, and setting of academic standards beyond the threshold level.

70 PDI's approach to setting and maintaining comparable standards are robust and credible. This is because PDI has established its own deliberative governance structures including an Academic Board [001] with oversight and responsibility for the setting and maintenance of academic standards and through the Policy and Procedures for Annual Monitoring and Review [060]. Minutes from the Academic Board Meeting on 15 and 19 June 2020 demonstrate that the Academic Board received and considered a report from the BEM Examination Board. [044] The BEM Examination Board, which reports to the BEM Course Board [004] is responsible for ensuring that the examination and assessment procedures for its awards are carried out in accordance with the regulations governing the courses in a fair and impartial manner. [007] The BEM Examination Board is responsible for considering and agreeing final grades for each student in each module [019, 073 -076] and validating semesters and/or academic years for the award of credit. [007] They are also responsible for reviewing students who have failed a semester. [019] Minutes from the BEM Course Board meeting on 15 June 2021 demonstrate that the purpose and timing of the examination board were discussed at the Course Board. [046] The review team therefore took the view that PDI's plans for maintaining comparable standards are robust and credible.

71 There are mechanisms designed to support the development of students to achieve standards beyond the threshold level including the 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] Appendix to Assessment Rules, [072] Plagiarism Policy [008] 2021-22 BEM staff handbook, [019] 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] and Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring Review. [060] In particular, PDI has coherent principles for the assessment of students to enable students to demonstrate the learning outcomes of each course. [007, 072] Module handbooks [013 -018, 147-151] indicate that modules have a coherent assessment strategy that will enable students to demonstrate intended learning outcomes. Summative assessment for modules comprises 50% continuous assessment, which varies between modules and can comprise a number of different elements including course participation, individual tasks (presentations, exercises, tests, essays, videos, podcasts), [007, 013 -018, 147-151] and 50% final exam. Continuous assessment components differ across modules and are designed to develop students to work in different ways to support their future development and employment including individual and team-based assessments, different forms of communication, face-to-face and online. [012, 019, 072]

72 The 2021-2022 BEM staff handbook [019] details the process of internal verification for the writing and development of final exam papers, overseen by the Undergraduate Programmes Director. [019] Module leaders are required to develop an exam paper (in collaboration with module lecturers and the academic lead where needed) using the Final Exam Cover Sheet Template [080, 084] which they can access on SharePoint. [019] If a module is supervised by a head of module in Paris the module leader needs to liaise with them for approval. The BEM programme structure [129] provides a comprehensive overview of modules and staff across Paris and London but does not indicate which modules are supervised by Paris. The final review and approval is undertaken by the Academic Lead and

the Undergraduate Programmes Director. [2021-2022 BEM staff handbook 19] Academics and staff from UPD-PSL clearly explained this approach and were satisfied that it provided PDI with sufficient autonomy and flexibility in developing the assessment for their provision. [M2, M5]

73 As outlined in the Additional information for QAA, [042] PDI does not currently have a process for the external verification of assessment design and marking schemes, as this is not common practice in the French higher education sector but plans to implement a new process by the start of the academic year 2022/23, if not before, [042] as part of a wider review and action plan for how PDI will further incorporate external verification into course and assessment design, marking and moderation to ensure the setting and maintaining of comparable standards. [088] Senior staff who met with the review team [M4] were able to explain in detail how they planned to implement the External Examiner Action Plan, [080] which provided the team with confidence that plans for external verification are credible.

74 Course-level student handbooks and booklets provide comprehensive and definitive information and are produced for the BEM course, [012] which is also the handbook provided to the students on the one semester law track, [response to evidence request] the finance summer school, [160] and international summer school course. [035] The approved course documentation for the BEM course presented in the student handbook, [012] the staff handbook [019] and module handbooks [013 -018, 147-151] demonstrate that standards are reasonably comparable with those in other UK providers. This is because learning outcomes are mapped against modules and the teaching and learning strategies are presented, with more detail at the module level in each of the module handbooks. [013 -018, 147-151] Mapping of learning outcomes at different levels of study is within the student handbook [012] and this is consistent with the FHEQ. The BEM student handbook [012] also encourages students to familiarise themselves with the assessment rules, [007] generic marking criteria on the VLE, BEM Marking Criteria for Presentations [167] BEM Marking Criteria for Course Participation, [168] BEM Marking Criteria for Essays Reports, [169] and assessment strategies and processes for each module as outlined in the module handbooks. [013 -018, 147-151]

75 The 2021-22 BEM student handbook [012] and the BEM Aims, Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map [011] provide a concise summary of the main features of the course and the learning outcomes students might reasonably be expected to achieve and demonstrate which are clearly designed for FHEQ Levels 4, 5 and 6. The Appendix to the Assessment Rules [072] and the 21-22 BEM programme structure [129] outline the overall structure of an entire course of study. Module handbooks [013 -018, 147-151] include details of the learning outcomes, the intended approaches to assessment and assessment criteria.

76 Formative assessment and feedback opportunities combined with an emphasis on attendance [012, 007] help students to understand what is required to achieve the highest possible mark. The 2021-22 BEM staff handbook [019] emphasises the importance of formative assessments in the assessment process for the course and states that staff should inform students what formative assessments are part of their course and when they take place, providing details in module handbooks. This is credible and robust because the formative assessment opportunities are embedded within the assessment strategies of modules and are outlined in the module handbooks, [013 -018, 147-151] which detail how formative assessment and feedback will be provided to students throughout the module. [013 -018, 147-151] For example, in the BEM 2019-20 Introduction to Marketing Handbook, Year 3 [147] students were informed that they would receive formative assessment and feedback opportunities through in-class activities with accompanying debriefs, peer feedback and specific feedback on marketing project tasks. In BEM 2020-221 Module Micro Economics Year 2 Semester 1, [148] students were able to access quizzes and exercises which they could submit to the lecturer for feedback. When meeting the review team,

students confirmed [M1] that there were multiple opportunities for formative assessment within modules that helped them to understand how to improve their performance. These ranged from completing past exam papers/essay questions and submitting these to academics for individual feedback, to extra tutorials where students could complete additional exercises and go into subjects in more depth. [M1] Academics who met the review team [M5] were also able to provide a number of examples of formative opportunities that were offered to students to help them understand how to improve their performance. [M5] For example, specific essay-writing workshops were put on where students went through a submitted assignment and evaluated it in relation to the marking criteria before reviewing the feedback that the assignment had received from academics. [M5,200-202] Academics also described worked examples of answers to exam questions which were posted on the VLE. [M5]

77 The sample of assessment briefs and exam papers reviewed show that assessments enable students to achieve outcomes and marks for each question/component are clearly indicated. [153-156, Assessed student work] The team's scrutiny of assessed student work demonstrates that credit and qualifications are awarded only where relevant standards have been met and that PDI's approach to classification affords students the opportunity to achieve beyond the threshold. Assessed student work also demonstrates that staff understand and apply PDI's approach to setting and maintaining standards and that students understand what is required to reach standards beyond the threshold.

78 All external examiner reports seen by the team confirm that standards beyond the threshold level are reasonably comparable with those in other UK providers, and credit and qualifications are awarded only where those standards have been met. [022-024,059.131,132] External examiner reports, [022-024,059, 131, 132] while making some recommendations for enhancement, comment favourably on the nature of assessments set and the quality of marking and moderation processes. For example, the Humanities External Examiner Annual Report 2019-20 notes the innovative assessment methods and formative as well as summative feedback. [059] The external examiner considered the currency and relevancy of the course and the emphasis on developing critical thinking skills as a major strength and commended staff for high quality teaching as demonstrated in student achievement. The humanities external examiner also notes [059] good practice in detailed and constructive feedback, and the formative opportunity that a revision test session provides.

79 The review team met with students on the BEM course who were at different levels of study. [M1] Students noted that the student handbook [012] and the assessment rules [007] were clear and provide comprehensive information about academic quality and assessment processes. Module handbooks, learning resources on the VLE and academic staff were also key reference points for students seeking assistance. They also confirmed that, in their experience, the same marking standards and expectations are consistently applied across modules and that the different opportunities for formative assessment and feedback received on formative, continuous and summative assessment helps them to understand their grade and improve their work. They highlighted the value of marking criteria in understanding their grades. [M1] The review team therefore concluded that students understand what is required of them to reach standards beyond the threshold.

80 Members of Academic Board were able to describe their responsibilities in respect of maintaining comparable standards and the requirement to comply with the regulations and policies of the University. [M4] Staff responsible for course development and module assessment design described how formative assessment is used and embedded in modules to help students develop to achieve beyond the threshold standard. [M3, M4, M5] Staff responsible for course development and delivery understood the process for moderation and recognised its importance in maintaining standards. [M3, M4, M5] Staff at UPD-PSL [M2]

considered that PDI senior staff have a good understanding of the requirements of both the French and UK national frameworks that underpin academic standards. The team was assured and was confident that staff understand and undertake their responsibilities in respect of maintaining comparable standards.

Conclusions

81 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.

82 Based on the evidence presented, the team determined that the standards PDI has set for students to achieve beyond the threshold are reasonably comparable with those set by other UK providers. The review team considered that the standards described in the approved course documentation and in PDI's academic regulations and policies ensure that such standards are set and maintained appropriately.

83 PDI's approach to setting and maintaining comparable standards are robust and credible through its deliberative committee structures. Assessed student work demonstrates that credit and qualifications are awarded only where relevant standards have been met and that PDI's approach to classification affords students the opportunity to achieve beyond the threshold. External examiner reports seen by the team confirm that external examiners agree that standards beyond the threshold level are reasonably comparable with those in other UK providers, and credit and qualifications are awarded only where those standards have been met. Students understand what is required of them to reach standards beyond the threshold. Staff know their responsibilities in respect of maintaining comparable standards and the requirement to comply with the regulations and policies of UPD-PSL and what is required to help students achieve beyond the threshold.

84 The team's concern is that the translation of the 20-point scale to the UK classification system is potentially preventing students from being recognised as having achieved a first-class honours award. This concern, coupled with a lack of evidence to test whether PDI's approach to classification beyond the threshold is comparable with other UK providers, means that the effectiveness of PDI's approach to ensuring that students have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers could not be fully tested. However, the review team was satisfied by confirmation from external examiners that standards beyond the threshold level are reasonably comparable with those in other UK providers and that markers use the full range of the marking scale. Although PDI does not currently benchmark award and classification data with other UK providers, senior staff were able to articulate an evolving approach to undertake this activity and an ongoing review of the issue by Academic Board, which provided reassurance to the team that they were aware of this issue and the Academic Board was reviewing the approach. Therefore, the team concludes, based on the evidence described above, that this Core practice is met.

85 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix for this Core practice. Therefore, the team has a high 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

86 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.

87 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).

The evidence the team considered

88 The QAA team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The assessment team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other assessments and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a Board of Directors Terms of Reference [000]
- b Academic Board Terms of Reference [001]
- c BEM Course Board Terms of Reference [002]
- d Summer Courses Board Terms of Reference FV [003]
- e Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting [004]
- f 2020-21_UCL-PDI_Cooperation Agreement [005]
- g 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules [007]
- h Plagiarism Policy [008]
- i Appeals and Complaints Policy [009]
- j BEM Aims Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map [011]
- k 2021-22 BEM student handbook [012]
- l BEM1_Macroeconomics_Module Handbook [013]
- m BEM1_101 English and Communication_Module Handbook [014]
- n BEM2_Management Accounting_Module Handbook [015]
- o BEM2_Digital Sciences_Module Handbook [016]
- p BEM3_Basics of Strategy_Module Handbook [017]
- q BEM3_Current Issues in Sociology_Module Handbook [018]
- r 2021-2022 BEM staff handbook [019]
- s 2020-21 Business and Management_External Examiner Annual Report [022]
- t 2020-21 Economics_External Examiner Annual Report [023]
- u 2020-21 Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report [024]
- v 2021 Summer Course Board_Minutes [028]
- w Overall BEM Course Survey Report [029]
- x 2020-21 Academic Board minutes [030]
- y International Summer School_Programme Booklet [035]
- z Quality Management System Policy [038]
- aa Additional information for QAA [042]

bb October 21 Academic Board Agenda [043]
 cc June 20 Academic Board minutes [044]
 dd 21-22 Quality annual cycle [045]
 ee June 21 BEM Course Board minutes [046]
 ff June 2021 Academic Board meeting minutes [047]
 gg February 21 Academic Board minutes [048]
 hh April 21 Academic Board minutes [049]
 ii 2020-21_Standardisation evidence for English and Communication [050]
 jj EQUIS_2020_SAR_Universite_Paris_Dauphine [057]
 kk External Examiner_Role Description [058]
 ll 2019-20_Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report [059]
 mm Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring [060]
 nn June 2019 Board of Directors_BEM Overall Survey [061]
 oo June 26 2019 Board of Directors minutes [062]
 pp Feedback Analysis 2019 International Summer School [063]
 qq June 21 Academic Board Main supporting document [064]
 rr 2021 Finance Summer School Completion Report [065]
 ss 2021 International Summer School Completion Report [066]
 tt 2021 Summer Course Board main supporting document [067]
 uu S1 2020-21 BEM Modules Review [068]
 vv S2 2019-20_BEM Modules Review [069]
 ww Translation of Décret 2004-186 [070]
 xx Translation of Arrete 2015-1168 [071]
 yy 2020-21 Annual Examination Board minutes BEM1 and 2 [073]
 zz 2020-21 Annual Examination Board minutes BEM3 [074]
 aaa 2019-20 Annual Examination Board minutes BEM3 [076]
 bbb Standardisation evidence for Macroeconomics [085]
 ccc External Examiners Action Plan [088]
 ddd 2022 Executive MBA project [089]
 eee 2021 International Management Summer School_Final Grades [091]
 fff 2021 Finance Summer School_Final Grades [092]
 ggg March 21 BEM Course Board minutes [093]
 hhh 2020-21 S2 BEM UCL final grades [094]
 iii February 2021 Board of Directors minutes [104]
 jjj Executive summary for the June 2021 Board of Directors [111]
 kkk 2019-20_Standardisation evidence for English and Communication [112]
 ll Budget 21-22 (approved by Board of Directors June 2021) [114]
 mmm May 21 Board of Directors minutes [115]
 nnn Report on the EMBA Steering Committee [123]
 ooo Responsibilities checklist [124]
 ppp Evidence English Consultancy Work Record [125]
 qq 2019-20_Management_External Examiner Annual Report [131]
 rrr 2019-20_Economics_External Examiner Annual Report [132]
 sss June 2019 Board of Directors Agenda [138]
 ttt January 2020 Board of Directors Agenda [139]
 uuu 157_HR and Quality Manager_Job description [157]
 vvv 161_BEM Examination Board Procedure [161]
 www 2017_Convention PDI-UPD English [209]
 xxx Statement of decision_President_March 2021_English_translation [210]
 yyy Student submission QAA [SS]
 zzz Students meeting [M1]
 aaaa Meeting with UPD-PSL staff [M2]
 bbbb Meeting with staff to discuss assessment, grading and harmonisation [M3]
 cccc Meeting with senior staff at PDI [M4]
 dddd Meeting with academic staff at PDI [M5]

eeee Meeting with professional staff at PDI [M6]
ffff Final meeting at PDI. [M7]

89 Some of the key pieces of evidence, outlined in Annex 4, were not considered by the assessment team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this assessment are outlined below:

90 The team was not able to consider other organisations' views about whether effective standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them (see paragraph 6).

How any samples of evidence were constructed

91 The team randomly selected 90 pieces of assessed student work from 208 which were completed in the 2020-21 academic year.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

92 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the assessment team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the assessment team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the assessment team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below:

93 To assess whether the provider has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for securing standards in partnership work, the review team considered the Board of Directors Terms of Reference, [000] Academic Board Terms of Reference, [001] BEM Course Board Terms of Reference, [002] Summer Courses Board Terms of Reference FV, [003] Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting, [004] 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] BEM1_Macroeconomics_Module Handbook, [013] BEM1_101 English and Communication_Module Handbook, [014] BEM2_Management Accounting_Module Handbook, [015] BEM2_Digital Sciences_Module Handbook, [016] BEM3_Basics of Strategy_Module Handbook, [017] BEM3_Current Issues in Sociology_Module Handbook, [018] 2021-2022 BEM staff handbook, [019] 2021 Summer Course Board_minutes, [028] Overall BEM Course Survey Report, [029] 2020-21 Academic Board minutes, [030] Quality Management System Policy, [038] October 21 Academic Board Agenda, [043] June 20 Academic Board minutes, [044] 21-22 Quality annual cycle, [045] June 21 BEM Course Board minutes, [046] June 2021 Academic Board Meeting minutes, [047] February 21 Academic Board minutes, [048] 2020-21_Standardisation evidence for English and Communication, [050] External Examiner_Role Description [058] Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring, [060] June 2019 Board of Directors_BEM Overall Survey, [061] June 26 2019 Board of Directors minutes, [062] Feedback Analysis 2019 International Summer School, [063] June 21 Academic Board Main Supporting Document, [064] 2021 Summer Course Board Main Supporting Document, [067] S1 2020-21 BEM Modules Review, [068] S2 2019-20_BEM Modules Review, [069] Standardisation evidence for Macroeconomics, [085] External Examiners Action Plan, [088] March 21 BEM Course Board minutes, [093] February 2021 Board of Directors minutes, [104] Executive summary for the June 2021 Board of Directors, [111] 2019-20_Standardisation evidence for English and Communication, [112] Budget 21-22 (approved by Board of Directors June 2021), [114] May 21 Board of Directors minutes, [115] 2020-21 S1 BEM student representatives meeting minutes, [121] June 2019 Board of Directors Agenda, [138] January 2020 Board of Directors Agenda, [139] HR and Quality Manager_Job description, [157] BEM Examination Board Procedure,, [161]

2019-20_Marketing_External Moderation, [162] 2019 20_Macroeconomics_External Moderation, [163] 2020-21_Global Contemporary Issues_External Moderation, [164] 2019-20_Computer Science_External Moderation, [165] 2020-21_Linear Algebra_External Moderation, [166] and student submission. [SS] The review team also met with students, [M1] the UPD-PSL staff, [M2] and a range of PDI staff to discuss assessment, grading and harmonisation, [M3] the senior staff at PDI, [M4] the academic staff at PDI, [M5] and the professional staff at PDI, [M6] as well as the final meeting at PDI. [M7]

94 To interrogate the basis for the maintenance of academic standards within specific partnerships, and that those arrangements are in line with the provider's regulations or policies, the review team considered the 2017 Convention PDI-UPD, [209] Statement of decision by the president of the UPD-PSL, [201] the associated responsibilities checklist, [124] and discussions with the UPD-PSL staff [M2] and PDI staff. [M4, M5, M6] To test the basis for the maintenance of high quality within PDI and the UCL-CLIE partnership, and that those arrangements are in line with the provider's regulations or policies, the review team scrutinised 2020-21_UCL-PDI_Cooperation Agreement [005] and discussed the partnership with senior staff at PDI. [M4]

95 To test whether external examiners or verifiers consider that standards are credible and secure, thus confirming the effectiveness of the underpinning arrangements, the review team scrutinised 2020-21 Business and Management_External Examiner Annual Report, [022] 2020-21 Economics_External Examiner Annual Report, [023] 2020-21 Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report, [024] 2019-20_Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report, [059] 2019-20_Management_External Examiner Annual Report, [131] 2019-20_Economics_External Examiner Annual Report, [132] 2019-20_Marketing_External Moderation, [162] 2019-20_Macroeconomics_External Moderation, [163] 2020-21_Global Contemporary Issues_External Moderation, [164] 2019-20_Computer Science_External Moderation, [165] and 2020-21_Linear Algebra_External Moderation. [166]

96 To test that standards of awards are credible and secure, thus confirming the effectiveness of the underpinning arrangements, the review team sampled 110 pieces of marked student work from different stages of the BEM course (that is, BEM1 to BEM3) and different types of assessments (that is, 40 marked midterm exam papers, 50 marked final exam papers, and 20 marked continuous assessments), together with 14 related assessment briefs.

97 To test whether staff understand and discharge effectively their responsibilities to the awarding body, the review team met a range of staff at PDI including senior staff, [M4] academic staff, [M5] and professional staff. [M6] To test that the awarding body/organisation/lead provider is meeting its responsibilities, the team met UPD-PSL staff. [M2]

What the evidence shows

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

99 PDI and UPD-PSL have held a formal cooperation agreement since 2016, and in March 2021 a Statement of Decision was issued by the President of UPD-PSL to confirm the relationship between PDI and UPD-PSL and current courses that PDI delivers, which should align with both the academic standards of UPD-PSL in France and UK academic standards at PDI. [210] A formal review process of the agreement is in place on an annual basis. [209]

100 Responsibilities for both parties in ensuring academic standards are detailed in the formal agreement [209] and further explained in the Responsibilities Checklist. [124] The responsibilities of course design and/or delivery are shared; PDI is fully responsible for the

course delivery, UPD-PSL has the ultimate responsibility for the course design. PDI can adapt the design of the course locally (for example, English communication [014]) but subject to approval of UPD-PSL. [124] The membership of the Course Boards includes ex-officio and additional members from both parties. [002, 003, 060] The responsibility varies regarding the setting of assessments depending on courses. For the BEM course, assessments (for example, final exam papers) are reviewed by a head of module at UPD-PSL [124] and staff at PDI receive confirmation. For the summer courses, setting assessments is the exclusive responsibility of PDI. For the EMBA course, which is an ongoing development, PDI will be responsible for setting assessments. In terms of marking, first marking of student work is solely done by PDI and moderation or second marking of student work is shared with UPD-PSL [124] and the process is described in the BEM staff handbook. [019] PDI is also solely responsible for responding to external examiners [088] and other third parties, managing relationships with other partner organisations (such as placement providers). [095] Both PDI and the UPD-PSL use external expertise in maintaining academic standards: PDI uses external examiners [058] and consultants, [125] while UPD-PSL use EQUIS, Advisory Board and various Steering Committees (for example, the EMBA Steering Committee). [123]

101 PDI and the University College London Centre for Languages and International Education (UCL-CLIE) have a cooperation agreement which has been renewed annually since 2015. [005, M4] The agreement specified the UCL-CLIE's provision [005] as testing the English language of all PDI students at the beginning of the academic year of 2015, timetabling classes, teaching languages to students in classes, student access to individual tutorial time during teachers' office hours and course assessment/marks for each semester. As UCL is an established English higher education provider, academic standards of foreign language modules which PDI students choose to take are ensured and secured by UCL-CLIE.

102 The Organisation Chart and Courses Committees [004] detail how the two organisations (PDI and UPD-PSL) work together to share their responsibilities in current and future course management to meet the quality expectations of French and English higher education systems. PDI's quality management system [038] ensures its compliance with the regulatory requirements from UPD-PSL [070, 071] including the norms and regulations from the HCERES and the EQUIS accreditation standards [057] and its compliance with the UK regulatory requirements. [060] The Board of Directors (BoDs) at PDI has key areas of responsibilities, which directly relate to securing standards in partnership work; [000] its board agenda has standing matters associated with these aspects [138, 139] to allow regular review of such matters at its meetings. [061, 062, 104, 111, 114, 115] The Academic Board [001] has the responsibility to ensure the highest standards of academic provision across PDI courses, and hence academic standards are key matters on its agenda [043] and ensure its regular meetings to review course evaluation data and discuss quality enhancement initiatives in teaching and learning to secure academic standards. [030, 044, 047, 048, 049, 064] Different Course Boards specific to each course, [002, 003, 060] which is a formal arrangement with UPD-PSL, allows a regular space of discussion between PDI and UPD-PSL and helps to guarantee the respective sets of standards are met. [028, 046, 067, 093] The team concludes that PDI has clear and comprehensive regulations and policies for the management of partnerships to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure because it has clear partnership agreements and lines of responsibilities which are overseen through a deliberative committee structure.

103 Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring review [060] provides the context, process and procedures of annual monitoring to ensure and secure the standards of the courses at PDI. The external examiners only review final exam assessments currently, [058] although the future approved plan [088] will extend to approval of the final exam papers. Although the external examiners look at relevant module handbooks to comment on the

curriculum and assessments including continuous assessments to prepare their annual reports, [058] they are not involved in approval and moderation of the continuous assessments (normally count 50% of the module results) which is confirmed by the senior staff at PDI in meetings with the team. [M4, M7] PDI expressed the intention to further improvement of engagement of the external examiners in the current BEM course and an appointment of an external examiner for future EMBA. [M7] The review team was assured by the plans to further develop the external examining system which would ensure that academic standards for provision delivered in partnership would be more robust.

104 The 2021-22 calendar of annual monitoring and quality cycle activities includes different quality assurance activities at PDI. [045] The HR and Quality Manager [038, 060, 157] oversees the provision, review and regular update of all policies, handbooks and/or guides, procedures, form templates and/or records and other key documents, in cooperation with management and staff. The examples of PDI's course survey result, [029] the module reviews, [068, 069] the Academic Board minutes, [047, 048, 049] and June 2019 Board of Directors_BEM Overall Survey [061] provide evidence of how the monitoring process is operated. PDI staff provided different examples of how they implement the PDI policy and procedures to ensure academic standards. [M4, M5, M6] Hence, the review team concludes that PDI's approaches to ensure academic standards for provision delivered in partnership are evidence-based and credible.

105 Since external examining is not a common practice in the French higher education system, [042] PDI is solely responsible for using and responding to external examiners [124] and strengthening its practice to compliance with the UK regulatory requirements and maintain academic standards (more detail about PDI's approach to using external examiners is explored in S1 paragraph 39, S2 paragraph 77, and S4 (paragraphs 125-127). PDI has appointed three external examiners for its wide range of modules in its BEM course since 2020. [060] Submitted external moderation evidence of final exam forms [162, 163, 164, 165, 166] include external moderation from all three external examiners. The external examiners agree that assessments are designed in line with the relevant learning outcomes, and marking is fair and consistent in their sampled work. In their annual reports [022, 023, 024, 059, 131, 132] they consider that standards achieved are comparable with similar courses elsewhere in the sector. The assessed student work together with the assessment briefs are consistent with relevant learning outcomes of associated modules. The assessed student work indicates their achievement of the academic standards set by UPD-PSL are comparable with similar courses elsewhere in the UK. The review team thus concludes that the external examiners confirm that PDI properly applies the arrangements underpinning academic standards in its partnership with the UPD-PSL, and that academic standards are credible and secure.

106 The senior staff at PDI [M4] demonstrated to the team that they understand their responsibilities to the UPD-PSL partnership within the formal cooperation agreement and governance framework, stating that UPD-PSL has overall responsibility for the setting and maintenance of standards. The HR and Quality Manager and Head of Teaching and Learning Development at PDI clearly articulated in a meeting with the team [M4] the delineation of responsibilities of PDI and UPD-PSL. Members of Academic Board, the staff responsible for the course and academic staff who met the team [M4, M5] articulated their responsibilities and how this is implemented and monitored in practice. The UPD-PSL staff informed the team [M2] of their involvement in the process of course and module design and approval, assessments, harmonisation, staff recruitment and associated policies and regulations for PDI courses. They recognised that differences do exist between French and UK practice in external examining and appeals and complaints (see Q6). They confirmed that PDI has flexibility to adapt its approach to the management of the delivery in England to ensure compliance of UK academic standards and this flexibility is demonstrated, for example, by the implementation of the External Examiners Action Plan [088] (see S1

paragraph 31). Their explanation is consistent with the responsibilities stated in the cooperation agreement [209] and the responsibilities checklist. [124] The team's discussions with staff confirmed the view that staff from both PDI and UPD-PSL understand their respective responsibilities for academic standards.

Conclusions

107 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.

108 The team concludes that PDI has clear and comprehensive regulations or policies for the management of partnerships with other organisations to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure. PDI has credible approaches to secure standards in provision delivered in partnership, but the lack of moderation and external review of continuous assessment elements, while in line with PDI's regulations and policies, means that the maintenance and application of academic standards through internal marking practices could not be tested across all elements of assessment. However, PDI acknowledged that the provision was in development under the UK higher education systems with plans in place for improvement, and the team agreed that these plans especially around the use of external examiners was credible.

109 Partnership agreements are clear and comprehensive, up-to-date and reflect PDI's regulations or policies for the management of partnerships. External examiner reports and the assessed student work confirm that the standards of awards delivered within the partnership are credible and secure. The staff from both PDI and UPD-PSL understand their respective responsibilities for academic standards. The review team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.

110 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of the evidence, apart from the third-party endorsement, described in the QSR evidence matrix, the review team therefore has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

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

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

112 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).

The evidence the team considered

113 The QAA team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The assessment team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other assessments and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a Board of Directors Terms of Reference [000]
- b Academic Board Terms of Reference [001]
- c BEM Course Board Terms of Reference [002]
- d Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting [004]
- e 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules [007]
- f Plagiarism Policy [008]
- g Appeals and Complaints Policy [009]
- h 2021-22 BEM student handbook [012]
- i BEM1_Macroeconomics_Module Handbook [013]
- j BEM1_101 English and Communication_Module Handbook [014]
- k BEM2_ManagementAccounting_Module Handbook [015]
- l BEM2_Digital Sciences_Module Handbook [016]
- m BEM3_Basics of Strategy_Module Handbook [017]
- n BEM3_Current Issues in Sociology_Module Handbook [018]
- o 2021-2022 BEM staff handbook [019]
- p 2020-21 Business and Management_External Examiner Annual Report [022]
- q 2020-21 Economics_External Examiner Annual Report [023]
- r 2020-21 Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report [024]
- s 2020-21 Academic Board minutes [030]
- t Additional information for QAA [042]
- u June 20 Academic Board minutes [044]
- v 2020-21_Standardisation evidence for English and Communication [050]
- w External Examiner_Role Description [058]
- x 2019-20_Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report [059]
- y Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring [060]
- z Standardisation evidence for Macroeconomics [085]
- aa External Examiners Action Plan [088]
- bb 2022 Executive MBA project [089]
- cc 2019-20_Standardisation evidence for English and Communication [112]
- dd Report on the EMBA Steering Committee [123]
- ee Responsibilities checklist [124]
- ff Evidence English Consultancy Work Record [125]

gg	2019-20_Management_External Examiner Annual Report [131]
hh	2019-20_Economics_External Examiner Annual Report [132]
ii	2019-20 S1_BEM3_Introduction to Marketing module handbook [147]
jj	2020-21 S1_BEM2_Microeconomics module handbook [148]
kk	2020-21 S2_BEM2_GCI module handbook [149]
ll	2019-20 S1_BEM1_English and Communication module handbook [150]
mm	2019-20 S1_BEM1_Computer Science module handbook [151]
nn	2019-20-S1_BEM3_Introduction to Marketing final exam [152]
oo	2020-21 S1_BEM2_Microeconomics final exam [153]
pp	2020-21 S1_BEM2_GCI final exam [154]
qq	2019-20 S1_BEM1_English and Communication final exam [155]
rr	2019-20 S1_BEM1_Computer Science final exam [156]
ss	BEM Examination Board Procedure [161]
tt	2019-20_Marketing_External Moderation [162]
uu	2019-20_Macroeconomics_External Moderation [163]
vv	2020-21_Global Contemporary Issues_External Moderation [164]
ww	2019-20_Computer Science_External Moderation [165]
xx	2020-21_Linear Algebra_External Moderation [166]
yy	BEM Marking Criteria for Presentations [167]
zz	BEM Marking Criteria for Course Participation [168]
aaa	BEM Marking Criteria for Essays Reports [169]
bbb	2017_Convention PDI-UPD English [209]
ccc	Students meeting [M1]
ddd	Meeting with UPD-PSL staff [M2]
eee	Meeting with staff to discuss assessment, grading and harmonisation [M3]
fff	Meeting with senior staff at PDI [M4]
ggg	Meeting with academic staff at PDI [M5]
hhh	Meeting with professional staff at PDI [M6]
iii	Final meeting at PDI [M7]
jjj	Student assessed work. [SAW]

114 Some of the key pieces of evidence, outlined in Annex 4, were not considered by the assessment team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this assessment are outlined below:

115 The team was not able to consider other organisations' views about external expertise, assessment and classification processes (see paragraph 6).

How many samples of evidence were constructed

116 The team randomly selected 90 pieces of assessed student work from 208 which were completed in the 2020-21 academic year.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

117 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the assessment team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the assessment team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the assessment team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below:

118 To identify how external experts are used in setting and maintaining academic

standards, and how the College's assessment and classification processes operate, the team considered Board of Directors Terms of Reference, [000] Academic Board Terms of Reference, [001] BEM Course Board Terms of Reference, [002] Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting, [004] 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] Plagiarism Policy, [008] Appeals and Complaints Policy, [009] 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] BEM1_Macroeconomics_Module Handbook, [013] BEM1_101 English and Communication_Module Handbook, [014] BEM2_Management Accounting_Module Handbook, [015] BEM2_Digital Sciences_Module Handbook, [016] BEM3_Basics of Strategy_Module Handbook, [017] BEM3_Current Issues in Sociology_Module Handbook, [018] 2021-2022 BEM staff handbook, [019] Additional information for QAA, [042] 2020-21_Standardisation evidence for English and Communication, [050] External Examiner_Role Description, [058] Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring, [060] Standardisation evidence for Macroeconomics, [085] External Examiners Action Plan, [088] 2022 Executive MBA project, [089] 2019-20_Standardisation evidence for English and Communication, [112] Report on the EMBA Steering Committee, [123] Responsibilities checklist, [124] Evidence English Consultancy Work Record, [125] 2019-20 S1_BEM3_Introduction to Marketing module handbook, [147] 2020-21 S1_BEM2_Microeconomics module handbook, [148] 2020-21 S2_BEM2_GCI module handbook, [149] 2019-20 S1_BEM1_English and Communication module handbook, [150] 2019-20 S1_BEM1_Computer Science module handbook, [151] 2019-20-S1_BEM3_Introduction to Marketing final exam, [152] 2020-21 S1_BEM2_Microeconomics final exam, [153] 2020-21 S1_BEM2_GCI final exam, [154] 2019-20 S1_BEM1_English and Communication final exam, [155] 2019-20 S1_BEM1_Computer Science final exam, [156] BEM Examination Board Procedure, [161] BEM Marking Criteria for Presentations, [167] BEM Marking Criteria for Course Participation, [168] BEM Marking Criteria for Essays Reports, [169] and 2017_Convention PDI-UPD English. [209] The team also met the senior staff [M4] and again at the final meeting. [M7]

119 To assess whether plans for using external expertise in setting and maintaining academic standards and plans for assessment and classification processes are credible, robust and evidence-based, the team considered Board of Directors Terms of Reference, [000] Academic Board Terms of Reference, [001] BEM Course Board Terms of Reference, [002] Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting, [004] 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] 2021-2022 BEM staff handbook, [019] 2020-21 Business and Management_External Examiner Annual Report, [022] 2020-21 Economics_External Examiner Annual Report, [023] 2020-21 Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report, [024] 2019-20_Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report, [059] External Examiners Action Plan, [088] 2019-20_Management_External Examiner Annual Report, [131] 2019-20_Economics_External Examiner Annual Report, [132] BEM Examination Board Procedure, [161] 2019-20_Marketing_External Moderation, [162] 2019-20_Macroeconomics_External Moderation, [163] 2020-21_Global Contemporary Issues_External Moderation, [164] 2019-20_Computer Science_External Moderation, [165] 2020-21_Linear Algebra_External Moderation, [166] and 2017_Convention PDI-UPD English. [209] The review team also sampled 110 pieces of marked student work from different stages of the BEM course (that is, BEM1 to BEM3) and different types of assessments (that is, 40 marked midterm exam papers, 50 marked final exam papers, and 20 marked continuous assessments), together with 14 related assessment briefs.

120 To assess the reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes, the team considered BEM1_Macroeconomics_Module Handbook, [013] BEM1_101 English and Communication_Module Handbook, [014] BEM2_Management Accounting_Module Handbook, [015] BEM2_Digital Sciences_Module Handbook, [016] BEM3_Basics of Strategy_Module Handbook, [017] BEM3_Current Issues in Sociology_Module Handbook, [018] 2019-20 S1_BEM3_Introduction to Marketing module handbook, [147] 2020-21 S1_BEM2_Microeconomics module handbook, [148] 2020-21

S2_BEM2_GCI module handbook, [149] 2019-20 S1_BEM1_English and Communication module handbook, [150] 2019-20 S1_BEM1_Computer Science module handbook, [151] 2019-20-S1_BEM3_Introduction to Marketing final exam, [152] 2020-21, S1_BEM2_Microeconomics final exam, [153] 2020-21 S1_BEM2_GCI final exam, [154] 2019-20 S1_BEM1_English and Communication final exam, [155] and 1_BEM1_Computer Science final exam. [156]

121 To interrogate the use of external examiners or verifiers, and that the provider considers and responds appropriately to externals' reports regarding standards, and to identify externals' views about reliability, fairness and transparency of assessment and classification processes, the review team scrutinised 2020-21 Business and Management_External Examiner Annual Report, [022] 2020-21 Economics_External Examiner Annual Report, [023] 2020-21 Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report, [024] 2019-20_Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report, [059] External Examiners Action Plan, [088] 2019-20_Management_External Examiner Annual Report, [131] 2019-20_Economics_External Examiner Annual Report, [132] 2019-20_Marketing_External Moderation, [162] 2019-20_Macroeconomics_External Moderation, [163] 2020-21_Global Contemporary Issues_External Moderation, [164] 2019-20_Computer Science_External Moderation, [165] and 2020-21_Linear Algebra_External Moderation. [166]

122 To test that external experts are used according to the provider's regulations or policies, the review team considered Academic Board Terms of Reference, [001] 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] 2021-2022 BEM staff handbook, [019] 2020-21 Business and Management_External Examiner Annual Report, [022] 2020-21 Economics_External Examiner Annual Report, [023] 2020-21 Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report, [024] 2020-21 Academic Board minutes, [030] Additional information for QAA, [042] June 20 Academic Board minutes, [044] 2019-20_Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report, [059] Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring, [060] 2022 Executive MBA project, [089] Report on the EMBA Steering Committee, [123] Evidence English Consultancy Work Record, [125] 2019-20_Management_External Examiner Annual Report, [131] 2019-20_Economics_External Examiner Annual Report, [132] 2019-20_Marketing_External Moderation, [162] 2019-20_Macroeconomics_External Moderation, [163] 2020-21_Global Contemporary Issues_External Moderation, [164] 2019-20_Computer Science_External Moderation, [165] and 2020-21_Linear Algebra_External Moderation. [166]

123 To test that staff understand the requirements for the use of external expertise, and the provider's assessment and classification processes, the review team held a meeting with senior staff, [M4] academic staff, [M6] professional staff [M6] and there was a final meeting. [M7] The team also held a meeting particularly relating to assessment, grading and harmonisation. [M3]

124 To assess student views of assessment and classification processes, the team held a meeting with students to discuss their views. [M1]

What the evidence shows

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

126 The system of external examining is not common practice in the French higher education sector, [Additional information for QAA 042] but in preparation for this review, PDI started using external examiners in its assessment process in 2019. [Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring 060] The Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring [060] explains that three external examiners are appointed and they are provided with an annual general report for the provision of the BEM course, as well as detailed module reports for each module included in the BEM course structure, at the end of the two semesters. [External

examiner job description 058]

127 The appointment and engagement of the external examiners, consideration of their annual reports, approval of the External Examiners Action Plan are responsibilities of the Academic Board [043] as outlined in the Terms of Reference of the Academic Board. [001] In October 2021, the Academic Board approved an 'External Examiner action plan' [088] aiming at continuously strengthening the external examination process and incorporating the external examiners' feedback into the quality assurance process. This plan includes eight different actions and details the specific activities, responsibilities by individual or group and the deadlines. This plan is discussed, approved and recorded and evidenced in the sample of minutes provided by the Academic Board in June 2020 [044] and October 2021. [030] Ongoing engagement and consultation with the external examiner are evidenced in submitted external moderation of final exam forms [162, 163, 164, 165, 166] and the annual reports. [022, 023, 024, 059, 131, 132] The review team therefore concludes that the external examiners are used according to Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring [060] and PDI's external examiner job descriptions. [058]

128 The external examiners' views of the assessment and classification process are detailed across several documents including their moderation of final exams [162, 163, 164, 165, 166] and their last two-year annual reports. [022, 023, 024, 059, 131, 132] All the external examiners confirm that the assessments of their related modules are designed in relation to relevant module learning outcomes and hence the assessments are reliable. They also all agree that the process of assessment and determination of awards is sound and has been conducted rigorously, fairly, reliably and consistently, in accordance with the university assessment rules. However, the external examiners for Business and Management, and Economics point out in their moderation of final exams [162, 163, 165, 166] that internal moderation processes should be more transparent in relation to a potential template to use for internal moderation, clear marking criteria for final exams and consistency in second marking. The 'External Examiner action plan' [088] which responds to the external examiners' feedback was approved (see S1 paragraph 31).

129 Since 2019, PDI has also worked with external consultants with experience in curriculum design and QAA processes, and who have worked at a number of London universities, alumni, external company representatives to ensure alignment with sector standards (for example, the review and redesign of the English Curriculum [125] and the design of the curriculum of the EMBA [042, 089, 123]). PDI is planning to set up a Programme Approval and Review Committee (PARC). [042] Senior staff admitted that procedures for using external expertise are not formalised for the development of courses but confirmed that the formal procedures are being developed. [M4] It was planned that any new course has to be assessed by an external, approved by directors and academic board. PDI further confirmed that an external examiner would be appointed for its future EMBA course. [M4] The review team therefore concludes that PDI's regulations and/or policies describing its requirements for using external expertise in setting and maintaining academic standards are comprehensive but not clear because policies and procedures for using different types of external expertise (for example, external examiners, corporate partners, alumni) in relation to course approval and review are not formalised.

130 The use of external examiners is clearly articulated to students in the student handbook 2021-22. [012] The staff are also given clear instructions how to incorporate the external examiners to its moderation process on page 46 of the staff handbook. [019] There was some evidence that external examiners had been engaged with staff in the annual review. The appointment and engagement of the external examiners and consideration of their annual reports are responsibilities of the Academic Board [043] as outlined in the Terms of Reference of the Academic Board. [001] The External Examiners Action Plan [088] was approved by the Academic Board to further strengthen its engagement of the external

examiners. However, its plans are not robust because although the External Examiners Action Plan [088] extends the involvement of the external examiners to approval of the final exam papers, the external examiners are not involved in approval and moderation of the continuous assessments (normally 50% of the module results) in all modules. This is also confirmed by the senior staff at PDI in the meetings. [M4, M7] The senior staff expressed their intention to further improve engagement of the external examiners in the current BEM course and an appointment of an external examiner for future EMBA. [M7] The review team therefore concludes that PDI's plan for using external expertise in setting and maintaining academic standards are credible but could be more robust.

131 PDI's approaches to assessment design, marking and moderation, requirements for awards and approaches to classification are detailed across several documents - for example, Terms of reference for Board of Directors, [000] Academic Board [001] and Course Boards, [002] Organisation and committee structure, [004] 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] Plagiarism Policy, [008] Appeals and Complaints Policy, [009] student and staff handbooks for the BEM course, [012, 019] relevant module handbooks, [013, 014, 015, 016, 017, 018, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151] Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring, [060] External Examiners Action Plan, [088] Additional information for the attention of QAA document, [042] and BEM Examination Board Procedure. [161] These documents identify PDI's processes for assessment and classification and show PDI's processes are reliable, fair and transparent. This is because the module handbooks [013, 014, 015, 016, 017, 018, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151] clearly set out the assessment methods for each module detailing the component tasks, the percentage weightings of each assessment component and associated learning outcomes.

132 PDI documentation such as 2021-2022 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] 2021-2022 BEM student handbook, generic marking criteria for Essays and Reports, [169] Presentations [167] and Course Participation [168] together provide comprehensive information to students about assessment strategies and methods and marking criteria. The academic staff also receive detailed instructions for approaching final exam assessment through the staff handbook regarding final exam paper approval, preparation checklist, on the final exam day, marking and scripts handling procedures, final grades reporting, notification of examination results, and student access to their final exam papers. [019, page 43-48]

133 PDI's organisation and committee structure [004] details responsibilities and reporting structure of keyboards (for example, Board of Directors, [000] Academic Board, [001] Course Board, [002] and Examination Board [161]) in the quality assurance of the courses delivered by PDI but awarded by UPD-PSL. 2021-2022 BEM Assessment Rules [007] details rules at various stages of assessment and classification process including final grade and module validation, final exams, semester and academic year validation, attendance, specific circumstances, roles of Examination Board and requirements for honours, conditions to repeat a year, maximum number of registration, recognition of student involvement and course structure year by year. It uses the term 'validation' [007, page 2] as 'successful completion', which is consistently used in the assessment rules of UPD-PSL at the levels of the module, the semester, and the course. The classification process detailing honours calculation are set out in the formal cooperation agreement between PDI and UPD-PSL [209] and the 2021-2022 Assessment Rules. [007] This is clear and comprehensive because it provides unambiguous information about the processes for passing the module, the semester and the course.

134 Academic staff articulated the assessment design to be aligned to the learning outcomes. They also explained their regular communication with UPD-PSL staff and their power of final approval. [M5] The staff were clear in their understanding of the marking process of different assessments including standardisation, second marking and

harmonisation as they receive guidance through the staff handbook and support from management through the module review process. Staff told the team that the students have been given different support (office hours, continuous feedback during and after the classes, staff office hours, past papers and solutions on the VLE, peer support scheme, and so on) to improve their performance through assessment, and students confirmed that they were well supported and guided through feedback mechanisms and past exam papers. [M1] In the meeting with academic staff, [M5] staff admitted that they had not fully utilised external examiners in assessment and explained that the approved External Examiners Action Plan [088] would provide detailed actions for the management and academic staff to follow to strengthen PDI's engagement with the external examiners. [M4] The review team therefore concludes that staff understand the arrangements of external examining and assessment and classification processes.

135 The students told the review team [M1] that at the beginning of each semester the lecturer presents on the assessment rules and how to achieve their grades and how they will receive feedback. They confirmed that the information is clear, can be found in handbooks and is accessible. The students are aware of precise marking criteria for different types of assessments, and they are aware of what is expected of them to achieve the learning outcomes. Students confirmed that assessments are very thorough and there were different assessments to test the student abilities such as tests and presentations. The students agreed that the approach to marking is fair as lecturers apply the criteria and the given marks are aligned to the standards. Furthermore, students confirmed that lecturers make them aware of where they need to improve. The review team therefore concludes that the students met by the team confirmed that they are satisfied that PDI's assessment and classification processes are reliable, fair and transparent and that they are given opportunity to seek guidance and support around assessment.

Conclusions

136 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.

137 PDI's regulations and/or policies describing its requirements for using external expertise in setting and maintaining academic standards are comprehensive but not clear because the procedures for using external expertise (external examiners, corporate partners, alumni) in relation to course approval and review are absent. The plans for using external expertise in both setting and maintaining academic standards and assessment and classification are credible but not robust because the involvement of the external examiners is not embedded fully in the process for continuous assessments.

138 The assessed student work confirms assessment and classification are carried out in line with PDI and course requirements. The external examiner reports and PDI's responses to them confirm the use of external expertise and that PDI does give the external expertise due consideration. The external examiner reports confirm that PDI's assessment and classification processes are reliable and fair. However, the internal moderation process and second marking is not consistent currently, but PDI does have a constructive plan to address different issues. Records of course approval and review confirm that the external expertise is used according to PDI's regulations.

139 The staff understand the requirements for the use of external expertise and PDI's

assessment and classification processes. The students confirm that PDI's assessment and classification processes are reliable, fair and transparent. The review team concludes on balance, therefore, that the Core practice is met.

140 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of the evidence, apart from third party endorsements described in the QSR evidence matrix. Although PDI staff were able to articulate in meetings how they will improve their practice in using the external expertise (for example, external examiners, external consultants, others) in setting and maintaining academic standards, the team's understanding of the plans for meeting the Core practice relies partly on oral testimony from the staff. The review team therefore has moderate confidence in this judgement.

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

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

142 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).

The evidence the team considered

143 The QAA team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The assessment team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other assessments and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a Admissions Policy [006]
- b Academic Board Terms of Reference [001]
- c BEM Coarse Board minutes [046]
- d June 2021 Academic Board Meeting minutes [047]
- e BEM1 Selection committee report [126]
- f BEM2 Selection committee report [127]
- g BEM3 Selection committee report [128]
- h Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring [060]
- i Course Board Terms of Reference [002]
- j 2021 Summer Course Board_Minutes [028]
- k March 21 BEM Course Board minutes [093]
- l BEM cohort indicators.pdf [136]
- m Special Education Needs Report.pdf [137]
- n June 2019 Board of Directors Agenda.pdf [138]
- o January 2020 Board of Directors Agenda.pdf [139]
- p 2021-22 Bursary Commission July 20221_V1 [186]
- q Access and Participation Statement [187]
- r Welfare and Wellbeing Policy [033]
- s Trustees report [185]
- t International Summer School_Programme Booklet [035]
- u Summer Courses Board Terms of Reference [003]
- v 2021 Summer Course Board main supporting document [067]
- w Feedback Analysis 2019 International Summer School [063]
- x 2021 Finance Summer School Completion Report.pdf [065]
- y 2021 International Summer School Completion Report.pdf [066]
- z 2021 Summer Course Board Main Supporting Document.pdf [067]
- aa 2021 International Management Summer School_Final Grades.pdf [091]
- bb 2021 Finance Summer School_Final Grades [092]
- cc March 21 BEM Course Board minutes [093]
- dd June 21 BEM Course Board minutes [046]
- ee 2021 Summer Course Board_Minutes [028]
- ff Additional information for QAA [042]

- gg PDI's website (Admissions section)
- hh Senior staff meeting [M4]
- ii Academic staff meeting [M5]
- jj Professional staff meeting [M6]
- kk Student meeting [M1]
- ll Staff from PDI Paris meeting. [M2]

How any samples of evidence were constructed

144 The team randomly selected 51 admissions records from the 63 applications in the 2020-21 academic year. This was to assess whether reliable, fair and inclusive admissions decisions were made for the applicants sampled.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

145 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the assessment team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the assessment team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the assessment team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below:

146 To identify institutional policy relating to the recruitment, selection and admission of students the review team considered PDI's Admissions Policy. [006]

147 To identify the institutional oversight of the admissions policy and practice, roles and responsibilities of staff involved in the admissions process, how the provider verifies applicants' entry qualifications, how the provider facilitates an inclusive admissions system and how it handles complaints and appeals, the review team considered Academic Board Terms of Reference, [001] BEM Coarse Board minutes, [046] June 2021 Academic Board Meeting minutes, [047] BEM1 Selection committee report, [126] BEM2 Selection committee report, [127] BEM3 Selection committee report, [128] Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring, [060] Course Board Terms of Reference, [002] 2021 Summer Course Board_Minutes, [028] March 21 BEM Course Board minutes, [093] BEM cohort indicators.pdf, [136] Special Education Needs Report.pdf, [137] June 2019 Board of Directors Agenda.pdf, [138] January 2020 Board of Directors Agenda.pdf, [139] 2021-22 Bursary Commission July 20221_V1, [186] Access and Participation Statement, [187] Welfare and Wellbeing Policy, [033] and Trustees report. [185] The team also met with senior staff from PDI, [M4, M7] USP-PSL [M2] academic staff and students. [M1]

148 To identify institutional approaches to summer school recruitment, the review team considered the International Summer School_Programme Booklet, [035] Summer Courses Board Terms of Reference, [003] 2021 Summer Course Board_Minutes, [028] 2021 Summer Course Board main supporting document, [067] Feedback Analysis 2019 International Summer School, [063] 2021 Finance Summer School Completion Report.pdf, [065] 2021 International Summer School Completion Report.pdf, [066] 2021 Summer Course Board Main Supporting Document.pdf, [067] 2021 International Management Summer School_Final Grades.pdf, [091] 2021 Finance Summer School_Final Grades, [092] March 21 BEM Course Board minutes, [093] June 21 BEM Course Board minutes, [046] 2021 Summer Course Board_Minutes, [028] and Additional information for QAA. [042] The team also met with PDI senior staff [M4] and academic staff. [M5]

What the evidence shows

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

150 PDI's approach to admissions is defined by its Admissions Policy, [006] which describes the policy and its operational practice and includes a timeline for applications and application criteria. The policy claims to admit students of the highest calibre and maintain integrity in its admissions process, continuing to ensure a fair and equal access to higher education. The policy outlines procedures for entry to Bachelor's in Economics and Management, Level 4, but also direct entry to Levels 5 and 6. The policy also outlines admission to the institution's credit-bearing Summer School, and Level 5 Law Track. The policy identifies its commitment to equality of opportunity for all candidates, regardless of background, and commits itself to a culture of diversity and inclusivity. The institution is able to accommodate candidates below the age of 18 from Université Paris Dauphine in line with the institution's Admissions Policy. Senior staff [Meeting M4] recognise the need for safeguarding but also confirm that no students under the age of 18 have been admitted to study in the UK. The Admissions Policy identifies that the institution does not offer deferred entry, and each cycle requires original application. Similarly, PDI senior staff [M5] confirm that the institution does not offer Accreditation of Prior Learning as indicated on the website [QAA PDI Submission Document] but this is not identified in the Admissions Policy document. [006]

151 PDI students are currently recruited through the French higher education system which is governed by 'detailed public regulations formalised in the Code de l'Education, that take the form of circulaires and décrets that apply to all the public accredited Higher Education Institutions'. [BEM Course Board Minutes 047] Consequently, cohorts currently recruited to the institution all apply to UPD-PSL, and then apply to study in London with a letter of application expressing their interest to study in London, and record of English competency [M1; Admission Records, M2; M6] through which applicants' entry qualifications are already verified. Application to London is based on a candidate's English competency recorded by formal qualification, an English test showing a B2 level minimum, from TOEFL, IELTS or Cambridge. [006, p. 3] The team scrutinised candidate applications and confirmed that all students met the criteria for English competency. [Admissions Records]

152 All French and non-UK PDI BEM students have been accepted initially by the UPD-PSL admissions system through the Parcoursup online system which is similar to the UCAS system in the UK. Students who then wish to study in the UK apply through PDI's website [<https://london.dauphine.psl.eu/programmes-and-training/bachelors-in-economics-and-management/admissions>] which contains the information on entry requirements including the Parcoursup Application Procedure timeline, course information and support for candidates' admissions enquiries. The team found that the web-based information aligns to the Admissions Policy. [006]

153 Each award is supported by a Selection Committee [BEM1 Selection committee report 126, BEM2 Selection committee report 127, BEM3 Selection committee report 128] which is solely authorised to award admission offers to candidates who wish to study in the UK. Candidate routes are identified for those holding different national qualifications and thresholds for French Baccalaureate, UK 'A' Levels, International Baccalaureate, and other high school diplomas. All awards require evidence of English language proficiency, and an English language test requiring a B2 grade. Once a candidate achieves the thresholds for course admission, a candidate receives an unconditional offer. The team found that the Selection Committee reports show a summary of applications, how many were considered and how many were rejected. For example, the BEM1 Selection Committee report for May 2021 confirmed that 700 applications were selected out of 1,634 applications with 1,596 students having attained the French Baccalaureate and confirmed where students were

rejected either based on a 'negative deviation' on an average mark algorithm or where students were rejected based on not having a B2 level of English. The team concluded that the Selection Committee was a robust and reliable method for selecting applicants to study in London as it followed an algorithm and set criteria that were clear and fair to all applicants.

154 The team assessed a sample of admissions records to ascertain whether reliable, fair and inclusive admissions decisions were being made and found that all the records contained the certified paperwork required as outlined in the Admissions Policy [006] and criteria.

155 PDI's Admissions Policy [006] includes information about complaints and appeals on admissions. The policy directs students to the Appeals and Complaints Policy [009] if students want to make a complaint about the level of service during the admissions process. The policy confirms that any complaint needs to be made within 14 days of the admissions decision notification and PDI aims to resolve the complaint within 21 days. Both the Admissions Policy and the Appeals and Complaints Policy [006, 009] confirm that an applicant has no right of appeal against a declined application. However, feedback is available if a request is made within 14 days of the decision, and a reply is sent by email. Senior staff [M4] confirmed that they have not received any complaints or appeals regarding admissions. Therefore, the team could not evaluate whether the policy for appeals is robust and credible in practice.

156 PDI's Access and Participation Statement [187] outlines its approach to 'the advancement of education for the benefit of all regardless of student background, ethnicity or gender' and PDI do this through funding scholarships and tuition fees exemptions and supporting special education needs in line with the Student Welfare and Wellbeing Policy [033] and the Special Needs Procedures. [137] PDI ensures qualifying students are supported through the institution's Bursary and Scholarship awards adjudged against stated criteria, which is summarised in the Trustees Report [185] detailing recruitment. For example, the report highlights analysis of non-continuation rates from 2015-20 per intake. The report shows that since PDI was established in 2015 the non-continuation rate has been very low (between 0.6% and 8.6%) which could demonstrate that admissions criteria support student progression and attainment. However, the team could find no evidence that the institution yet considers admissions practice based on equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) data beyond its bursaries and scholarships.

157 The Admissions Policy [006] was reviewed by PDI and UPD-USL [M4] in the last academic year, has been aligned to UCAS timeline requirements, to enable candidates external to UPD-USL to apply. Senior staff acknowledged [M4] that admissions practice will need to change as a result to account for greater widening access, for example by revising the criteria for scholarships bursaries to support potentially 20% of students.

158 Senior staff are aware that plans must include regular review of the Access and Participation statement [187] but that there is no equivalent in France, which means it is a local arrangement for PDI. Senior staff are confident that there is no unfair discrimination in the application system, as the majority of students come from France and the Parcoursup platform is the same as UCAS. While the admissions policies for bachelor's awards and summer schools mention EDI, analysis of this data has yet to mature sufficiently to influence those policies.

159 PDI delivers Summer School courses that lead to the awards of academic credits (ECTS) from UPD-PSL International Summer School Programme Booklet [035]. Admissions requirements to summer schools mirror those of full awards, requiring application through a personal statement, CV, the previous year's Grades Transcript, and most recent English language test certificate. [Overview Document QAA Statement; PDI website] However,

neither on the website nor in the International Summer School Programme Booklet [035] are academic admissions criteria defined because candidates are drawn from current UPD-USL students, so an academic transcript is required including an English competency qualification by way of application.

160 The Admissions Policy and its outcomes are overseen by Academic Boards [028_2021 Summer Course Board_Minutes, 093_March 21 BEM Course Board 028; 046; 093_March 21 BEM Course Board_Minutes 093] through BEM Selection Committee Reports [126 - 128] with detailed analysis of admissions accepts/rejects and feedback on year-on-year recruitment success. There is evidence of candidates not making the entry threshold being rejected and reported in Selection Committee Reports. [126; 128; 137] The team found that this analysis is in accordance with the institution's Policy and Procedures for Annual Monitoring. [60]

161 There is not yet formal reporting of admissions based on EDI data. However, discussion with senior staff [M4] claimed that the institution seeks to be as inclusive as possible because EDI is a key value of the institution. The institution's Access and Participation Statement [187] is identified as a key future mechanism, as is the Scholarship and Bursary Committee to support widening access. [Budget 21-22 (approved by Board of Directors June 2021 114; 2021-22 Bursary Commission July 2021 186)]

162 The team found that there was no systematic approach for Summer Schools' admissions data to be considered. PDI presented evidence of consideration of admissions data of summer courses concerning policies and development, and monitoring profiles through its Course Boards, [2021 Summer Course Board_Minutes 028; 2021 Summer Course Board Main Supporting Document 067] but only by occupation background, nationality and study location. The minutes of Course Boards [093; 046; 028; 042] did not address the admissions impact of Summer Schools, described by the Board's ToRs. Similarly, the minutes of the Academic Board [043] did not offer an analysis of policy and practice of the Admissions Policy, rather the results of the Summer Schools are reported. [2021 Finance Summer School_Final Grades 92]

163 Academic staff [M5] reported that candidates were made unconditional offers based on their achieving a certified threshold for English. Where a language qualification was not available, candidates may be invited for interview to ascertain competency in English, conducted by the Academic Lead, English and Communication, who has extensive career experience in language certification. Currently, there is no semi-structured interview, or formal reporting mechanism for candidates' interviews, reliant on the experience of the Academic Lead, English and Communication. Senior staff confirmed that the interview approach is rarely used because most candidates achieve the certified threshold for English. [M7] Senior staff also [M4] recognised that this approach, focused on one colleague's responsibility, will need to be revised when using UCAS to support the need for candidates' feedback.

164 Senior staff from Paris [M2] identify that admissions is operated locally, ensuring the institution has access to the necessary documentation. The inequality may arise given the Paris status as a 'Grande Ecole' which affords them a highly selective status in France, and access to the most highly qualified students. The Parcoursup system is automated, and grades driven, but when processing applications for London, the competence in English is individually checked. The operation of admissions through UCAS for PDI will introduce widening access, and senior staff [M2] noted that admission thresholds required by London may be lower than those agreed in Paris, and PDI is alert to the need for harmonisation for candidates applying through Parcoursup following OfS registration.

165 Students confirmed [M1] that PDI and UPD-PSL had enough accessible information

about the courses to enable them to make the decision about applying. Students reported possessing the required certification for English language, but individuals had also been interviewed as academic staff described. [Meeting 5] All students had applied through the Parcoursup system, and all were confident that the information provided had been accurate and comprehensive.

Conclusions

166 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.

167 The team found that, overall, PDI has a clear policy for the recruitment and admissions of students which is currently reliable, fair and inclusive. This is because the recruiting criteria are clear and decisions are made based on that criteria, its policy and on the website, it is fair because the decisions that are made within that criteria apply to all students and it is robust because the Selection Committee has oversight of the selections following a set algorithm that is evidenced and recorded.

168 The review team found that the PDI approach to admissions is reliable, fair and credible. PDI has a clear Admissions Policy for awards and courses, aligned to its scope and mission which is reliable, fair and inclusive. PDI ensures that fairness and reliability are embedded principles within admissions and recruitment. PDI's current reliance on the French Parcoursup system means that inclusivity is integrated into an anonymous grades-based automated system. Governance and reporting of admissions exist through the institution's committee structure. [010]

169 PDI adheres to the practice of having clearly articulated and transparent processes for handling complaints of prospective students that are accessible to all stakeholders. However, admissions decisions cannot be appealed, although there is a formal mechanism for feedback of rejected applications.

170 The Admissions Policy and practice takes into account academic attainment, individual circumstances, applicant background and applicant characteristics. PDI is committed to its Access and Participation Policy, and its Scholarship and Bursary approach to support individual students, which may include 100% funding. However, PDI acknowledges that the approach is a work in progress and are aware that OfS Registration and recruitment through UCAS will require modification of scholarship and bursaries to promote widening participation.

171 Candidates from Paris who apply for study in London, are made an unconditional offer based on their personal qualifications, personal statement outlining their motivation to study in London, and certified competence in English. Should there be uncertainty on the candidate's competence in English, the final decision is made by the Academic Lead, English and Communication. The team could find no evidence of candidates being rejected on this basis. Staff involved in admissions in London understand their role, and PDI confirmed that the Academic Lead, English and Communication is appropriately skilled and trained with career experience working with English testing organisations.

172 Through the sample of the admissions records, the team has been able to determine that students meet the academic threshold the institution requires, through academic transcripts, personal statements and certified qualification in the English language.

173 Information provided to applicants is clear, accessible (to all applicants) and fit for purpose and students report the process was straightforward and did not lack for information which prepared them for study in London.

174 The review team concludes that the admissions system is reliable, fair and inclusive, and found that staff involved in admissions are appropriately skilled. The admissions requirements set out in approved course documentation are consistent with the institution's policies and procedures. The team concludes that PDI has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system and that the Core practice is met.

175 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects the majority of the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix. Therefore, the team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

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

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

177 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).

The evidence the team considered

178 The QAA team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The assessment team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other assessments and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a Board of Directors Terms of Reference [000]
- b Academic Board Terms of Reference [001]
- c BEM Course Board Terms of Reference [002]
- d Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting [004]
- e 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules [007]
- f BEM Aims Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map [011]
- g 2021-22 BEM student handbook [012]
- h BEM1_Macroeconomics_Module Handbook [013]
- i BEM1_101 English and Communication_Module Handbook [014]
- j BEM2_Management Accounting_Module Handbook [015]
- k BEM2_Digital Sciences_Module Handbook [016]
- l BEM3_Basics of Strategy_Module Handbook [017]
- m BEM3_Current Issues in Sociology_Module Handbook [018]
- n 2021-2022 BEM staff handbook [019]
- o 2020-21 Business and Management_External Examiner Annual Report [022]
- p 2020-21 Economics_External Examiner Annual Report [023]
- q 2020-21 Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report [024]
- r Overall BEM Course Survey Report [029]
- s The EMBA learning outcomes [037]
- t Quality Management System Policy [038]
- u Additional information for QAA [042]
- v June 20 Academic Board minutes [044]
- w 21-22 Quality annual cycle [045]
- x Undergraduate programmes Attendance Committee Terms of Reference [051]
- y EQUIS_2020_SAR_Universite_Paris_Dauphine [057]
- z 2019-20_Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report [059]
- aa Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring [060]
- bb June 21 Academic Board Main Supporting Document [064]
- cc Appendix to the Assessment Rules 2021-22 Licence Sciences des Organisations Year 1 to 3 [072]
- dd External Examiners Action Plan [088]
- ee Executive MBA project plan [089]
- ff Internship Agreement [095]

gg	Minutes from the Board of Directors meeting 4th May 2021 [115]
hh	Responsibilities checklist [124]
ii	Evidence English Consultancy Work Record [125]
jj	2019-20_Management_External Examiner Annual Report [131]
kk	2019-20_Economics_External Examiner Annual Report [132]
ll	2019 Teaching Observation Form [133]
mm	2020 Teaching Observation Form_English and Communication 201 [142]
nn	2021 Teaching Observation Form_Ecological challenges for the 21st century [143]
oo	2021 Teaching Observation Form_Microeconomics.pdf [144]
pp	2019-20 S1_BEM3_Introduction to Marketing module handbook [147]
qq	2020-21 S1_BEM2_Microeconomics module handbook [148]
rr	2020-21 S2_BEM2_GCI module handbook [149]
ss	2019-20 S1_BEM1_English and Communication module handbook [150]
tt	2019-20 S1_BEM1_Computer Science module handbook [151]
uu	BEM Marking Criteria for Presentations [167]
vv	BEM Marking Criteria for Course Participation [168]
ww	BEM Marking Criteria for Essays Reports [169]
xx	Career and future study conference [171]
yy	Hamilcar Capital Internship offers [172]
zz	Poplar Studio_Internship offer [173]
aaa	Visa_Internship offer [174]
bbb	Banks_Internship offer [175]
ccc	SuperCharger Ventures Internship offer [176]
ddd	Find internship in London [177]
eee	Alumni breakfast [178]
fff	Soft Skills and Employability BEM3 [181]
ggg	CV to land an internship [184]
hhh	Academic essay writing for new arrivals in S2 [196]
iii	Academic essay writing workshop with teacher info [197]
jjj	YR2_WORKSHOP - ESSAY FOR ANALYSIS with teacher notes [200]
kkk	YR2_WORKSHOP - ESSAY FOR ANALYSIS [201]
lll	YR2_WORKSHOP - ESSAY FOR ANALYSIS [202]
mmm	Moodle_General Information space [207]
nnn	Teaching Observation Policy_21-22 v1.docx [211]
ooo	Students meeting [M1]
ppp	Meeting with UPD-PSL staff [M2]
qqq	Meeting with staff to discuss assessment, grading and harmonisation [M3]
rrr	Meeting with senior staff at PDI [M4]
sss	Meeting with academic staff at PDI [M5]
ttt	Meeting with professional staff at PDI [M6]
uuu	Final meeting at PDI [M7]
vvv	Response to evidence request
www	Teaching observations. [Obs]

179 Some of the key pieces of evidence, outlined in Annex 4, were not considered by the assessment team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this assessment are outlined below:

180 The team was not able to consider other organisations' views regarding the design and delivery of high-quality courses (see paragraph 6).

How any samples of evidence were constructed

181 Five observations of online and face-to face teaching were carried out. These observations were sampled on a representative basis, which covered all levels of the BEM.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

182 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the assessment team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the assessment team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the assessment team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below:

183 To identify the provider's approach to designing and delivering high-quality courses the team scrutinised Additional information for QAA, [042] EQUIS 2020_SAR_Universite Paris_Dauphine, [057] Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring, [060] Responsibilities checklist, [124] Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting, [004] Academic Board Terms of Reference, [001] Executive MBA project plan, [089] The EMBA learning outcomes, [037] Minutes from the Board of Directors meeting 4 May 2021, [115] Evidence English Consultancy Work Record. [125] The team also met staff from UPD-PSL, [M2] senior staff, [M3, M4] academics, [M5] and professional staff [M6] in order to clarify aspects of policy and procedures.

184 To assess whether the provider has credible, robust and evidence-based approaches for designing high-quality courses, the team scrutinised 2021-2022 BEM staff handbook, [019] 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] Undergraduate programmes Attendance Committee Terms of Reference, [051] module handbooks, [013-018, 147-151] 2020-21 Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report, [024] essay workshops, [196, 197, 200, 201, 202] BEM Aims Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map, [011] Appendix to the Assessment Rules 2021-22 Licence Sciences des Organisations Year 1 to 3, [072] Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting, [004] Soft Skills and Employability BEM3, [181] CV to land an internship, [184] Internship Agreement, [095] Hamilcar Capital_Internship offers, [172] SuperCharger Ventures_Internship offer, [176] and Moodle_General Information space. [207] The team also met with PDI senior staff [M4] and students. [M1]

185 To test that all elements of the courses sampled are high quality (curriculum design, content and organisation; learning, teaching and assessment approaches) and that the teaching, learning and assessment design will enable students to demonstrate the intended learning outcomes, the review team considered the BEM Aims Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map [011] 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] a selection of module handbooks, [013 -018] 2021-2022 BEM staff handbook, [019] External examiners annual reports, [022-024, 059] BEM Course Board Terms of Reference, [002] June 20 Academic Board minutes, [044] June 21 Academic Board Main Supporting Document, [064] Overall BEM Course Survey Report, [029] 2021-22 Quality annual cycle, [045] and Academic Board Terms of Reference. [001]

186 To identify external examiners' or verifiers' views about the quality of the courses sampled the review team considered external examiners' reports. [022- 024, 059, 131,132]

187 To assess how academic and support staff ensure courses are high quality, the review team met senior staff, [M3, M4, M7] staff responsible for course development and delivery, [M4, M5] and professional support staff [M6, M7] from PDI. The team also met staff from UPD-PSL [M2] in order to clarify aspects of policy and procedures. The review team also considered Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring, [060] Teaching observation forms, [133, 142-144] Career and future study conference, [171] Find internship in London, [177] Alumni breakfast, [178] and Teaching Observation Policy_21-22 v1.docx. [211]

188 To assess students' views about the quality of the courses sampled, the team met with students from the BEM course [M1] and considered the 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules [007] and marking criteria. [167-169]

189 To test whether course delivery is of high-quality, the team reviewed a sample of assessed work and conducted teaching observations [Obs] alongside the teaching materials.

What the evidence shows

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

191 The Staff Programme Handbook, [019] organisation chart and course committees reporting document, [004] Terms of Reference for the key committees (Academic Board [001] Board of Directors [000] Course Board [002]), Responsibilities Checklist, [124] the 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] Quality Management System Policy, [038] Quality Annual Cycle, [045] Additional information for the attention of QAA, [042] External Examiners Action Plan, [088] and the Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring and Review [060] provide detail of PDI's approach to the design and delivery of high-quality courses.

192 This approach facilitates the design and delivery of high-quality courses because while, as detailed in the Responsibilities Checklist [124] UPD-PSL, the awarding body is fully responsible for course and assessment design for courses delivered at PDI, there is scope (as outlined in the Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring [060]) for UPD-PSL London to adapt course design and delivery in response to the local context, subject to the approval of the relevant UPD-PSL Course Board. There are three Course Boards at present, one for each of the courses currently offered. There will be a Course Board for the EMBA when this is running. The BEM Course Board will meet at least twice a year given the length of the course, while the Course Boards for the Summer Course, Law Track BEM 1 Semester Course and the EMBA will meet at least once a year. [Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring 060] Staff from UPD-PSL, [M2] senior staff [M3, M4] and academics [M5] explained how this process works in practice and allows for a collaborative approach between UPD-PSL and PDI to the design and delivery of the course in London. Each subject within the course has an Academic Lead as illustrated in the Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting. [004] In a meeting with the review team an Academic Lead confirmed that continuous assessment elements are designed by the academics delivering in London but shared with colleagues in Paris, and also explained how final exams are developed in London but subject to approval from Paris. [M5] Academics with responsibility for course delivery also explained how colleagues at PDI and UPD-PSL have access to each other's learning resources on the VLE to share resources. [M5]

193 As detailed in its terms of reference, Academic Board [001] has responsibility and oversight of the development of new courses and modules at PDI. Following discussion and review, they issue recommendations and reports for consideration and approval by Course Boards and the Board of Directors. [001] The team found that this approach is robust for designing high-quality courses because, as evidenced in the Executive MBA project plan, [089] the Academic Board ensures that an appropriate market is identified, a project team/steering committee is established which has appropriate representation from PDI and UPD-PSL academic and professional staff, alumni and external expertise (including corporate partners). [089] The EMBA learning outcomes [EMBA Aims and Learning Outcomes document 037] also demonstrate that the relationship of new courses to the FHEQ is embedded in the process as the learning outcomes are appropriate to Level 7 of the FHEQ. The minutes from the Board of Directors meeting on 4 May 2021 [115] note the approval of the development of the EMBA course by the Board of Directors, demonstrating the credibility of this approach.

194 PDI has a collegial approach to curriculum design supported by consultation with a wide range of contributors (involving academics, students and external professionals) and external advisers. This approach is evident in the review and redesign of the English Curriculum [125] and, specifically, the design of the curriculum for the EMBA. PDI has involved alumni and corporate partners including having representation on the EMBA steering committee. [Additional information for QAA 042, 2022 Executive MBA project 089, Evidence English Consultancy Work Record 125]

195 The learning and teaching strategy for the course in approved course documentation (the 2021-22 BEM staff handbook [019] and 2021-22 BEM student handbook [012]) sets out PDI's approach to designing and delivering high-quality, learning and assessments which ensures course learning outcomes can be achieved. In the meeting with senior staff, [M4] they explained how PDI seeks to capitalise on its small scale 'boutique' provision to deliver high-quality interdisciplinary and interactive provision focused on small group teaching with high levels of contact, opportunities for formative assessment and ongoing continuous assessment within modules as outlined in the 2021-22 BEM staff handbook [019] and 2021-22 BEM student handbook. [012]

196 Reflecting the centrality of interactive small group delivery and continuous assessment to the high-quality experience of PDI, attendance at scheduled classes is mandatory for all students on the BEM course and the BEM One Semester Law Track. [012, 007, 051] Attendance records are kept at the module level [019] and considered by an Attendance Committee who meet in the last teaching week of each semester. [051] Failure to attend without approved mitigating circumstances can lead to grade reductions on the module. [012] Module handbooks [013 -018, 147-151] indicate that modules have a coherent assessment strategy that will enable students to demonstrate intended learning outcomes. This is because assessment components differ across modules and are designed to support students' future development and employment. In particular, the range of continuous assessment elements across modules, including course participation and individual tasks (presentations, exercises, tests, essays, videos, podcasts) [007, 013 -018, 147-151] have been noted as innovative, challenging and rigorous by an external examiner. [024]

197 The team found multiple opportunities for students to engage in formative assessment, ensuring a high-quality experience for students. This is because students are able to get individual feedback on formative exercises and activities to support them in improving their performance. [M1] These include all class group feedback, one-to-one tutorials, and feedback activities. [M1] In addition to individualised formative opportunities, students have access to a range of formative development opportunities to support their academic skill development more broadly, such as academic writing workshops. [196, 197, 200, 201, 202]

198 Approved course documentation indicates that the teaching, learning and assessment design enable students to meet and demonstrate the intended learning outcomes. [011, 012, 072, 013 -018, 147-151] The 2021-22 BEM staff handbook [019] and 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] BEM Aims, Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map [011] for the Bachelor's in Economics and Business Management provide the aims of the course, course structure and intended course learning outcomes by course stage and FHEQ level. Learning outcomes are separated into three categories - knowledge, skills and values. [011,012] Module learning outcomes are mapped against these course-level learning outcomes to show how they will be met during course delivery. [011] Module handbooks clearly state module aims and intended module learning outcomes (knowledge, skills, values). [007, 013 -018, 147-151] The course documentation reviewed to date describes a high-quality course that will enable students to demonstrate the intended learning outcomes.

199 The staff and student handbooks [012 and 019] state that students are provided

with opportunities to work first-hand with industry partners to acquire lived experience of applying knowledge and skills to accompany the more theoretical elements of the course. This approach is credible and robust because the BEM Assessment Rules [007] outline that Year 1 students are required to validate the Soft Skills and Employability Module (compulsory not-for-credit module) in order to achieve academic year validation. In addition, Year 2 and Year 3 students are required to validate the Soft Skills and Employability modules and demonstrate completion of their Professional Experience (requirement to demonstrate completion of professional experience - employment and/or internship). [007] Students are informed of these requirements in the student handbook [012] and they are mapped to the learning outcomes. [011] As illustrated in the Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting document, [004] students receive support from the Student Life team which comprises three professional service staff. [004] This team ensures that students are supported in securing professional experience through a range of mechanisms including one-to-one appointments, [Soft Skills and Employability BEM3 181] sessions to support internship applications, [CV to land an internship 184] and supporting students to complete internship agreements with organisations. [Internship Agreement [095095] The senior programme administrator also circulates information about professional experience opportunities by email [172-176] and on the VLE. [207]

200 External examiners report satisfaction with the range of assessment methods and confirm that the standard of the student learning experience is appropriate with innovative and varied approaches to teaching, learning and assessment. [External examiner reports 022- 024, 059, 131, 132] For example, the Economics External Examiner Report 2020-21 [023] notes 'a well-designed mix of theoretical concepts and actual real-world issues' - highlighting an example of references to the effect of COVID on the macroeconomic module. The Humanities External Examiner Report 2020-21 notes that diverse, current and relevant content is a major strength of the course and that the range of innovative assessments are an excellent example of good practice. [024]

201 The Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring and Review [060] and the Quality Annual Cycle [045] state that a number of mechanisms are used throughout the year for course teams to review their course and capture actions designed to enhance provision. These mechanisms include engagement with external bodies and external examiners, Course Board reviews and Academic Board. PDI also solicits formal feedback from students in the form of module surveys, a general student experience survey, the Student Life Committee and student representation on Academic Board. [060, 012, 001]

202 The team found that this approach is credible and robust as PDI reflects on its provision as part of the Annual Monitoring and Review Processes at the Course Board [002] and Academic Board. [060] Minutes and supporting documents from Academic Board [044, 064] confirm that the institution proactively engages with an ongoing review process and that, where appropriate, PDI makes the necessary course modifications. For example, the Overall BEM Course Survey Report 2020-21 identifies themes arising from the survey (including need for clearer communications, increased opportunities for feedback and clearer responses to student voice) with actions approved by the Academic Board. [029]

203 Staff are supported to deliver a high-quality experience through a formal process of class observation that has been in place since 2019. [060] This involves academic leads/programme director/head of course conducting observations of lecturers in their subject areas to ensure teaching quality and encourage reflective practice. Examples of completed observations demonstrate that observations have taken place in 2019, 2020 and 2021; [2019 Teaching Observation template 133, teaching observation forms 142-144] however, the provider was unable to confirm the number of observations that have taken place and it is noted in the Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring [060] that observations were disturbed by the pandemic. As part of a broader review of support and

development of PDI staff, the newly appointed Head of Teaching and Learning Development working with the Human Resources and Quality Management, has been developing a revised approach to peer observation. [060, M4, M7, 211] The revised Teaching Observation Policy [211] outlines the planned approach for two types of observation. Firstly, formal observations conducted annually by the Head of Teaching and Learning Development with other experienced observers (academic staff or externals) to review quality of provision and individual performance. The second form of observation, peer observation, will also be conducted annually but by Academic Leads with an emphasis on development. [211]

204 Academics who teach and professional staff (such as the Dean of Student Life, Head of Programme Administration, representatives from facilities, Quality and HR Manager and an Education Coach) who met with the review team collectively demonstrated a sound knowledge and experience of course and assessment delivery and were able to articulate what 'high-quality' means. [M3, M5, M6] Academic Leads were able to articulate the importance of external reference points for ensuring high-quality provision. [M3, M4, M5] Examples of what academic and professional staff regarded as high quality included personalised experiences, opportunities for formative feedback, interactive small group teaching, active learning opportunities, innovative assessments and ensuring that students gain insights from professionals and experiences of working. Staff were able to provide multiple examples to show how the provision met the requirements of high-quality provision including all key staff having student consultation hours, including the Managing Director, [M5, M7] one-to-one support for career and employability development from the student life team, a range of industry-focused events with professionals and alumni [171, 177, 178] and innovative assessments such as podcasts on the Global Contemporary Issues module. [M3] Academics with responsibility for course delivery also spoke of the need to be able to respond to student feedback in terms of course design and assessment and were able to provide examples of how this occurred. For example, feedback from students in the end of semester module survey had led to the integration of French terminology into Accounting sessions to help students understand concepts in different international contexts. [M5] The review team was satisfied that staff were able to articulate what 'high quality' means in the context of PDI and demonstrate how the provision meets that definition.

205 Students who met with the review team [M1] expressed satisfaction with the quality of the course. In particular they highlighted that the 2021-22 BEM student handbook [012] and 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules [007] provides them with a clear overview of what to expect as a student on the BEM course at PDI, how to access support and the rules for validating semesters/academic years. [M1] They also valued the diverse, interdisciplinary nature of the course, small group teaching, the varied nature of assessments, the numerous opportunities for personalised feedback, the quality of feedback received and the clear and explicit marking criteria. [M1, 167-169] The professional experience of academic staff was also highlighted as adding to the high-quality experience at PDI, as this helped students to apply their academic studies to the work environment. The review team therefore concludes that students tend to regard their course as being of high quality.

206 The team conducted five online observations of teaching and learning [Obs] across all levels of the BEM course, and found that the lessons demonstrated clarity of objectives, good planning and organisation, a sound method or approach, good delivery, appropriate content, effective use of resources and student engagement. [Obs] Objectives of the sessions were clearly articulated and located in the wider context of the module and staff made effective use of activities to generate student engagement; for example in one session students were working through an example with the academic and in another the academic was using contemporary images to encourage students to reflect on sociological theory and concepts. The review team therefore concludes that course delivery is appropriate and facilitates a high-quality experience for students.

Conclusions

207 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.

208 The review team concludes that PDI designs and delivers high-quality courses. This is because PDI has in place credible processes for the design and delivery of high-quality courses. Approved course documentation indicates that the teaching, learning and assessment design enables students to meet and demonstrate module and course learning outcomes. External examiner reports confirm that the courses are of a high quality. Feedback from students confirms that they regard their courses as being of high quality, in particular the interdisciplinary nature of the course, emphasis on small group teaching, the varied nature of assessments, the numerous opportunities for personalised feedback and the quality of feedback received. Staff articulate what 'high quality' means in the context of PDI and demonstrate how the provision meets that definition. Observations of teaching demonstrate good planning and organisation, a sound approach, strong delivery, appropriate content, effective use of resources and student engagement. The review team concludes, therefore, that PDI has in place credible, robust and evidence-based arrangements to design and deliver high-quality academic courses and that the Core practice is met.

209 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix. Therefore, the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

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

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

211 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).

The evidence the team considered

212 The QAA team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The assessment team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other assessments and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a BEM Course Board Terms of Reference [002]
- b Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting [004]
- c 2021-22 BEM staff handbook [019]
- d ██████████ Chair of Academic Board_CV [020]
- e Academic Leads_CV [021]
- f Academic Lead_Job Description [026]
- g Head of Teaching and Learning Development_Job description [027]
- h Overall BEM Course Survey Report.pdf [029]
- i Additional information for the attention of QAA Ongoing [042]
- j June 21 BEM Course Board Minutes.pdf [046]
- k Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring [060]
- l June 26 2019 Board of Directors minutes [062]
- m June 21 Academic Board Main Supporting Document [064]
- n S1 2020-21 BEM Modules Review [068]
- o S2 2019-20_BEM Modules Review [069]
- p Translation of Décret 2004-186 [070]
- q Employee annual appraisal template [096]
- r Probation review form template [097]
- s ██████████ Vice President Universite Paris Dauphine - PSL_CV [098]
- t ██████████ Chair of BEM Course Board_CV short version [099]
- u ██████████ Chair of Summer Course Board_CV [100]
- v ██████████ Chair of BEM one semester Law Track Course Board_CV [101]
- w ██████████ Chair of the Executive MBA Course Board_CV [102]
- x ██████████ Dean of Student Life_CV [103]
- y ██████████ Senior Programmes Administrator_CV [105]
- z Senior Programmes Administrator_Job Description [106]
- aa Chair of the Academic Board_Role Description [107]
- bb Module Leader_Job description [108]
- cc Contract Law Lecturer_Job description [109]
- dd Statistics Applied to Management Lecturer_Job description [110]
- ee May 21 Board of Directors minutes [115]
- ff 2021-22 email invitation for staff induction [116]

gg	2020-21 staff induction email [117]
hh	2020-21 HPL staff induction presentation [120]
ii	HR_Permanent Lecturer recruitment procedure [130]
jj	2019 Teaching Observation Form.pdf [133]
kk	June 2019 Board of Directors Agenda [138]
ll	2020 Teaching Observation Form_English and Communication 201 [142]
mm	2021 Teaching Observation Form_Ecological challenges for the 21st century [143]
nn	2021 Teaching Observation Form_Microeconomics [144]
oo	Lecturer Observation Form_Template [145]
pp	HR and Quality Manager_Job description [157]
qq	PROGRAMME FINAL LIVRET V4 SEMINAIRE 2019 [192]
rr	Teaching Observation Policy_21-22 v1 [211]
ss	Students meeting [M1]
tt	Meeting with UPD-PSL staff [M2]
uu	Meeting with staff to discuss assessment, grading and harmonisation [M3]
vv	Meeting with senior staff at PDI [M4]
ww	Meeting with academic staff at PDI [M5]
xx	Meeting with professional staff at PDI [M6]
yy	Final meeting at PDI [M7]
zz	Student submission. [SS]

213 Some of the key pieces of evidence, outlined in Annex 4, were not considered by the assessment team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this assessment are outlined below:

214 The team was not able to consider other organisations' views about whether the provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience (see paragraph 6).

How any samples of evidence were constructed

215 No sampling activity was carried out for this Core practice.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

216 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the assessment team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the assessment team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the assessment team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below:

217 To identify how the provider recruits, appoints, inducts and supports staff so that it has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience, the review team considered Translation of Décret 2004-186, [070] HR Permanent Lecturer recruitment procedure, [130] June 26 2019 Board of Directors minutes, [062] June 2019 Board of Directors Agenda, [138] BEM Course Board Terms of Reference, [002] June 21 BEM Course Board minutes, [046] May 21 Board of Directors minutes, [115] Contract Law Lecturer_Job description, [109] Statistics Applied to Management Lecturer_Job description, [110] Senior Programmes Administrator_Job Description, [106] Module Leader_Job description, [108] Chair of the Academic Board, [107] 2021-22 BEM Staff Handbook, [019] 2021-22 email invitation for staff induction, [116] 2020-21 staff induction email, [117] VLE [120] HR and Quality Manager_Job description, [157] Policy and

procedures for Annual Monitoring [060] and Teaching Observation Policy_21-22 v1. [211] The team also met staff from UPD-PSL, [M2] PDI senior staff, [M4, M7] academic leads, [M3] PDI academics [M5] and professional staff. [M6]

218 To assess whether the provider has credible, robust and evidence-based approaches for ensuring that they have sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality learning experience, the review team considered the Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring, [060] Lecturer Observation Form_Template, [145] 2019 Teaching Observation Form.pdf, [133] Teaching observation forms, [142-144] Teaching Observation Policy_21-22 v1, [211] Additional information for the attention of QAA Ongoing, [042] Employee annual appraisal template, [096] Academic Leads_CV, [021] PROGRAMME FINAL LIVRET V4 SEMINAIRE 2019, [192] Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting, [004] and 2021-22 BEM staff handbook. [019] The team also discussed these matters with PDI senior staff [M4, M7] and PDI academic and professional staff. [M4, M5, M6]

219 To identify the roles or posts the provider has to deliver a high-quality learning experience and assess whether they are sufficient, the review team considered Contract Law Lecturer_Job description, [109] Statistics Applied to Management Lecturer_Job description, [110] Senior Programmes Administrator_Job Description, [106] Module Leader_Job description, [108] Chair of the Academic Board, [107] ██████████ Chair of Academic Board_CV, [020] 2021-22 BEM staff handbook, [019] 2021-22 email invitation for staff induction, [116] 2020-21 staff induction email, [117] and considered PDI's VLE. [120] The team also met with PDI senior staff [M4, M7] and academic staff. [M5]

220 To identify students' views about sufficiency, qualifications and skills of staff, the review team considered the student submission, [SS] June 21 Academic Board Main Supporting Document, [064] BEM Course Survey Report, [029] and module reviews. [068-069] The review team also met with students from the BEM course. [M1]

221 To assess whether the staff sampled are appropriately qualified and skilled to perform their roles effectively, the review team considered ██████████ Chair of Academic Board_CV, [020] Academic Leads_CV, [021] ██████████ Vice President Universite Paris Dauphine - PSL_CV, [098] ██████████ Chair of BEM Course Board_CV short version, [099] ██████████ Chair of Summer Course Board_CV, [100] ██████████ Chair of BEM one semester Law Track Course Board_CV, [101] ██████████ Chair of the Executive MBA Course Board_CV, [102] ██████████ Dean of Student Life_CV, [103] ██████████ Senior Programmes Administrator_CV, [105] Academic Lead_Job Description, [026] and Head of Teaching and Learning Development_Job description. [027] The team also met with PDI senior staff. [M7]

222 To assess that the staff sampled were recruited according to the provider's policies and procedures (for example that post-holders' prior qualifications and experience were properly checked), the review team considered ██████████ Chair of Academic Board_CV, [020] Academic Leads_CV [021] ██████████ Vice President Universite Paris Dauphine - PSL_CV, [098] ██████████ Chair of BEM Course Board_CV short version, [099] ██████████ Chair of Summer Course Board_CV, [100] ██████████ Chair of BEM one semester Law Track Course Board_CV, [101] ██████████ Chair of the Executive MBA Course Board_CV, [102] ██████████ Dean of Student Life_CV, [103] ██████████ Senior Programmes Administrator_CV, [105] Academic Lead_Job Description, [026] and Head of Teaching and Learning Development_Job description. [027] The team also met with PDI senior staff. [M7]

223 To cross-check outcomes identified by desk-based activities and test that staff are appropriately qualified and skilled and to assess whether students consider that the provider

has sufficient staff and that those staff are appropriately qualified and skilled, the review team met with PDI senior staff, academic staff and professional staff. [M4, M5, M6, M7]

224 To test whether academic staff deliver a high-quality learning experience, the review team observed five lessons and reviewed learning materials on PDI's VLE. [VLE]

What the evidence shows

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

226 As outlined in the Translation of Décret 2004-186, [070] the Board of Directors has strategic oversight for organisation and human resources and is responsible for the recruitment, deployment and career development of academic staff. [070] When meeting the review team, senior staff confirmed that student numbers have decreased as a result of Brexit and the implications of this for the number of student visas that they are able to sponsor. [M4, M7] Senior staff confirmed that the staff recruitment strategy in relation to future student number planning is as a result unclear [M4] although emphasised that they were continuously reviewing staffing levels and identifying where new roles were needed; [M4, M7] an example given was the new Director of Undergraduate Studies role, to which they were in the process of recruiting a permanent appointment. [M4]

227 Any decision to create new permanent lecturer positions is made by the Board of Directors. [0130] Minutes from Board of Directors meetings confirm this approach. [062, 38] In addition, the Board of Directors has responsibility for recruitment or renewal of temporary teaching and research associates [070] approving new permanent lecturer positions and in the case of appointments with teaching duties and roles which require cooperation with UPD-PSL, deciding on who will chair the recruitment committee (a UPD/PSL department/teaching unit or the Chair of the London Academic Board). The procedures state that representatives from both UPD-PSL and PDI London are involved in the recruitment committees. [130] The agenda and minutes from the Board of Directors meeting on 4 May 2021 highlight how colleagues across PDI London and UPD-PSL planned to meet to develop a new job description for the new Dean of Undergraduate Studies appointment and launch the recruitment process. [115]

228 The HR Permanent Lecturer recruitment procedure [130] outlines how the responsibility for the recruitment and appointment of appropriately qualified and skilled staff rests with London, but appointments made to teaching positions are also subject to the approval of Paris. [130] This document also provides an overview of the approach for developing job descriptions, person specifications and the subsequent recruitment processes. [130] The team found the procedures credible because each stage of the procedure is outlined and both PDI and UPD-PSL senior staff were able to articulate how the procedure was applied, for example the role of the Recruitment Committee with members from both UPD-PSL and PDI.

229 The BEM Course Board has the responsibility for having an overview, on behalf of the UPD-PSL, for London staff teaching on the BEM course. [002, M2, M4] This includes designation of academics in Paris to confirm the candidate's profiles (degrees, qualifications and experience). [002] Minutes from the BEM Course Board [046] and senior staff who met with the review team [M4] confirmed that the head of modules in Paris is sent details of candidates as part of the shortlisting process before candidates are invited to interview in London, which is then reported to the Course Board.

230 There are job descriptions and person specifications for both full-time and hourly paid academic teaching positions, [109, 110] non-academic professional service positions, for example Senior Programmes Administrator [106] and roles such as module leader [108] and Chair of the Academic Board. [107] These outline the requirements of the positions in

terms of previous experience. For example, the role description for the Chair of the Academic Board [107] outlines the requirements for the role including at least 15 years' experience in UK HEIs, a relevant PhD and professional proficiency in French. This is credible and robust because the CV of the current Academic Board Chair demonstrates that they meet the listed requirements. [020] Role descriptions also provide an outline of expected duties. For example, the module leader job description provides details of expected activities, processes and reporting structures. [108] The review team therefore took the view that PDI has robust and credible plans for the recruitment and appointment of sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff.

231 Following appointment, the institute provides all staff with a course staff handbook specific to the course they are teaching on, [019] which gives an overview of the institution, key contacts, learning facilities, assessment policies and procedures, Mitigating Circumstances Policy, how to access the quality management system, Appeals and Complaints Policy, methods of communication, student wellbeing and inclusion. In addition, the programme staff handbook provides details of the teaching strategy, aims and learning outcomes, and course structure for the specific course. [019] All teaching staff are expected to attend induction sessions, held before the start of the academic year, [116 - 117] which provide an overview of the institution, course information, staff details, procedures for attendance, assessment, marking criteria, online delivery and the VLE. [120] Staff are also required to attend training sessions prior to final examination periods to ensure that they understand and apply policies and processes for marking and moderation of final exams. [019] In meeting with the review team, academic staff confirmed that they were aware of and attend the annual induction and assessment training sessions. [M4, M5] Academic staff with responsibility for teaching, emphasised the value of the assessment meetings for ensuring that they were fully aware of policies and procedures for marking final exams. [M5]

232 The revised Teaching Observation Policy [211] outlines a revised approach to supporting staff development through two types of observation. Firstly, formal observations conducted annually by the Head of Teaching and Learning Development with other experienced observers (academic staff or externals) to review quality of provision and individual performance. The second form of observation, peer observation, will also be conducted annually but by Academic Leads with an emphasis on development. [211] The Academic Lead Job Description [026] states that Academic Leads will support the Undergraduate Programmes Director and the Head of Teaching and Learning Development in the preparation of the annual induction course for teaching staff, and senior staff were able to articulate how they plan to achieve this with an emphasis on the weekly meetings that take place and the role that these currently play in ensuring teaching quality. [M4, M7]

233 In the Additional information for QAA, [042] PDI notes that it has supported scholarly activity and development for staff by providing access to online library facilities, seminars and workshops to support research and guidance, support and funding for Advance HE fellowship and/or executive education courses. [042] Support and training needs are formally identified through an annual appraisal, which reviews performance against set objectives/competences, explores existing skills and contributions against a framework, assesses performance against performance levels (outstanding, standard, less than standard, unsatisfactory), sets objectives/competences for the following year and identifies any development/training needs and career planning. [096] Senior staff, academics and professional service staff noted how being a small-scale venture, both in terms of staff numbers and size of the site, also enables a range of informal 'in-house' support and development opportunities. [M4, M5, M6] Academic and professional staff also emphasised the benefit of peer support and regular team meetings. [M5, M6] A newly appointed academic noted that they had felt well supported by the induction process and ongoing mentoring by an Academic Lead. [M5]

234 PDI supports teaching staff to gain recognition as a Fellow of the HEA. CVs of the six Academic Leads [021] show that four individuals have Fellowship and two Senior Fellowship and in the meetings with academics and senior staff it was confirmed that PDI is supporting some colleagues in working towards senior fellowship. [M4, M5] In a meeting with the review team, professional service staff also confirmed access to training; for example, one professional service staff member noted that the institute had funded her French language learning to help develop her ability to communicate with colleagues in Paris. [M6] Senior staff also confirmed that PDI has recently joined SEDA (Staff and Educational Development Association) [M4] and professional service colleagues noted the opportunities and resources that they were now able to access through this membership. [M6] Academic staff informed the team [M5] of an annual event, The Dauphine Intercampus Seminar, offered by UPD-PSL to staff across all campuses, which offered a valuable opportunity to share effective practice and work together to develop the course content, assessment and pedagogic approaches. [192, M2, M5]

235 The organisation chart [004] shows the current roles and posts that PDI has to deliver its courses. This consists of three senior management positions (Chair of Board of Directors, Managing Director and Chair of Academic Board), 11 individuals in academic leadership roles (academic leads, programme directors, Head of teaching and learning development, head of summer schools, chairs of course boards), four lecturers with over 100 teaching hours per year, 17 lecturers with less than 100 teaching hours per year and 13 professional service colleagues plus resources from six external contractors to support Finance and Programme Administration and Facilities. [004] Other key positions identified from the staff handbook [019] and the organisation chart [004] are the Dean of Student Life and Senior Programmes Administrator. Senior staff recognise that growth of provision and student numbers may necessitate further expansion in staffing, particularly in student support and teaching. [M4] The review team concluded that there are sufficient roles and posts in place to deliver a high-quality learning experience that meets the learning and support needs of students and supports students to successful outcomes in the context of the current number of courses, the nature of the delivery model and the number of students enrolled. Students who met with the review team confirmed that they were satisfied with the number and mix of academic and professional support staff. [M3] The Management External Examiners Report 2019-20 [131] also notes that the 'teaching standards and the recruitment/retention of experienced and suitably qualified tutors is commendable'.

236 The sample of job and role profiles (academic and professional services) reviewed [026, 027, 106 -110, 157] clearly describe the job purpose, key responsibilities and duties, and person criteria including knowledge, experience and skills. The CVs of staff appointed to the Academic Lead Roles demonstrate a good match to the person criteria. This is because the Academic Lead Job Description [026] states that the Academic Lead should have at least a master's degree in the subject taught, postgraduate teaching qualifications and/or significant teaching experience (three years+ in UK HE). They should also have at least FHEA status or agree to undertake this within 12 months of taking the role. The Academic Leads' CVs [021] demonstrate that the candidates currently in these positions meet these criteria and, save one individual who has extensive experience outside of PDI, meet the requirement of having taught at the institute for at least one year before being appointed. [021, 026] Senior staff confirmed that when individuals are appointed who do not meet the criteria, there is a clear and considered rationale for that decision. [M7]

237 Staff assigned to academic or senior management roles that have responsibility for ensuring standards of provision typically have considerable prior experience in academia and/or related industry. [020, 021, 098 – 103, 105] For example, the Dean of Student Life has over 20 years' experience in senior roles related to this position [103] and the Chair of the Academic Board has over 10 years' experience in UK Higher Education and over 10 years' experience of the French higher education system. [020]

238 The CVs sampled from academic staff [21, 98 -102] demonstrate that all have a master's degree, and several have a doctoral qualification in related subject areas. They all have more than four years of prior teaching experience and relevant work experience in subject areas which they teach. There is also a range of relevant professional experience across the academic team, for example in finance, accountancy and business; and all staff have undertaken some further education and training after their master's study. The CVs for individuals in two key professional support roles, the Dean of Student Life [103] and Senior Programmes Administrator [105] indicate one has a bachelor's degree and one a master's qualification. [103, 105] Both have prior relevant work experience in educational institutes. The team concludes that academic and professional staff are appropriately qualified and skilled to perform their roles effectively to deliver a high-quality academic experience.

239 Remote observations of both in-person and online teaching sessions [Obs] found that sessions were well planned and had clear learning objectives and structure. Supporting learning materials in the session and on the VLE were accessible and relevant to students' development of knowledge and skill. The teaching staff that were observed demonstrated relevant and current discipline knowledge. Observations, review of learning materials on the VLE, combined with the review of CVs, led the review team to conclude that teaching staff are appropriately qualified and skilled.

240 The student submission [SS] states that lecturers are 'extremely helpful during and outside classes, are highly skilled, fair and experienced in their respective fields'. [Student Submission] The student submission also notes that lecturers' professional experience beyond the institution provides students with valuable insights into the professional world. [Student Submission] This was confirmed in the meeting with students [M1] who highlighted how staff with professional experience outside of academia helped them to think about how they could apply their theoretical learning to the work environment. Students also commented on the easy access to staff for support. [M1] While the institution does not currently engage with the National Student Survey (NSS), they do collect student feedback through the BEM Course Survey which replicates the questions of the NSS. [064] The overall BEM Course Survey Report [029] and selected module evaluations reviewed do not highlight any student concerns about sufficiency and qualification of staff. [068 -069] The end-of-module feedback surveys indicate an overall high level of satisfaction with staff, in particular that classes were well prepared. [068,069] In the meeting with the review team, students praised the availability of lecturers and the student life team members for providing academic advice and pastoral support. [M1] The team concludes that students agree that there are sufficient appropriately skilled and qualified staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience.

Conclusions

241 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.

242 The review team concludes that PDI has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience. This is because the number of staff currently employed, including professional support staff, permanent academics and hourly paid lecturers directly involved in course delivery, is proportionate to the number of courses delivered and the number of students enrolled to meet the learning and support needs of students and supports students to successful outcomes. Staff CVs demonstrate

that those employed in key roles are well qualified and skilled. Students express satisfaction with the skills of teaching staff and with the support that they provide. Observations of teaching sessions and review of learning materials on the VLE indicates that teaching staff are appropriately skilled. PDI is in the process of reviewing its existing approach to staff induction and development and articulated clear plans for achieving and implementing a more formalised approach. Staff feel well supported by PDI in terms of induction and opportunities for informal and formal staff development. The team therefore concludes that the Core practice is met.

243 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix and leads the team to have a high 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

244 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.

245 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).

The evidence the team considered

246 The QAA team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The assessment team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other assessments and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a QAA Paris Dauphine International Submission document FV
- b Board of Directors Terms of Reference [000]
- c Academic Board Terms of Reference [001]
- d Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting [004]
- e 2020-21_UCL-PDI_Cooperation Agreement [005]
- f 2021-22 BEM student handbook [012]
- g 2021-22 BEM staff handbook [019]
- h [REDACTED] of Academic Board_CV [020]
- i Academic Leads_CV [021]
- j Academic Lead_Job Description [026]
- k Head of Teaching and Learning Development_Job Description [027]
- l Overall BEM Course Survey Report [029]
- m 2020-21 Academic Board minutes [030]
- n Student Union and Societies Policy [031]
- o DLSU Constitution [032]
- p Students Welfare and Wellbeing Policy [033]
- q Special Education Needs Procedure [034]
- r International Summer School_Programme Booklet [035]
- s 2021-22_Academic Calendar [036]
- t June 21 BEM Course Board minutes [046]
- u June 2021 Academic Board Meeting minutes [047]
- v February 21 Academic Board minutes [048]
- w April 21 Academic Board minutes [049]
- x EQUIS_2020_SAR_Universite_Paris_Dauphine [057]
- y June 2019 Board of Directors_BEM Overall Survey [061]
- z June 26 2019 Board of Directors minutes [062]
- aa S1 2020-21 BEM Modules Review [068]
- bb S2 2019-20_BEM Modules Review [069]
- cc Academic writing workshop material [086]

dd BEM1 September 2020 timetable including writing workshop [087]
 ee December 19 Extracurricular Activities Committee minutes [090]
 ff Internship Agreement [095]
 gg [REDACTED] Vice President Universite Paris Dauphine - PSL_CV [098]
 hh [REDACTED] Chair of BEM Course Board_CV short version [099]
 ii [REDACTED] Chair of Summer Course Board_CV [100]
 jj [REDACTED] Chair of BEM one semester Law Track Course Board_CV [101]
 kk [REDACTED] Chair of the Executive MBA Course Board_CV [102]
 ll [REDACTED] Dean of Student Life_CV [103]
 mm February 2021 Board of Directors minutes [104]
 nn [REDACTED] Senior Programmes Administrator_CV [105]
 oo Senior Programmes Administrator_Job Description [106]
 pp Module Leader_Job description [108]
 qq Contract Law Lecturer_Job description [109]
 rr Statistics Applied to Management Lecturer_Job description [110]
 ss Budget 21-22 (approved by Board of Directors June 2021) [114]
 tt 2020-21 staff induction email [117]
 uu 2020-21 HPL staff induction presentation [120]
 vv 2020-21 S1 BEM student representatives meeting minutes [121]
 ww Responsibilities checklist [124]
 xx 09 April 21 Student Representatives Meeting_Key Actions [134]
 yy 19 April 21 Student Representatives Meeting_Key Actions [135]
 zz Special Education Needs Report [137]
 aaa June 2019 Board of Directors Agenda [138]
 bbb January 2020 Board of Directors Agenda [139]
 ccc June 2021 Newsletter [140]
 ddd 2020-21_Employability skills student survey [141]
 eee 2019-20_Employability skills student survey [146]
 fff HR and Quality Manager_Job description [157]
 ggg Education Coach JD (2) [190]
 hhh Moodle_General Information space [207]
 iii 2017_Convention PDI-UPD English [209]
 jjj Meeting 1 Students Meeting [M1]
 kkk Meeting 4 Senior Staff Meeting [M4]
 ll Meeting 5 Academic Staff Meeting [M5]
 mmm Meeting 6 Professional Staff Meeting [M6]
 nnn NOTES QSR Observation facilities-learning resources-support services (VT)
 ooo Student submission. [SS]

247 Some of the key pieces of evidence, outlined in Annex 4, were not considered by the assessment team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this assessment are outlined below:

248 The team was not able to consider other organisations' views about sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning and student support services (see paragraph 6).

How many samples of evidence were constructed

249 No sampling activity took place for this Core practice.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

250 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the assessment team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the assessment team to make

its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the assessment team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below:

251 To identify how the provider's facilities, learning resources and student support services contribute to delivering a high-quality academic experience, the review team considered QAA Paris Dauphine International Submission document FV, [null] 2020-21_UCL-PDI_Cooperation Agreement, [005] 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] 2021-22_BEM staff handbook, [019] Student Union and Societies Policy, [031] DLSU Constitution, [032] Students Welfare and Wellbeing Policy, [033] Special Education Needs Procedure, [034] June 21 BEM Course Board minutes, [046] EQUIS_2020_SAR_Universite_Paris_Dauphine, [057] Responsibilities checklist, [124] Moodle-General Information Space, [207] 2017_Convention PDI-UPD English, [209] Meeting 4 Senior Staff Meeting. [M4]

252 To assess whether the provider has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for ensuring that it has sufficient facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience, the review team considered Board of Directors Terms of Reference, [000] Academic Board Terms of Reference, [001] BEM student handbook, [012] 2021-22_BEM staff handbook, [019] Overall BEM Course Survey Report, [029] 2020-21 Academic Board minutes, [030] International Summer School_Programme Booklet, [035] 2021-22_Academic Calendar, [036] June 21 BEM Course Board minutes, [046] June 2021 Academic Board Meeting minutes, [047] February 21 Academic Board minutes, [048] and April 21 Academic Board minutes. [049] Also considered were EQUIS_2020_SAR_Universite_Paris_Dauphine, [057] June 2019 Board of Directors_BEM Overall Survey, [061] June 26 2019 Board of Directors minutes, [062] Academic writing workshop material, [086] BEM1 September 2020 timetable including writing workshop, [087] December 19 Extracurricular Activities Committee minutes, [090] Internship Agreement, [095] February 2021 Board of Directors minutes, [104] Budget 21-22 (approved by Board of Directors June 2021), [114] 2020-21 staff induction email, [117] 2020-21 HPL staff induction presentation, [120] 09 April 21 Student Representatives Meeting_Key Actions, [134] 19 April 21 Student Representatives Meeting_Key Actions, [135] Special Education Needs Report, [137] June 2019 Board of Directors Agenda, [138] January 2020 Board of Directors Agenda, [139] June 2021 Newsletter, [140] 2020-21_Employability skills student survey, [141] 2019-20_Employability skills student survey. [146]

253 To identify students' views about facilities, learning resources and support services, the review team considered Overall BEM Course Survey Report, [029] June 2019 Board of Directors_BEM Overall Survey, [061] S1 2020-21 BEM Modules Review, [068] S2 2019-20_BEM Modules Review, [069] 2020-21 S1 BEM student representatives meeting minutes, [121] 2020-21_Employability skills student survey, [141] 2019-20_Employability skills student survey, [146] student submission [SS] and the meeting with the students. [M1]

254 To determine whether the roles are consistent with the delivery of a high-quality learning experience, the review team considered staff contact details on the staff handbook, [019, page 7] job descriptions for different academic and professional roles (for example Academic Lead_Job Description, [026] Head of Teaching and Learning Development_Job Description, [027] Students Welfare and Wellbeing Policy, [033] Senior Programmes Administrator_Job Description, [106] Module Leader_Job description, [108] Contract Law Lecturer_Job description, [109] Statistics Applied to Management Lecturer_Job description, [110] Education Coach JD (2) [190]). The team also considered academic and professional staff CVs, for example [redacted] Chair of Academic Board_CV, [020] Academic Leads_CV, [021] [redacted] Vice President Universite Paris Dauphine - PSL_CV, [098]

██████████ Chair of BEM Course Board CV short version, [099] ██████████
██████████ Chair of Summer Course Board CV, [100] ██████████ Chair of BEM one semester Law
Track Course Board CV, [101] ██████████ Chair of the Executive MBA Course
Board CV, [102] ██████████ Dean of Student Life CV, [103] ██████████ Senior
Programmes Administrator CV. [105]

255 To determine whether staff are appropriately qualified and skilled and understand their roles and responsibilities, the review team met the senior staff, [M4] academic staff, [M5] professional staff [M6] and the students. [M1]

256 To test that the facilities, resources and services under assessment deliver a high-quality academic experience, the review team undertook a guided virtual tour of facilities and learning resources at PDI (VT) and considered PDI's VLE. [VLE]

What the evidence shows

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

258 A cooperation agreement [209] exists between PDI and UPD-PSL which articulates the responsibilities of the two organisations including facilities and learning resources. [209] Furthermore, their responsibilities are further explained in the Responsibilities Checklist. [124] where the responsibilities for facilities, learning resources and student support services is shared. [124] PDI moved to the Borough of Islington in 2018, a 15-minute walk from St Pancras International railway station. [057]

259 The team found that PDI's approaches to facilities, learning resources and student support services are credible because the Board of Directors makes strategic decisions, approves and oversees the budget, overall quality, risks and continuous improvement. [004] Key areas which the Board considers are strategy and development, student experience quality, and organisation and human resources [000] and is directly associated with facilities, learning resources and student support services at PDI. The Board's meeting agendas [138,139] and minutes [062; 104] provide clear evidence of its commitment to these three key areas as these areas are standing matters for discussion and report. Both the Academic Board and Student Life Committee report to the Board. [004] Academic Board [001] is to ensure the highest standards of academic provision across PDI courses and all aspects related to the student education experience within PDI including facilities, learning resources and student support. Its minutes evidence that student feedback is considered and results in actions in relation to facilities - for example, IT and materials [030]; learning resources, such as all the sources on the VLE [047]; and Student Support Services - for example, Special Education Needs validation and study plan [048]; student mental health and general support [049] were undertaken or planned.

260 The team was given a virtual tour of the new location, which offers a range of facilities for up to 250 students with 8am-8pm opening hours. The building contains seven classrooms each of which has space for 24 to 36 students, which can be used as study rooms outside of the teaching and tutorial hours. They are all sound-proofed and include audio and video-equipment with a video-projector, speakers and a camera. A lecture theatre space can temporarily be available (capacity of 120) and an annex on the ground floor (capacity of 90) can be used for events or extracurricular activities. There is a high-speed Wi-Fi network throughout the building and communal facilities including break-out spaces, kitchen and outdoor spaces for students to use, which are consistent with what PDI explains in the student handbook [012, page 8] and staff handbook. [019, page 9] There was a noticeboard for each of the levels of studies and a classroom timetable that showed which classrooms are free for students to use for private study and group work. There is a welfare and wellbeing noticeboard with information for resources for wellbeing. The Programme

Administration Office is located on the first floor with a list of available office hours. Students can come in during those hours, but it was confirmed by programme administrative staff [M6] that support staff could also be contacted outside those hours by email. There was a specific room for the student union and rooms specifically for teaching staff both permanent and hourly staff who can hot desk with access to a scanner and printer. There are meeting rooms used for educational coaches to have one-to-one meetings with students. In relation to IT facilities for students, PDI confirmed that it has spare laptops for students to borrow and use. There was also a dedicated student printer available. The building operates a one-way system due to Covid precautions and there are sanitisers on every floor. The team found that the physical facilities at PDI were appropriate to delivering a high-quality academic experience because there were well-equipped classrooms and facilities for students to enable their learning and access to student support staff.

261 PDI students can access learning resources through different channels. PDI does not have an on-site library [VT] but PDI students can access physical texts through the UCL library as PDI has established an annually reviewed cooperation agreement with UCL-CLIE, [005; M3] which enables its full-time students to study foreign languages and access student facilities, such as the libraries, sport and society activities, seminars and IT rooms. [012, page 5 and 8] Due to new immigration laws, [012, page 5] all the returning full-time students (from October 2021) continue to have automatic access to most UCL learning facilities, including libraries, computer rooms, sports and student society facilities but newly admitted full-time students have optional access to UCL learning facilities if they choose to attend extracurricular optional language classes at the Centre of Languages and International Education of UCL. [012, page 8; 046, page 4] Furthermore, PDI students and staff also have access to all the online resources of the UPD-PSL Library which has more than 700 journals, 56,000 digital journals, 300,000 digital books, 130 databases and academic papers published by researchers from UPD-PSL. [012, page 8; 019, page 10; MV] The VLE of PDI uses a platform administered by UPD-PSL. [VT] There is a general information VLE space for students and staff, which lists PDI general policies, academic key documents, student timetables, announcements from the programme administration team, as well as internship opportunities. [207] The team found that students had appropriate access to their relevant learning materials which were made available to them through various means.

262 Student Welfare and Wellbeing Policy [033] describes the support available, both internally and externally, to its students and details existing resources on which the students can call when difficulties arise. At PDI, student support includes academic issues, administrative issues, personal development, wellbeing and general support. The Student Life Team provides overall pastoral support and holds regular office hours. [033] Additionally, PDI developed its Special Educational Needs Procedure [034] to provide students with ongoing or chronic medical conditions, disabilities or other learning difficulties and the students can access a tailored academic support plan in consultation with Education Coaches. In Academic Year 2020-21, three academic support plans were approved for the BEM course, but two students left the course due to different reasons and one student successfully passed the Year 1 and progressed into Year 2; in 2021-22, five academic support plans are currently pending approval. [137]

263 PDI approved and reviewed the Student Union and Societies Policy [031] which extends and replaces the previous Student Societies Code of practice, issued in 2016. This policy is in accordance with the requirements of clause 22(3) of the UK Education Act 1994 which requires that the corporation shall take such steps as are reasonably practicable to secure that the student societies operate in a fair and democratic manner and are accountable for their own finances. The Dauphine London Student Union (DLSU) is bound by this policy [032] and its aims are fourfold including to advance the education of the students of PDI; to promote and protect the welfare of all students who are members of the DLSU; to represent the interests of the students and act as a channel of communication

between campus and other bodies; and to promote students' societies, clubs, sports, social and cultural activities within the campus. Student Life Committee [004] mainly discusses student life and monitors the DLSU activities which represents the wider student body in order to influence social, cultural and recreational activities [090] supported by the Union. Overall, based on the available evidence, the review team concludes that facilities, learning resources and student support services of PDI contribute to delivering a high-quality academic experience because facilities and resources are sufficient and appropriate to the courses and the student body, and student support is comprehensive and accessible.

264 The team found that PDI's approaches to planning resources are realistic as campus relocation is a clear example how PDI addressed its limited facilities in relation to its growing number of students and prepared for further courses being offered. [062] Furthermore, its Budget 2021-22 (approved by Board of Directors June 2021) [114] provides three-year financial data (2018/19 to 2021/22) on its growing spending on facilities (for example building fit-out, computer equipment, office equipment, real estate and building maintenance), its learning resources (payments to UCL foreign language courses and access to UCL Student Life facilities and societies, pedagogical materials and other resources) and its student support services (for example student life, co and extracurricular activities). The budgets are consistent with a growing number of students at PDI although there is a decrease in 2021-22. [Overview document, page 7]

265 The student handbook [012] provides detailed information to students about facilities and learning resources, [page 8, 11] and student support services (for example student life, welfare, wellbeing and inclusion), [page 13 to 15] Covid-19 and Brexit update, [page 17] and professional experience and career plans [page 29-30] at PDI. Similarly, the staff handbook [019] provides information in relation to facilities, learning resources and a range of student support services to staff. [page 9, 16, 18-20, 24, 41-42] At induction for students [035] during welcome week, PDI offered detailed induction sessions to help with the transition to university and understanding of the course. Professional staff confirmed that the students were trained on the VLE at the beginning of the year; this was done remotely during the restriction imposed in response to Covid-19 for the first time and was so successful PDI has confirmed that this approach would probably remain. [M6] During Welcome Week, there is a welcome session from UCL where students are introduced to all the resources and the PDI students were made aware that books can only be read in the study areas at UCL as PDI students only have access to a part-time card that limits full access. Similarly, the staff (whether new or returning staff) also received updates at the start of the year from the Dean of Studies, for example in relation to Covid 19 procedures, or IT-specific sessions for online learning and the VLE [117, 120] due to new procedures or new features on the VLE. Student representative meetings were regularly held [134, 135] during the pandemic and different student support services were explained [134, Covid test] and planned. [e.g. 135, tutorials, internships, stress release] The team concludes that PDI strategies and approaches for facilities, learning resources and student support services are credible, realistic and demonstrably linked to the delivery of successful academic and professional outcomes for students as they are considered strategically, are comprehensive and students are well informed about what is available and how they can access these resources.

266 The team considered student views about facilities, learning resources and support services at PDI through surveys and module reviews, [Overall BEM Course Survey Report [029] June 2019 Board of Directors_BEM Overall Survey, [061] S1 2020-21 BEM Modules Review, [068] S2 2019-20_BEM Modules Review, [069] 2020-21_Employability skills student survey, [141] 2019-20_Employability skills student survey [146] and found that, overall, students were positive about the range of facilities and resources made available to them during their time at PDI. For example, students considered that the building and facilities [061] were a significant improvement in 2018-19 after the campus relocation. They also valued the fact that unoccupied classrooms at the new building are made available for quiet

study. The students in their submission [SS] agreed that PDI offers its students sufficient and appropriate online and on-campus resources for them to succeed. Students also highlighted how additional exercises, formative tests and past papers are accessible on the VLE, which helps students prepare for exams. Students highlighted that reading lists are also extensive in all subjects and enable students to acquire more information on certain topics. In relation to learning resources, PDI students highlighted their satisfaction in their submission that the online library of the UPD-PSL comprises a wide range of useful books and academic articles. [SS] The students also appreciate PDI's partnership with UCL which allows them to have access and study at UCL's library and access extracurricular activities and societies which was made evident to the review team in the meeting and in their submission. [M1, SS] The review team concludes that the evidence relating to student views demonstrated that students regard facilities, learning resources and student support services as sufficient and appropriate in facilitating a high-quality academic experience.

267 The Student Welfare and Wellbeing Policy [033] explains internal student support which includes support for academic issues, administrative issues, personal development, wellbeing and general support. Current job descriptions [026, 027, 106, 108, 109, 110, 190] provided the team with an understanding of roles and responsibilities of academic and support staff in supporting students. The team considered the CVs for senior leadership, academic and professional staff against the above job descriptions and found the staff to be well qualified for their roles according to the criteria listed in the job profiles (see Q3 paragraphs 233, 235 and 237). At the meeting with professional staff [M6] including the Facility Officer, the Programme Administrator, HR and Quality Manager and the Education Coach, the review team found that professional staff were able to discuss their role in supporting students through individual examples. They were positive about the staff induction and continuing professional training they have received to enable them to fulfil their roles. [M5, M6] Therefore the team concludes that staff involved in supporting students understand their roles and responsibilities. [M5, M6]

Conclusions

268 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.

269 The review team concludes that PDI has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience. This is because its strategies and approaches for facilities, learning resources and student support services are credible, realistic and demonstrably linked to the delivery of successful academic and professional outcomes for students. The student submission and the student meeting confirm that students regard facilities, learning resources and student support services at PDI as sufficient and appropriate, and facilitating a high-quality academic experience. Relevant staff understand their roles and responsibilities in using resources to provide a high-quality academic experience to students. The review team's own assessment of particular facilities and learning resources confirms that facilities, learning resources and student support services are sufficient and appropriate. The review team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.

270 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, with the exception of the third-party endorsements. Therefore, the review team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

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

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

272 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).

The evidence the team considered

273 The QAA team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The assessment team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other assessments and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a Board of Directors Terms of Reference [000]
- b Academic Board Terms of Reference [001]
- c BEM Course Board Terms of Reference [002]
- d 2021-22 BEM student handbook [012]
- e BEM1_101 English and Communication_Module Handbook [014]
- f BEM2_Management Accounting_Module Handbook [015]
- g BEM2_Digital Sciences_Module Handbook [016]
- h BEM3_Basics of Strategy_Module Handbook [017]
- i BEM3_Current Issues in Sociology_Module Handbook [018]
- j Staff handbook [019]
- k 2021 Summer Course Board_Minutes [028]
- l Overall BEM Course Survey Report [029]
- m 2020-21 Academic Board minutes [030]
- n June 20 Academic Board minutes [044]
- o June 21 BEM Course Board minutes [046]
- p June 2021 Academic Board Meeting minutes [047]
- q February 21 Academic Board minutes [048]
- r April 21 Academic Board minutes [049]
- s June 26 2019 Board of Directors minutes [062]
- t Students Welfare and Wellbeing Policy [033]
- u June 2019 Board of Directors_BEM Overall Survey [061]
- v Feedback Analysis 2019 International Summer School [063]
- w June 21 Academic Board Main Supporting Document [064]
- x 2021 Finance Summer School Completion Report [065]
- y 2021 International Summer School [066]
- z 2021 Summer Course Board main supporting document [067]
- aa S1 2020-21_BEM Modules Review [068]
- bb S2 2019-20_BEM Modules Review [069]
- cc March 21 BEM Course Board minutes [093]
- dd Executive summary for the June 2021 Board of Directors [111]
- ee 2020-21 Academic Calendar [113]
- ff May 21 Board of Directors minutes [115]

gg	2020-21 S1_BEM student representatives meeting minutes [121]
hh	BEM1 and 2 - student representatives meeting minutes following lockdown announcement [122]
ii	Employability Skills Survey [141]
jj	Employability Skills Student Survey [146]
kk	Mock Interviews Feedback [183]
ll	Education Coach JD [190]
mm	Student Union and Societies Policy [031]
nn	DLSU Constitution [032]
oo	June 26 2019 Board of Directors Minutes [062]
pp	February 2021 Board of Directors Minutes [104]
qq	December 19 Extracurricular Activities Committee Minutes [090]
rr	09 April 21 Student Representatives Meeting_Key Actions [134]
ss	19 April 21 Student Representatives Meeting_Key Actions [135]
tt	June 2019 Board of Directors Agenda [138]
uu	2021-22 Academic Calendar [036]
vv	2020-21 Student representative election information email [118]
ww	2021-22 Student representative election information email [119]
xx	Students meeting [M1]
yy	PDI Senior staff meeting [M4]
zz	Academic staff meeting [M5]
aaa	Professional staff meeting. [M6]

274 Some of the key pieces of evidence, outlined in Annex 4, were not considered by the assessment team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this assessment are outlined below:

How any samples of evidence were constructed

275 No sampling activity was conducted for this Core practice.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

276 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the assessment team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the assessment team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the assessment team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below:

277 To assess whether the institution has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for engaging students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience, the team reviewed Overview Document, [001] 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] BEM1_101 English and Communication_Module Handbook, [014] BEM2_Management Accounting_Module Handbook, [015] BEM2_Digital Sciences_Module Handbook, [016] BEM3_Basics of Strategy_Module Handbook, [017] BEM3_Current Issues in Sociology_Module Handbook, [018] Staff handbook, [019] Overall BEM Course Survey Report, [029] Special Education Needs Procedure, [034] February 21 Academic Board minutes, [048] June 26 2019 Board of Directors minutes, [062] Students Welfare and Wellbeing Policy, [033] June 2019 Board of Directors_BEM Overall Survey, [061] Feedback Analysis 2019 International Summer School, [063] June 21 Academic Board Main Supporting Document, [064] 2021 Summer Course Board main supporting document, [067] S1 2020-21_BEM Modules Review, [068] S2 2019-20_BEM Modules Review, [069]

Executive summary for the June 2021 Board of Directors, [111] 2020-21 S1_BEM student representatives meeting minutes, [121] BEM1 and 2 - student representatives meeting minutes following lockdown announcement, [122] Student Welfare and Wellbeing Policy, [033] Employability Skills Survey, [141] Employability Skills Student Survey, [146] Mock Interviews Feedback, [183] and the Education Coach job description. [190] The team also met with students. [M1]

278 To identify how the institution's activity engages students in the quality of their educational experience, the team examined the governance and management structure, and considered Board of Directors ToRs, [001] 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] 2021 Summer Course Board_Minutes, [028] Overall BEM Course Survey Report, [029] Student Union and Societies Policy, [031] DLSU Constitution, [032] February 21 Academic Board minutes, [048] June 2019 Board of Directors_BEM Overall Survey, [061] Feedback Analysis 2019 International Summer School, [063] June 21 Academic Board Main Supporting Document, [064] June 26 2019 Board of Directors minutes, [062] 2021 Summer Course Board main supporting document, [067] S1 2020-21_BEM Modules Review, [068] S2 2019-20_BEM Modules Review, [069] February 2021 Board of Directors minutes, [104] December 19 Extracurricular Activities Committee minutes, [090] BEM1 and 2 - student representatives meeting minutes following lockdown announcement, [122] 09 April 21 Student Representatives Meeting_Key Actions, [134] 19 April 21 Student Representatives Meeting_Key Actions, [135] and the June 2019 Board of Directors Agenda. [138] The team also met with PDI senior staff, [M4] academic staff [M5] and professional staff. [M6]

279 To identify students' views and assess whether they consider they are engaged in the quality of their educational experience, the review team considered Board of Directors Terms of Reference, [000] Academic Board Terms of Reference, [001] BEM Course Board Terms of Reference, [002] 2021 Summer Course Board_Minutes, [028] Overall BEM Course Survey Report, [029] 2020-21 Academic Board minutes, [030] June 20 Academic Board minutes, [044] June 21 BEM Course Board minutes [046] June 2021 Academic Board Meeting minutes, [047] February 21 Academic Board minutes, [048] April 21 Academic Board minutes, [049] June 26 2019 Board of Directors minutes, [062] Feedback Analysis 2019 International Summer School, [063] 2021 Finance Summer School Completion Report, [065] 2021 International Summer School, [066] 2021 Summer Course Board main supporting document, [067] March 21 BEM Course Board minutes, [093] February 2021 Board of Directors minutes, [104] May 21 Board of Directors minutes, [115] 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] 2021-22 Academic Calendar, [036] 2020-21 Academic Calendar, [113] 2020-21 Student representative election information email, [118] and the 2021-22 Student representative election information email. [119] The team also met with students. [M1]

What the evidence shows

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

281 PDI's approach to actively engaging students individually and collectively in the quality of their educational experience can be found in the BEM student handbook [012] and the staff handbook. [019] The student handbook confirms that regular feedback is collected throughout the year through liaison meetings with student representatives, module surveys at the end of each semester and an end-of-year general PDI survey which covers facilities and the student experience. The handbook also confirms that evaluation data is considered at Academic Board where student representatives attend. There is also a student representative on the Board of Directors. The handbook provides detail about the Student Life Committee (which focuses on the social and cultural activities at PDI and the remit of the Student Union) and highlights that there will be opportunities for staff and students to get together for discussions in liaison meetings. The staff handbook contains the same

information. [019]

282 The principal way in which students are actively engaged individually is through module surveys which are carried out on each module at the end of each semester and reported and considered at Academic Board. [047, 048] The BEM Course Survey Report 2021 [029] details the summary of surveys conducted and identifies themes in the responses and actions to be taken. For example, clearer communication with students on exams resulted in the action of an additional section in the student handbook around standardisation and the grades harmonisation process. The report also confirmed the need for a new Student Life Committee, responding to criticism of poor response by students to previous meetings. Academic Board also discusses the results of a general survey which is sent to students at the end of each semester or course and PDI confirmed that it took the decision to map this survey to the National Student Survey questions. [M4] In June 2021 Academic Board [047] discussed the latest results from the general survey and noted themes around clear grading criteria, support for new lecturers from HEA Fellowships and further clarification to students of resources available on the VLE. Facilities and student support services were highlighted in student responses in the 2019 Overall Survey [061] where subsequent actions were planned in relation to extracurricular activities, campus life and personal guidance, IT and study space to improve students' satisfaction in 2019.

283 Individual student feedback is sought for the majority of the activities delivered by the Education Coaches who are integrated into the student experience [190] whose role is to support individual students in development of their soft skills, immersive experiences including placements and internships. Students are sent employability skills surveys at the end of each semester which highlights the satisfaction of workshops offered for either CV or successful job application writing. [141 2020-21_Employability skills student survey; 146_2019-20_Employability skills student survey; 183 Mock Interviews Feedback] Through these various approaches, the team found that PDI actively engages students individually in the quality of their educational experience because it provides regular opportunities through survey mechanisms and uses the results to inform change.

284 Collective student engagement is demonstrated through representation of the student body at the Board of Directors and Academic Board, which student representatives regularly attend. [ToRs 000, 001, Academic Board minutes; 030, 044, 047, 048, 049; BoD minutes 062, 104, 115] Academic Board has a standing agenda item where student representatives at all levels have the opportunity to engage with the Board and share concerns and issues agreed by their cohort. The minutes the team considered demonstrated good engagement and representation during the meetings by students with recent highlighted examples of issues including the mental health of students especially during the pandemic and the effectiveness of the Student Union. [049] Students whom the team met confirmed that PDI actively facilitates the election of student representatives. [M1] PDI also appoints student ambassadors who are current students to apply for the position. [188 Student Ambassador Training 2021-2022; 189 Student ambassador Agenda] Student ambassadors attend a 3-day training session which covers how to support students, student representatives and the institution in welfare and wellbeing, running Guardian Angel Groups for support during Covid, housing advice, and maintaining social media. [189] The Student President of the Student Union is a member of the Board of Directors and attends the first part of the meeting where students' issues are discussed. [BoD ToR 000]

285 Student representatives are also members of the Student Life Committee which discusses student life and monitors the DLSU activities which represents the wider student body in order to influence social, cultural and recreational activities supported by the Union and reports to Academic Board. [Academic Board ToR 001, M1] PDI acknowledges that no student representative is a member of the Summer Board, as these are short summer courses (from 2 to 6 weeks). However, PDI monitors the student satisfaction and feedback

of the student experience throughout the summer courses, via informal weekly surveys and informal discussions with the Head of the summer course. Summer Course Boards show that the enhancement of student experience was considered (for example, provision of English classes and networking events) and student feedback was recorded and identified. [028 2021 Summer Course Board Minutes; 063 Feedback Analysis 2019 International Summer School.pdf; 065 2021 Finance Summer School Completion Report; 066 2021 International Summer School Completion Report; 067 2021 Summer Course Board Main Supporting Document] Overall, the team found that there are opportunities for students to collectively engage in the quality of their educational experience, through representation at PDI's committee structure with evidence of engagement and responses to students' issues.

286 There are opportunities for students to informally feed back with management and teaching staff which is achieved through end-of-term Staff-Student Representative meetings and evidenced in committee minutes. [062 June 26 June 21 Academic Board Main Supporting Document; 064 June 21 Academic Board Main Supporting Document; 067 2021 Summer Course Board Main Supporting Document; 111 Executive summary for the June 2021 Board of Directors] The Summer School also holds informal meetings with Head of School [121; 122] and this student voice is reported to Academic Board. [030 June 2019 Board of Directors_BEM Overall Survey; 104 February 2021 Board of Directors Minutes.;048 February 21 Academic Board Minutes] Throughout the review visit, PDI staff spoke about an open-door environment where a small-scale provider can enable informal feedback between staff and students. [M1, M4, M5, M6] Staff also claimed that PDI had responded to the student voice after covid lockdowns had ended by providing workshops addressing anxiety and resilience [Support Staff Meeting6] as the result of student feedback.

Conclusions

287 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.

288 The team found that PDI seeks to actively engage students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience, using both formal and informal approaches. The BEM Course Handbook promotes this to students in sections including The Student Life Committee, societies and clubs, as well as welfare and wellbeing. Student ambassadors and student representatives ensure the student voice is represented at all levels of institutional governance, and it is captured in the formal annual review processes, and informally through the relationship with academic and support staff.

289 PDI has developed a clear and effective approach which provides appropriate mechanisms to facilitate students with opportunities to provide feedback, individually and collectively, on their experiences. Feedback from students is considered as part of course monitoring and review and the student voice is a standing item on the Academic Board Meeting agenda. Student surveys are a central mechanism for actively engaging the student voice for the institution, but students confirmed that the institution received and responded to both formal and informal feedback from students to enhance the learning environment. While the institution does not currently engage with the NSS, it has aligned its student feedback mechanism to the NSS survey.

290 The institution's approach to the engagement of students is credible and robust because it is clearly understood by students and staff and supported by appropriate resource

and infrastructure. Students who met with the review team confirmed the impact of this approach, reporting that they had a range of channels for providing feedback and provided examples where changes had been made to provision as a result of student engagement. The team concludes that PDI actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience and therefore, that this Core practice is met.

291 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix. Therefore, the team has a high 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

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

293 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).

The evidence the team considered

294 The QAA team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The assessment team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other assessments and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a Board of Directors Terms of Reference [000]
- b Academic Board Terms of Reference [001]
- c BEM Course Board Terms of Reference [002]
- d Summer Courses Board Terms of Reference [003]
- e Admissions Policy [006]
- f Appeals and Complaints Policy [009]
- g 2021-22 BEM student handbook [012]
- h 2021-22_BEM staff handbook [019]
- i 2021 Summer Course Board minutes [028]
- j 2020-21 Academic Board minutes [030]
- k Student Union and Societies Policy [031]
- l Quality Management System Policy [038]
- m June 20 Academic Board minutes [044]
- n June 21 BEM Course Board minutes [046]
- o June 2021 Academic Board Meeting minutes [047]
- p February 21 Academic Board minutes [048]
- q April 21 Academic Board Minutes [049]
- r June 26 2019 Board of Directors minutes [062]
- s Student meeting [M1]
- t Paris staff meeting [M2]
- u Senior staff meeting [M4]
- v Academic staff meeting. [M5]

295 Some of the key pieces of evidence, outlined in Annex 4, were not considered by the assessment team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this assessment are outlined below:

296 The team was unable to sample any complaints or appeals as PDI confirmed none had been received. The team investigated the lack of formal complaints and appeals at the meetings with the senior staff [M5] and students [M1] and in requesting additional evidence. No formal complaint or appeal has been made by any student.

How any samples of evidence were constructed

297 No sampling of evidence was conducted for this Core practice.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

298 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the assessment team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the assessment team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the assessment team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below:

299 To identify the institution's processes for handling complaints and appeals and to confirm these processes are fair and transparent, the review team considered PDI's Admissions Policy, [006] the Appeals and Complaints Policy, [009] and the Student Union and Societies Policy. [031]

300 To identify whether the institution has credible and robust plans for monitoring and reporting on complaints and appeals, the review team considered Board of Directors Terms of Reference, [000] Academic Board Terms of Reference, [001] BEM Course Board Terms of Reference, [002] Summer Courses Board Terms of Reference, [003] 2021 Summer Course Board minutes, [028] 2020-21 Academic Board minutes, [030] Quality Management System Policy, [038] June 20 Academic Board minutes, [044] June 21 BEM Course Board minutes, [046] June 2021 Academic Board Meeting minutes, [047] February 21 Academic Board minutes, [048] April 21 Academic Board minutes, [049] and the June 26 2019 Board of Directors minutes. [062]

301 To test whether the institution's Complaints and Appeals Policy was accessible to students, and the information supporting the process to make the policy accessible, the team considered 2021-22 BEM student handbook [012] and 2021-22_BEM staff handbook. [019] The team also met with students, [M1] senior staff from UPD-PSL, [M2] PDI senior staff [M4] and academic staff. [M5]

What the evidence shows

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

303 Senior staff confirmed [M4] that its approach to complaints and appeals is specific only to the London Campus as there is no requirement in the French higher education system to have a formal complaints and appeals system within institutions. PDI's main approach is outlined in its Appeals and Complaints Policy [009] that sets out how complaints and appeals are managed. Types of complaints, and how they may be managed, are identified variously as: a, Informal, which directs the complainant to a member of staff; b, Informal meeting with staff (such as Module Leader, Senior Programmes Administrator, Finance Officer or Education Coach); or c, Formal complaint completing the pro forma to arrange meeting with Programme Director (academic) or Managing Director (non-academic) wherein an appointment will be arranged with the student following receipt of the form within seven days. An example of the complaint form is included in the policy and gives space for text for the complaint and a separate section for any informal discussion that may have happened preceding the formal complaint. The form also requests the outcome that the student is seeking. Student applicants or prospective students can also make a complaint if they are not satisfied with the service delivered during the admissions process or if they suspect an error was made in the handling of their application. In that instance they are

instructed to email the relevant Senior Programme Administrator within 14 days from the notification of the admission decision. The policy confirms that PDI aims to investigate all complaints from applicants within 21 days.

304 The Appeals and Complaints Policy [009] details an academic appeals process, based on unfair treatment or identified assessment irregularities, which include incorrect or misleading information about assessment tasks or briefs, lack of information regarding word counts or format, unclear submission deadlines, students' needs who are eligible for differences in assessments not being met. Students are advised to arrange a meeting with the lecturer to discuss the issue in the first instance; however, if the concerns are around the final exam this meeting should be scheduled within two months of the examination board. If following the meeting the student is not satisfied with the outcome, they can lodge an appeal by completing the Academic Appeal Form which can be found in the policy and should be sent to the Programme Director. The form requests the nature of the appeal and further opportunity for the student to give details is provided as well as opportunity to detail the outcome of the preceding meeting with the Lecturer. On receipt of the form a meeting with the Programme Director, Module Leader and Lecturer will be arranged within seven business days. If the matter is not resolved at that meeting the student can ask for a hearing at the next Academic Board meeting. The policy confirms that with regards to admissions decisions, no appeal is permitted against a rejection of application on academic grounds; however, the applicant can request the reason they were not selected.

305 The Admissions Policy identifies that there is no right of appeal against admissions decisions for selection, but applicants have the right to feedback on the reasons why they were not selected, which must occur within 14 days of the decision, and the reason communicated by email by PDI. [006, 10.1, page 5] The team found that not having an appeals process for an academic decision in admissions is appropriate, because there are clear criteria and benchmarks for admissions which if not met means rejection. The Appeals and Complaints Policy [009, para. 2] describes that an applicant can make a complaint if not satisfied with the service delivered during the admissions process, or if it is suspected a material error was made in the handling of an application. An appeal, made within 14 days of the admission decision notification, would need to provide all information required for an investigation. The Programme Director should investigate all complaints within 21 working days unless more complex, and provide a systematic answer by email to the applicant. However, the Appeals and Complaints Policy [009, para. 3] also repeats the information in the Admissions Policy [006] that there is no right of appeal against an admission decision. An unsuccessful applicant may only request the reason why they were not selected.

306 The team concluded that PDI's procedures for handling complaints and appeals in admissions as outlined in the Admissions Policy [006] and Appeals and Complaints Policy [009] are fair and transparent as the different types of complaint and appeals are clearly defined, as are the stages of the process with supporting documentation. The process had not yet been tested as PDI confirmed that it had not received any formal complaints or appeals. [M4]

307 The team found that there was no reference to monitoring Complaints and Appeals within the QA Management System Policy [038] nor was there any reference to scrutiny of complaints or appeals through any of the Boards' Terms of Reference. [000 Board of Directors Terms of Reference; 001 Academic Board Terms of Reference; 002 BEM Course Board Terms of Reference; 003 Summer Courses Board Terms of Reference] Senior staff confirmed that it had not received any formal complaints or appeals at the time of the QSR assessment [M4] and had therefore not had to report, or monitor formal complaints or appeals, and their outcomes. The team, therefore, could not test in practice the robustness of the approach for monitoring complaints and appeals.

308 Students [M1] confirmed that they understood the procedures for complaints and appeals, and knew the information was in handbooks [012_2021-22 BEM student handbook] and on the website. Students understood the difference between a complaint and an academic appeal, though explained that the supportive academic relationship shared with teaching staff meant that no one the team met had actual experience of making either. Confidence was expressed that if a complaint or appeal were to be made, then it was felt that the institution would treat students fairly. Students confirmed the process appeared to be accessible, fair and transparent.

309 The review team also discussed complaints and appeals with senior staff [Meeting 4] and teaching staff [Meeting 5] and scrutinised the BEM staff handbook. [019] Staff confirmed their understanding of the policies and procedures and their likely role in the process. It was highlighted that in France there is no Complaints and Appeals Policy, or a culture of students seeking formal action in such a way, and the institution's policy has been developed specifically for the London campus. Staff confirmed that student handbooks and all policies are reviewed and updated on an annual basis, which would ensure a formal opportunity for policy refinement and adjustment to practice. It was clear to the team that PDI remains aware of the cultural differences between Paris and London and are alert to the need to support any student making a complaint or appeal, to record the incident through the governance system, and ensure appropriate reaction in policy and practice.

Conclusions

310 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.

311 PDI's approach to complaints and appeals is through its Appeals and Complaints Policy, which is fair, transparent and accessible as it clearly outlines the different stages and timelines for each stage of the complaints and appeals process and who to contact. The policy is readily accessible to the students through handbooks and students confirmed they thought it was a fair, consistent and transparent approach.

312 As the provider had no complaints or appeals for the team to sample, the team could not test the robustness of the approach. In addition, PDI's approach to monitoring appeals and complaints through its committee system and oversight arrangements was underdeveloped. However, on balance, the review team concludes that PDI has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students, and therefore the Core practice is met.

313 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix, with the exception of examples of any complaints and appeals handled under the current procedures. As the main approach to the handling of complaints and appeals remains untested for the team and as PDI could not articulate a plan for the monitoring of complaints and appeals as none had been received, the team had 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

314 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.

315 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).

The evidence the team considered

316 The QAA team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The assessment team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other assessments and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a Board of Directors Terms of Reference [000]
- b Academic Board Terms of Reference [001]
- c BEM Course Board Terms of Reference [002]
- d Summer Courses Board Terms of Reference FV [003]
- e Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting [004]
- f 2020-21_UCL-PDI_Cooperation Agreement [005]
- g 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules [007]
- h Plagiarism Policy [008]
- i Appeals and Complaints Policy [009]
- j BEM Aims Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map [011]
- k 2021-22 BEM student handbook [012]
- l 2021-2022 BEM staff handbook [019]
- m 2020-21 Business and Management_External Examiner Annual Report [022]
- n 2020-21 Economics_External Examiner Annual Report [023]
- o 2020-21 Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report [024]
- p 2021 Summer Course Board_Minutes [028]
- q Overall BEM Course Survey Report [029]
- r 2020-21 Academic Board minutes [030]
- s International Summer School_Programme Booklet [035]
- t Quality Management System Policy [038]
- u Additional information for QAA [042]
- v October 21 Academic Board Agenda [043]
- w June 20 Academic Board minutes [044]
- x 21-22 Quality annual cycle [045]
- y June 21 BEM Course Board minutes [046]
- z June 2021 Academic Board Meeting minutes [047]
- aa February 21 Academic Board minutes [048]
- bb April 21 Academic Board minutes [049]

cc	EQUIS_2020_SAR_Universite_Paris_Dauphine [057]
dd	External Examiner_Role Description [058]
ee	2019-20_Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report [059]
ff	Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring [060]
gg	June 2019 Board of Directors_BEM Overall Survey [061]
hh	June 26 2019 Board of Directors minutes [062]
ii	Feedback Analysis 2019 International Summer School [063]
jj	June 21 Academic Board Main Supporting Document [064]
kk	2021 Finance Summer School Completion Report [065]
ll	2021 International Summer School Completion Report [066]
mm	2021 Summer Course Board Main Supporting Document [067]
nn	S1 2020-21_BEM Modules Review [068]
oo	S2 2019-20_BEM Modules Review [069]
pp	Translation of Décret 2004-186 [070]
qq	Translation of Arrête 2015-1168 [071]
rr	2020-21 Annual Examination Board minutes BEM1 and 2 [073]
ss	2020-21 Annual Examination Board minutes BEM3 [074]
tt	2019-20 Annual Examination Board minutes BEM3 [076]
uu	External Examiners Action Plan [088]
vv	2022 Executive MBA project [089]
ww	2021 International Management Summer School_Final Grades [091]
xx	2021 Finance Summer School_Final Grades [092]
yy	March 21 BEM Course Board minutes [093]
zz	2020-21 S2 BEM UCL final grades [094]
aaa	February 2021 Board of Directors minutes [104]
bbb	Executive summary for the June 2021 Board of Directors [111]
ccc	Budget 21-22 (approved by Board of Directors June 2021) [114]
ddd	May 21 Board of Directors minutes [115]
eee	2020-21 S1 BEM student representatives meeting minutes [121]
fff	Report on the EMBA Steering Committee [123]
ggg	Responsibilities checklist [124]
hhh	Evidence English Consultancy Work Record [125]
iii	2019-20_Management_External Examiner Annual Report [131]
jjj	2019-20_Economics_External Examiner Annual Report [132]
kkk	June 2019 Board of Directors Agenda [138]
lll	January 2020 Board of Directors Agenda [139]
mmm	2020-21_Employability skills student survey [141]
nnn	2019-20_Employability skills student survey [146]
ooo	157_HR and Quality Manager_Job description [157]
ppp	161_BEM Examination Board Procedure [161]
qqq	2017_Convention PDI-UPD English [209]
rrr	Statement of decision_President_March 2021_English_translation [210]
sss	Student submission QAA [SS]
ttt	Students meeting [M1]
uuu	Meeting with UPD-PSL staff [M2]
vvv	Meeting with staff to discuss assessment, grading and harmonisation [M3]
www	Meeting with senior staff at PDI [M4]
xxx	Meeting with academic staff at PDI [M5]
yyy	Meeting with professional staff at PDI [M6]
zzz	Final meeting at PDI. [M7]

317 Some of the key pieces of evidence, outlined in Annex 4, were not considered by the assessment team. These pieces of evidence and the reason why they were not considered during this assessment are outlined below:

318 The team was not able to consider other organisations' views about effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them (see paragraph 6).

How any samples of evidence were constructed

319 There was no sampling activity undertaken for this Core practice.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

320 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the assessment team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the assessment team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the assessment team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below:

321 To assess how the provider ensures courses are high quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them, the review team scrutinised 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] Plagiarism Policy, [008] Appeals and Complaints Policy, [009] 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] 2021-2022 BEM staff handbook, [019] Quality Management System Policy, [038] Additional information for QAA, [042] EQUIS_2020_SAR_Universite_Paris_Dauphine, [057] External Examiner_Role Description, [058] Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring, [060] Translation of Décret 2004-186, [070] Translation of Arrete 2015-1168, [071] and 2017_Convention PDI-UPD English. [209] The team also met with PDI staff to discuss its assessment, grading, and harmonisation practice at PDI. [M3, M7]

322 To assess whether the provider has credible, robust and evidence-based approaches to ensuring a high-quality academic experience in partnership work, the team reviewed Board of Directors Terms of Reference, [000] Academic Board Terms of Reference, [001] BEM Course Board Terms of Reference, [002] Summer Courses Board Terms of Reference FV, [003] Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting, [004] 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] 2021-2022 BEM staff handbook, [019] 2021 Summer Course Board minutes, [028] Overall BEM Course Survey Report, [029] 2020-21 Academic Board minutes, [030] Quality Management System Policy, [038] October 21 Academic Board Agenda, [043] June 20 Academic Board minutes, [044] 21-22 Quality annual cycle, [045] June 21 BEM Course Board minutes, [046] June 2021 Academic Board Meeting minutes, [047] February 21 Academic Board minutes, [048] External Examiner_Role Description, [058] Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring, [060] June 2019 Board of Directors_BEM Overall Survey, [061] June 26 2019 Board of Directors minutes, [062] Feedback Analysis 2019 International Summer School, [063] June 21 Academic Board Main Supporting Document, [064] 2021 Summer Course Board Main Supporting Document, [067] S1 2020-21 BEM Modules Review, [068] S2 2019-20_BEM Modules Review, [069] External Examiners Action Plan, [088] March 21 BEM Course Board minutes, [093] February 2021 Board of Directors Minutes, [104] Executive summary for the June 2021 Board of Directors, [111] Budget 21-22 (approved by Board of Directors June 2021), [114] May 21 Board of Directors minutes, [115] 2020-21 S1 BEM student representatives meeting minutes, [121] June 2019 Board of Directors Agenda, [138] January 2020 Board of Directors Agenda, [139] 2020-21_Employability skills student survey, [141] 2019-20_Employability skills student survey, [146] HR and Quality Manager_Job description, [157] BEM Examination Board Procedure, [161] 2019-20_Marketing_External Moderation, [162] 2019 20_Macroeconomics_External Moderation, [163] 2020-21_Global Contemporary

Issues_External Moderation, [164] 2019-20_Computer Science_External Moderation, [165] 2020-21_Linear Algebra_External Moderation, [166] and student submission. [SS] The review team also met with the students, [M1] UPD-PSL staff, [M2] a range of PDI staff to discuss assessment, grading and harmonisation, [M3] senior staff at PDI, [M4] academic staff at PDI, [M5] and the professional staff at PDI, [M6] and the final meeting at PDI. [M7]

323 To assess students' views about the quality of courses delivered in partnership, the review team scrutinised Overall BEM Course Survey Report, [029] June 2019 Board of Directors_BEM Overall Survey, [061] S1 2020-21 BEM Modules Review, [068] S2 2019-20_BEM Modules Review, [069] 2020-21 S1 BEM student representatives meeting minutes, [121] 2020-21_Employability skills student survey, [141] 2019-20_Employability skills student survey, [146] and considered the student submission. [SS] The team also met the students [M1] enrolled on the BEM course.

324 To test the basis for the maintenance of high quality within PDI and the UPD-PSL partnership, and that those arrangements are in line with the provider's regulations or policies, the review team scrutinised 2017 Convention PDI-UPD, [209] Statement of decision by the president of the UPD-PSL, [201] the associated responsibilities checklist, [124] and discussions with the UPD-PSL staff, [M2] and PDI staff. [M4, M5, M6] To test the basis for the maintenance of high quality within PDI and the UCL-CLIE partnership, and that those arrangements are in line with the provider's regulations or policies, the review team scrutinised 2020-21_UCL-PDI_Cooperation Agreement [005] and discussed the partnership with senior staff at PDI. [M4]

325 To test that external examiners or verifiers consider courses delivered in partnership to be of high quality, thus confirming the effectiveness of the underpinning arrangements, the review team reviewed 2020-21 Business and Management_External Examiner Annual Report, [022] 2020-21 Economics_External Examiner Annual Report, [023] 2020-21 Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report, [024] 2019-20_Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report, [059] 2019-20_Management_External Examiner Annual Report, [131] 2019-20_Economics_External Examiner Annual Report, [132] 2019-20_Marketing_External Moderation, [162] 2019-20_Macroeconomics_External Moderation, [163] 2020-21_Global Contemporary Issues_External Moderation, [164] 2019-20_Computer Science_External Moderation, [165] and 2020-21_Linear Algebra_External Moderation. [166]

326 To test whether staff understand and discharge effectively their responsibilities to the awarding body, the review team met a range of staff at PDI including senior staff, [M4] academic staff [M5] and professional staff [M6]; to test that the awarding body/organisation/lead provider is meeting its responsibilities the team met UPD-PSL staff. [M2]

What the evidence shows

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

328 PDI and the UPD-PSL have a cooperation agreement [209] since 2017. Responsibilities for both parties in ensuring a high-quality academic experience are detailed in the formal agreement [209] and further explained in the Responsibilities Checklist [124] (see paragraph 99 and 191). PDI has a range of policies which support the maintenance of quality, including 2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules, [007] Plagiarism Policy, [008] Appeals and Complaints Policy, [009] 2021-22 BEM student handbook, [012] 2021-22 BEM, [019] Quality Management System Policy, [038] External Examiner_Role Description, [058] and Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring. [060] The team found these policies and procedures have been aligned with UPD-PSL requirements as set out in the cooperation

agreement [209] and the responsibilities checklist. [124] Hence, the review team concluded that the partnership agreement between PDI and UPD-PSL is clear and comprehensive, up-to-date and reflects PDI regulations or policies for the management of partnerships.

329 PDI developed its Quality Management System Policy [038] to support the implementation of the Quality Management system, which covers the procedure for the annual review of policies, guides, handbooks and procedures. This policy is to ensure its compliance with the regulatory requirements from UPD-PSL [070, 071] including the norms and regulations from the HCERES and the EQUIS accreditation standards [057] and its compliance with the UK regulatory requirements. [060] Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring review [060] provides the context, process and procedures of annual monitoring to manage the partnerships which should enable a high-quality experience for the students. Therefore, the review team considers that PDI has clear and comprehensive regulations or policies for the management of the partnership between PDI and UPD-PSL to ensure that the academic experience is high quality.

330 The Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting document [004] details how PDI and UPD-PSL work together to share their responsibilities in current and future course management to meet the quality expectations of French and English higher education systems. The review team found PDI's organisational structure is robust because within its Terms of Reference [000] the Board of Directors has three of seven key areas (Academic and Programmes Quality, Risk Management and Partnerships) which directly relate to securing standards in partnership work. The Board's agenda has standing matters associated with these aspects [138, 139] to allow regular review of such matters at its meetings. [061, 062, 104, 111, 114, 115] The Board delegates the responsibility of quality assurance across PDI courses to the Academic Board [001] and the team found evidence that the Academic Board [043] reviews course evaluation data and quality enhancement initiatives in teaching and learning to secure academic standards. [030, 044, 047, 048, 049, 064] PDI has four examination boards [161] per academic year as per the BEM assessment rules. It applies, if necessary, the rules of modules and semester compensation. It has newly established different Course Boards specific to each course, [002, 003, 060] which is a requirement in the formal arrangement with UPD-PSL to ensure the academic homogeneity between the courses delivered at PDI and those delivered at UPD-PSL. These meetings which involve both London and Paris staff allow a regular space of discussion between PDI and UPD-PSL and help to guarantee a high-quality academic experience. [028, 046, 067, 093] For example, at the March 2021 BEM Course Board [093] there was full discussion about the approach to assessments from both a UK and French perspective and how that would be managed.

331 The review team was provided with the 2021-22 calendar of annual monitoring and quality cycle activities, [045] which include a detailed timetable of all relevant activities specified in the Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring. [060] The HR and Quality Manager oversees the administration of the provision, review and regular update of all policies, handbooks and/or guides, procedures, form templates and/or records and other key documents, in cooperation with management and staff. [038, 060, 157] In order to understand how the monitoring process is operated the team considered various documentation such as Course Survey Result, [029] the module reviews, [068, 069] the student feedback on its employability skill workshops, [141, 146] 2020-21 BEM student representatives meeting minutes, [121] the Academic Board minutes, [047, 048, 049] and June 2019 Board of Directors_BEM Overall Survey. [061] The students [SS, M1] confirmed their engagement with the monitoring process and their feedback was considered by PDI to improve their experience. Furthermore, PDI staff provided different examples of how students' feedback [M4, M5, M6] was considered to improve the academic experience. The review team concludes that PDI's approaches to ensure a high-quality academic experience for provision delivered in partnership are evidence-based and credible.

332 Students told the team that they consider the course to be high quality. [M1] The team heard that the student handbook, module handbooks and the VLE signposted both PDI and the UPD-PSL learning resources and student support. Students regard access to UCL library, extracurricular activities and societies invaluable to their overall experience at PDI and they considered the quality of academic support and available materials on the VLE for their study to be excellent. Students commended professional experience guidance and support from PDI involving different activities (for example soft skills modules, workshops, alumni breakfast, mentor scheme) which make them feel they are well-prepared for their career.

333 PDI and UCL-CLIE have a cooperation agreement, the latest agreement was signed in 2020 [005] but the senior staff at PDI confirmed that this agreement has been renewed for academic year 2021-22. [M4] The agreement [005] specifies the UCL-CLIE's provision including testing of all PDI BEM students at the beginning of the academic year, timetabling classes, teaching students in classes, student access to individual tutorial time during teachers' office hours, course assessment/marks for each semester. Additionally, the PDI students have access to all language and cultural activities organised within or outside classes, and access to different facilities in UCL. [005] In the meeting with the students, [M1] they commended the high-quality experience they receive from this partnership and raised their concern regarding the loss of some access to the UCL opportunities due to Brexit and PDI's subsequent current status. However, the senior staff at PDI [M4] confirmed that PDI and UCL-CLIE are keen to recover their full relationship once PDI gains OfS registration.

334 The external examiners' views of academic experience are reflected in their external moderation of final exams [162, 163, 164, 165, 166] and their annual reports, [022, 023, 024, 059, 131, 132] where they provide comments to curriculum, assessments, comparability of standards and student performance, enhancement of quality, and review. The external examiners report satisfaction with the quality of student learning materials and appropriateness of decisions made in assessments but they expect more robust internal moderation process [022, 023, 204, 059, 131, 132] (see paragraph 129). The external examiner arrangement is consistent with Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring at PDI. [060] Their reports inform PDI's review of PDI provision, which affirm the effectiveness of the underpinning partnership arrangements.

335 The review team found that PDI staff including its senior staff, academic staff and professional staff, understand their responsibilities to the awarding organisation because they could comprehensively articulate PDI's internal processes, how they relate to the UPD-PSL requirements, and their commitment to providing a quality academic experience. The review team found that PDI staff had a good knowledge of, and commitment to, implementing quality frameworks and they clearly articulated how these worked in their practice of teaching, assessment, and feedback. [M5] The team also found that the relationship with UCL-CLIE to deliver a high-quality academic experience was well articulated by PDI staff, which is consistent with its agreement with the UCL-CLIE. [005] PDI staff valued UCL for its contribution in providing a high-quality academic experience to its students. [M4] UPD-PSL staff who are involved in some aspects of the operation of PDI courses [M2] explained their involvement in the process of course design and delivery, assessments, harmonisation, and associated policies and regulations for PDI courses. Their explanation is consistent with the responsibilities stated in the cooperation agreement [209] and responsibilities checklist [124] and aligned to the processes as described by the PDI staff. The review team confirms that through their articulation of processes and the sole and joint responsibilities of the provision, that PDI and UPD-PSL staff understand responsibilities in ensuring a high-quality academic experience.

Conclusions

336 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.

337 The review team concludes that PDI partnership agreements with UPD-PSL and with UCL-CLIE are clear and comprehensive, up-to-date and reflect the provider's regulations or policies for the management of partnerships. It has clear and comprehensive regulations or policies for the management of the partnership between PDI and UPD-PSL to ensure that the academic experience is high quality. PDI's approaches to ensure a high-quality academic experience for provision delivered in partnerships with others are evidence-based and credible. External examiners' reports agree with the student views that the courses are effective and academic experience is high quality, but elements of its internal moderation process were under-developed. The staff from both PDI and UPD-PSL understood their roles in the partnership arrangements, and their respective responsibilities for quality. The review team concludes, therefore, that the Core practice is met.

338 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix. The review team therefore has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

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

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

340 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).

The evidence the team considered

341 The QAA team assessed the evidence presented, both prior to and at the visit, to determine if the provider could meet this Core practice at a threshold level. The Quality and Standards Review Guidance for Providers Applying to Register with the Office for Students includes a matrix (Annex 4) which identifies key pieces of evidence that a provider may present and which the team should consider when making a judgement against this Core practice to ensure that the relevant outcomes are being delivered. The assessment team used that matrix to ensure that the evidence considered was assessed in a way that is clear and consistent with all other assessments and focused on relevant outcomes. A list of the key pieces of evidence seen by the team is below:

- a Academic Board ToRs [001]
- b BEM Course Board ToRs [002]
- c Summer Courses Board ToRs [003]
- d BEM Assessment Rules [007]
- e BEM student handbook [012]
- f Staff handbook [019]
- g 2021 Summer Course Board minutes [028]
- h Overall BEM Course Survey Report 2020-21 [029]
- i 2020-21 Academic Board minutes [030]
- j Students Welfare and Wellbeing Policy [033]
- k Special Education Needs Procedure [034]
- l 2021-22_Academic Calendar [036]
- m October 21 Academic Board Agenda [043]
- n June 21 BEM Course Board minutes [046]
- o February 21 Academic Board minutes [048]
- p April 21 Academic Board minutes [049]
- q 2021 Finance Summer School Completion Report [065]
- r 2021 International Summer School Completion Report [066]
- s 2021 Summer Course Board main supporting document [067]
- t Internship Agreement [095]
- u 2021-22 Budget (approved by Board of Directors June 2021) [114]
- v May 21 Board of Directors minutes [115]
- w 2020-21 HPL staff induction presentation [120]
- x 09 April 21 Student Representatives Meeting Key Actions [134]
- y 19 April 21 Student Representatives Meeting Key Actions [135]
- z BEM cohort indicators [136]
- aa Special Education Needs Report [137]
- bb June 2021 Newsletter [140]
- cc 2020-21_Employability skills student survey [141]
- dd 2019-20_Employability skills student survey [146]
- ee Hamilcar Capital_Internship offers [172]
- ff Poplar Studio_Internship offer [173]

gg	Visa_Internship offer [174]
hh	Banks_Internship offer [175]
ii	SuperCharger Ventures_Internship offer [176]
jj	Find internship in London.pdf [177]
kk	2020 Trustees Report [185]
ll	Assessed student work [ASW]
mm	Meeting with students [M1]
nn	Meeting with senior staff [M4]
oo	Meeting with academic staff [M5]
pp	Meeting with professional staff. [M6]

How many samples of evidence were constructed

342 The team randomly selected 90 pieces of assessed student work from 208 which were completed in the 2020-21 academic year.

Why and how the team considered this evidence

343 As highlighted, all of the evidence submitted by the provider [Annex 1] was considered by the assessment team either prior to the visit, or at the visit itself. As such, several pieces of evidence will have been considered to allow the assessment team to make its judgement regarding the provider's ability to meet this Core practice. To ensure consistency in decision making and to ensure that those decisions focused on outcomes, the assessment team considered the key pieces of evidence outlined in Annex 4 of the Guidance for Providers. These key pieces of evidence and the reason for scrutinising them are outlined below:

344 To identify the College's approach to student support, including how it identifies and monitors the needs of individual students, the review team considered BEM Assessment Rules, [007] BEM student handbook, [012] 2020-21 HPL staff induction presentation, [120] Overall BEM Course Survey Report 2020-21, [029] 2020-21 Academic Board minutes, [030] Internship Agreement, [095] Special Education Needs Report, [137] June 2021 Newsletter, [140] 2020-21_Employability skills student survey, [141] 2019-20_Employability skills student survey, [146] Hamilcar Capital_Internship offers, [172] Poplar Studio_Internship offer, [173] Visa_Internship offer, [174] Banks_Internship offer, [175] SuperCharger Ventures_Internship offer, [176] and Find internship in London. [177] The team also met with students [M1] and professional staff. [M6]

345 To assess whether the College has credible, robust and evidence-based plans for ensuring that all students are supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes, the team considered Academic Board ToRs, [001] BEM Course Board ToRs, [002] Summer Courses Board ToRs, [003] 2021 Summer Course Board minutes, [028] Overall BEM Course Survey Report, [029] 2020-21 Academic Board minutes, [030] June 21 BEM Course Board minutes, [046] April 21 Academic Board minutes, [049] 2021 Finance Summer School Completion Report, [065] 2021 International Summer School Completion Report, [066] 2021 Summer Course Board main supporting document, [067] 09 April 21 Student Representatives Meeting Key Actions, [134] 19 April 21 Student Representatives Meeting Key Actions, [135] BEM cohort indicators and 137 Special Education Needs Report. [136]

346 To identify and assess students' views about student support mechanisms and whether students who have made particular use of student support services regard those services as accessible and effective, the team considered Students Welfare and Wellbeing Policy, [033] Special Education Needs Procedure, [034] October 21 Academic Board Agenda, [043] February 21 Academic Board minutes, [048] 21-22 Budget (approved by

Board of Directors June 2021), [114] May 21 Board of Directors minutes, [115] Special Education Needs Report, [137] and the 2020 Trustees Report. [185] The team also met with students. [M1]

347 To test whether staff understand their responsibilities and are appropriately skilled and supported, the team considered BEM student handbook, [012] staff handbook [019] Internship Agreement, [095] 2021-22_Academic Calendar, [036] 2020-21_Employability skills student survey, [141] 2019-20_Employability skills student survey, [146] and BEM Assessment Rules. [007] The team also met with students, [M1] academic staff [M5] and professional staff.

What the evidence shows

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

349 PDI's student handbook was last reviewed in September 2020 and is overseen by the Quality Manager, authorised by the Managing Director and reported to the Academic Board. [012] The handbook details the need to secure support for all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. PDI has an overarching strategy linked to its strategic plan regarding student support for academic and professional outcomes, and the handbook identifies the Student Welfare and Wellbeing Policy [030] and outlines the duty of care towards students, as well as support expected for academic issues, personal development and careers guidance through Education Coaches.

350 Individual student needs are identified in the student handbook [012] with a breakdown of support needs into academic, administrative and personal development and career guidance with information of whom to contact at PDI for support in these areas. The handbook also contains a link to the Special Education Needs Procedures [034] for those students requiring assistance with medical conditions, disabilities or additional learning needs. The team found that the handbook and the Special Education Procedures were an effective introduction and guide to the students about the initial support available to them as they were clear and accessible.

351 To support the students to achieve successful academic outcomes, PDI offers a range of study skills training, from embedded skills within subject specific areas, such as the English and Communication modules [018] to workshops covering plagiarism, referencing, [068, page 4] note-taking techniques, and academic writing, [086] which is included in the student induction and timetabled sessions throughout the year. [036, 087] Integration of study skills into module delivery was formalised as two sessions on academic essay writing in the social sciences were instructed in detail by lecturers at the start of the academic year. [2020-21 HPL staff induction presentation120]

352 Tutorials with lecturers also provide students with an opportunity to ask for support in their academic learning and go over assessments and feedback [012] although the team found that this approach depended on the lecturers and approval of the Programme Director. [2021-22_BEM Staff handbook 019, 19 April 21 Student Representatives Meeting Key Actions 135] PDI staff stressed that as a small institution they have an open-door policy where students can regularly communicate with PDI academic and professional staff outside the classroom. The students similarly expressed confidence in approaching any member of the academic staff. [M1] Weekly office hours of key contact staff such as the Dean of Student Life, Education Coaches, programme administrators and the Managing Director are available, and outlined in the student handbook. [012]

353 Students can also receive additional support if they have special education needs [Student Handbook 012, Special Education Needs Procedure 034, Special Education Needs Report 137] for chronic/ongoing medical conditions, disabilities or learning difficulties at their

enrolment or, if they are affected during their course of study, through the Education Coaches, who arrange a personal academic support plan. The Special Education Needs Procedure [034] explains how arrangements are tailored to each particular case. Student needs are identified at the start of the academic year and semester by students completing a personal information form and subsequently an academic support plan can be developed with an Education Coach if a need has been identified. The academic support plan can include a modification of study and assessment arrangement, for example assistive technology or additional exam time. PDI demonstrated the monitoring of student success of those learners on Academic Support Plans, [043 October 21 Academic Board Agenda; 048 February 21 Academic Board Minutes; 137 Special Education Needs Report] which anonymously reported the academic support individual learners required. The overall impact of student support is summarised in the Trustees Report to the Board of Trustees. [0185] Students confirmed both understanding the support available and how to arrange support. [012 BEM student handbook; M1] The team found that PDI's approach to supporting all students to achieve academic outcomes is comprehensive, robust and credible because there a number of mechanisms in place for students from Education Coaches to academic tutorials and extracurricular events to receive additional support for their academic learning; information about support is clear and accessible and students knew where to access the support online and through Education Coaches.

354 To support the students to achieve successful professional outcomes, PDI requires students to complete the professional experience in year 2 and year 3 of the BEM course as described in the BEM Handbook. [012] The professional experience can include an experience of continuous employment or internship or an aggregate of several employments and/or internships. The registration of the professional experience is an online procedure only, via a software platform developed for registering internships. The students record their professional internship, paid employment and experience in an association on the online application platform and their internship agreement [Internship Agreement example 095] will be automatically saved in the application. The agreement details the terms of the internship, confirms which PDI member of staff and host staff member will supervise the student during the period of the internship. In its June 2021 student newsletter, PDI shared examples and experience of internships with companies in e-commerce, private equity companies and restaurants. [June 2021 Newsletter 140] [172_Hamilcar Capital_Internship offers, 173_Poplar Studio_Internship offer, 174_Visa_Internship offer, 175_Banks_Internship offer, 176_SuperCharger Ventures_Internship offer, 177_Find internship in London] PDI stipulates that internships should take place during the holidays but students are given a 15% time allowance during term time to be used for interviews. [BEM Student Rep meeting minutes 2021] To validate year 2, students need to demonstrate professional experience of a minimum of five weeks before the Final Examination Board of year 2. To validate year 3, students need to demonstrate professional experience of a minimum continuous period of four weeks before the second session Examination Board of year 3. [BEM Assessment Rules 007]

355 PDI has two Education Coaches [Job description 190] who deliver the Soft Skills and Employability modules. The non-credit bearing Soft Skills and Employability modules must be completed in order to pass the year successfully. [BEM Assessment Rules 007] The Soft Skills and Employability modules support students' reflection and actions about their personal studies and professional projects. [BEM Handbook, 012] The modules include compulsory workshops on a range of topics including building a career plan, CV and online recruitment websites, writing successful applications, preparing for interview, and public speaking. Throughout the year, PDI also holds a range of career events to enable students to meet with professionals from various industries, many of whom are PDI alumni. The coaches, who are available three to four days a week on campus, provide wellbeing support to students as well as to students around internships and they also offer workshops and seminars about personal development, employment and career planning, support the study

and professional projects. [M6, 190] PDI puts significant emphasis on the quality of any employment experience [M4] which has to fulfil seven principles: a career plan, digital awareness, CV/on-line recruitment, successful applications, soft skills for an international career, preparing for interviews, and public speaking. [BEM student handbook 012] Students recognised this emphasis as an important part of their learning. [M1]

356 Further support and activities in order to help students achieve professional outcomes include careers guidance, careers events with institutional alumni in prominent career positions, and alumni breakfasts for informal meetings and careers advice. [Alumni breakfast 178] PDI also has plans for an incubator programme (support for business start-ups) where it arranges opportunities for cooperation between the incubator start-ups and the students, although the pandemic has delayed progress on this initiative. [Newsletter 140] PDI established a partnership with the Council of Islington [Overview document, page 20, M6] and it is a member of the Knowledge Quarter, and the Islington Sustainable Energy Partnership and Chambre de Commerce who run projects and events that some of its students can attend. [114] Overall, the team found that PDI's approach to supporting all students achieve professional outcome is comprehensive, robust and credible because there is a clear focus on employability for students embedded in the curricula as well as opportunities to engage with external organisations and alumni who provide guidance to be 'career ready'.

357 The team found that the BEM student handbook [012] is comprehensive in its information for students, which is information repeated in the staff handbook; [019] this is because the handbook explains in detail the operational aspects of the course such as the timetable and learning facilities, how communication is managed through the VLE, information about student life and wellbeing, inclusion of key policies such as appeals and complaints procedures and outlines the structure of the course including the aims and learning outcomes. In meetings with the team, students and staff demonstrated that the handbook was well understood by all throughout PDI. [M1, M4, M5, M6] The handbooks have a section that details the learning and support and wellbeing services that offer support and guidance to students on student issues and university work, societies and clubs, as well as extracurricular activities to enhance the student experience. Students report that all the information is accurate and signposts where effective assistance may be sought. [M 1]

358 Student support is overseen by the Academic Board, and the Terms of Reference identify quality assurance [001; Section 3] as a critical element of supporting students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. The Board receives regular reports on course evaluation data, and reviews updates on any developments in the evaluation process, such as approving the new design of a course evaluation form. [134 09 April 21 Student Representatives Meeting Key Actions; 135 19 April 21 Student Representatives Meeting Key Actions; 136 BEM cohort indicators; 137 Special Education Needs Report] Course Board Terms of Reference identify that it is to maintain and enhance academic quality and standards of the institution, and it receives and considers annual course evaluations and student surveys for potential subsequent report to the Organisation Sciences Bachelor's Board (Conseil Licence Sciences des Organisations). PDI evidences annual course evaluations [065; 066] and student surveys demonstrating oversight of student outcomes.

359 The sample assessed student work [ASW] and feedback indicates that assessment at the institution supports student learning. Courses have formative activities and assessment embedded within modules, and staff are provided with guidance to support the development of their material for each module. However, the review team has some concern about the manner and style of student feedback, which is handwritten, and reinforced in tutorial sessions. While feedback is provided in a timely fashion, according to the institutional benchmark of three weeks [012 BEM student handbook] it is not robust and credible,

providing systematised feedback and feed forward. In reviewing the sample of assessed student work, the team found that there was little evidence that the written feedback seen would help students to understand how they can improve or maintain performance levels. Also, the team found that feedback was not consistently explicitly related to assessment criteria. Staff confirmed that written feedback is always followed up in tutorials and this helps the students better understand what they need to improve but the team was unable to test this approach. [M5] However, students reported confidence in the feedback and how it supported their learning. [M1]

360 In meetings with staff [M5, M6] the responsibilities towards supporting students were understood. These key roles include admissions, student support and welfare and wellbeing. Staff confidently articulated intentions to develop more formalised and structured systems for monitoring, review and intervention that would be more appropriate as the student cohort changes in size and composition, including greater emphasis on progression, retention and attainment within a more academically diverse student cohort. [Senior Staff Meeting, M4] Academic and professional staff [M5, M6] explained their roles in facilitating all students, regardless of background and characteristics, to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes and could explain the mechanisms in place to monitor student engagement with and learning on courses including progression and attainment. This understanding is reinforced by all-staff monthly meetings to discuss policy development and the student exercise. Also, the staff handbook [019, Section 8] identifies Student Life, Welfare, Wellbeing and Inclusion and the support policies and actions to enable students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. This mirrors the information for students in the BEM student handbook. [012]

361 PDI staff [M5, M6] explained how the Education Coaches are accessible to all students and how they are responsible for guiding students with wellbeing issues and learning support needs. If cases arise, staff were able to confidently articulate how they would make reasonable adjustments to accommodate students with a disability and will accommodate and assist students with learning support needs. It was noted, however, that very few requests for academic or pastoral support are received at application or during studies. The team concluded that staff are appropriately skilled and supported to provide academic and non-academic support, reflected in CVs and job descriptions, because staff could articulate PDI's approach to student support, understood their responsibilities and were able to articulate how this approach worked in practice.

362 Through student surveys, the team found that student views of support are positive - not only for academic support they received (for example, study skills, referencing skills [068, page 4] and tutorials [069, page 2-3]) but also support to their professional and career development (for example, students' feedback on employability skills workshops in 'CV and Employability websites' (91.7% satisfaction) and 'How to write successful applications' (83.3% satisfaction), [141] Students' feedback on Mock Interviews with Alumni (100% satisfaction), and [146] internships. [069]) The students explained that they have 'more support regarding the professional world than in other universities' through the mandatory soft skills modules (for example, Soft Skills and Employability), the mentoring programme available for years 2 and 3, as well as the many meetings organised with alumni. [SS, M1] Students who met with the team confirmed that they valued these opportunities. Students [M1] confirmed the significant support for internships, particularly through the pandemic and lockdown, through the career pages of the VLE, and the employment programme. Therefore, the team concludes that students recognise they are adequately supported, and that they are adequately supported to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.

Conclusions

363 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.

364 The review team found that the institution actively supports all students through formal learning and extracurricular opportunities to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes, backed by policies, processes and infrastructure in place to facilitate successful academic and professional outcomes. These mechanisms include a tutorial system, provision of Education Coaches, focus on employability through employability modules and the inclusion of professional experience. The team found that these mechanisms are comprehensive and robust, with an appropriate infrastructure in place of staff supporting students.

365 The institution has a number of internal reporting mechanisms and structures that enable it to formally monitor and evaluate student academic achievement. Board Terms of Reference describe monitoring to scrutinise student performance, although the review team did not find minutes recording data points to affect such monitoring.

366 There is evidence of timely feedback that helps students to understand how they can improve or maintain performance levels, but there is concern that this feedback could be more structured and systematic across all the provision, and to be less reliant on a personal tutorial approach. Academic and support staff understand their roles in supporting student achievement and the various approaches used for this. Students reported that they were satisfied with the support mechanisms available, in particular personal tutors, and that they received comprehensive, helpful and timely feedback. The team therefore concludes that PDI supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes and that the Core practice is met.

367 The evidence underpinning this judgement reflects all of the evidence described in the QSR evidence matrix for this Core practice. Therefore, the team has a high degree of confidence in this judgement.

Annex 1

Evidence submitted 9 September 2021

_QAA Paris Dauphine International Submission document FV.pdf
000_Board of Directors Terms of Reference.pdf
001_Academic Board Terms of Reference.pdf
002_BEM Course Board Terms of Reference.pdf
003_Summer Courses Board Terms of Reference FV.pdf
004_Organisation Chart and Courses Committees reporting.pdf
005_2020-21_UCL-PDI_Cooperation Agreement.pdf
006_Admissions Policy.pdf
007_2021-22 BEM Assessment Rules.pdf
008_Plagiarism Policy.pdf
009_Appeals and Complaints Policy.pdf
010_Academic Freedom Policy.pdf
011_BEM Aims Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map.pdf
012_2021-22 BEM student handbook.pdf
013_BEM1_Macroeconomics_Module Handbook.pdf
014_BEM1_101 English and Communication_Module Handbook.pdf
015_BEM2_Management Accounting_Module Handbook.pdf
016_BEM2_Digital Sciences_Module Handbook.pdf
017_BEM3_Basics of Strategy_Module Handbook.pdf
018_BEM3_Current Issues in Sociology_Module Handbook.pdf
019_2021-22_BEM Staff handbook.pdf
020_██████████_██████████ Chair of Academic Board_CV.pdf
021_Academic Leads_CV.pdf
022_2020-21 Business and Management_External Examiner Annual Report.pdf
023_2020-21 Economics_External Examiner Annual Report.pdf
024_2020-21 Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report.pdf
025_External Examiners_CV.pdf
026_Academic Lead_Job Description.pdf
027_Head of Teaching and Learning Development_Job Description.pdf
028_2021 Summer Course Board_Minutes.pdf
029_Overall BEM Course Survey Report.pdf
030_2020-21 Academic Board Minutes.pdf
031_Student Union and Societies Policy.pdf
032_DLSU Constitution.pdf
033_Students Welfare and Wellbeing Policy.pdf
034_Special Education Needs Procedure.pdf
035_International Summer School_Programme Booklet.pdf
036_2021-22_Academic Calendar.pdf
037_EMBA Aims and Learning Outcomes.pdf
038_Quality Management System Policy.pdf

Evidence submitted 8 October 2021

PDI QSR request for additional evidence 240921.pdf
039_21-22 Year 1 UK and International Admitted Students.pdf
040_21-22 Year 1 Parcoursup Admitted Students.pdf
041_Schedule of Teaching Week 8 November 21.pdf
042_Additional information for QAA.pdf
043_October 21 Academic Board Agenda.pdf
044_June 20 Academic Board Minutes.pdf
045_21-22 Quality annual cycle.pdf
046_June 21 BEM Course Board Minutes.pdf
047_June 2021 Academic Board Meeting Minutes.pdf
048_February 21 Academic Board Minutes.pdf
049_April 21 Academic Board Minutes.pdf
050_2020-21_Standardisation evidence for English and Communication.pdf
051_Undergraduate programmes_Attendance Committee Terms of Reference.pdf
052_2019-20-S1_BEM1 and 2_Attendance Committee Minutes.pdf
053_2019-20-S1_BEM_Attendance Committee Decision.pdf
054_2020-21-S1_BEM_Attendance Committee Minutes.pdf
055_2020-21-S2_BEM_Attendance Committee Minutes.pdf
056_2020-21_BEM_Attendance Committee Decisions.pdf
057_EQUIS_2020_SAR_Universite_Paris_Dauphine.pdf
058_External Examiner_Role Description.pdf
059_2019-20_Humanities_External Examiner Annual Report.pdf
060_Policy and procedures for Annual Monitoring.pdf
061_June 2019 Board of Directors_BEM Overall Survey.pdf
062_June 26 2019 Board of Directors Minutes.pdf
063_Feedback Analysis 2019 International Summer School.pdf
064_June 21 Academic Board Main Supporting Document.pdf
065_2021 Finance Summer School Completion Report.pdf
066_2021 International Summer School Completion Report.pdf
067_2021 Summer Course Board Main Supporting Document.pdf
068_S1 2020-21 BEM Modules Review.pdf
069_S2 2019-20_BEM Modules Review.pdf
070_Translation of Décret 2004-186.pdf
071_Translation of Arrete 2015-1168.pdf
072_Appendix to the Assessment Rules 2021-22 Licence Sciences des Organisations Year 1 to 3.pdf
073_2020-21 Annual Examination Board Minutes BEM1 and 2.pdf
074_2020-21 Annual Examination Board Minutes BEM3.pdf
075_2019-20 Annual Examination Board Minutes BEM1 and 2.pdf
076_2019-20 Annual Examination Board Minutes BEM3.pdf
077_2019-20-S1_Markers' report form_BEM1 Computer Science.pdf
078_2019-20-S1_1st marker completion checklist_BEM1 Computer Science.pdf
079_2019-20-S1_2nd marker completion checklist_BEM1 Computer Science.pdf

080_2019-20-S1_Exam cover_BEM1 Computer Science.pdf
081_2020-21-S1_Markers Report form_BEM2 Probability and Statistics.pdf
082_2020-21-S1_1st markers completion checklist_BEM2 Probability and Statistics.pdf
083_2020-21-S1_2nd markers completion checklist_BEM2 Probability and Statistics.pdf
084_2020-21-S1_Exam cover_BEM2 Probability and Statistics.pdf
085_Standardisation evidence for Macroeconomics.pdf
086_Academic writing workshop material.pdf
087_BEM1 September 2020 timetable including writing workshop.pdf
088_External Examiners Action Plan.pdf
089_2022 Executive MBA project.pdf
090_December 19 Extracurricular Activities Committee Minutes.pdf
091_2021 International Management Summer School_Final Grades.pdf
092_2021 Finance Summer School_Final Grades.pdf
093_March 21 BEM Course Board Minutes.pdf
094_2020-21 S2 BEM UCL final grades.pdf
095_Internship Agreement.pdf
096_Employee annual appraisal template.pdf
097_Probation review form template.pdf
098_Vice President Universite Paris Dauphine - PSL_CV.pdf
099_Chair of BEM Course Board_CV short version.pdf
100_Chair of Summer Course Board_CV.pdf
101_Chair of BEM one semester Law Track Course Board_CV.pdf
102_Chair of the Executive MBA Course Board_CV.pdf
103_Dean of Student Life_CV.pdf
104_February 2021 Board of Directors Minutes.pdf
105_Senior Programmes Administrator_CV.pdf
106_Senior Programmes Administrator_Job Description.pdf
107_Chair of the Academic Board_Role Description.pdf
108_Module Leader_Job description.pdf
109_Contract Law Lecturer_Job description.pdf
110_Statistics Applied to Management Lecturer_Job description.pdf
111_Executive summary for the June 2021 Board of Directors.pdf
112_2019-20_Standardisation evidence for English and Communicationpdf.pdf
113_2020-21_Academic Calendar.pdf
114_Budget 21-22 (approved by Board of Directors June 2021).pdf
115_May 21 Board of Directors Minutes.pdf
116_2021-22 email invitation for staff induction.pdf
117_2020-21 staff induction email.pdf
118_2020-21 Student representative election information email.pdf
119_2021-22 Student representative election information email.pdf
120_2020-21 HPL staff induction presentation.pdf
121_2020-21 S1 BEM student representatives meeting minutes.pdf
122_BEM1 and 2 student representatives meeting minutes following lockdown announcement.pdf

123_Report on the EMBA Steering Committee.pdf
124_Responsibilities checklist.pdf
125_Evidence English Consultancy Work Record.pdf
126_BEM1 Selection committee report.pdf
127_BEM2 Selection committee report.pdf
128_BEM3 Selection committee report.pdf
129_21-22 BEM programme structure.pdf
130_HR_Permanent Lecturer recruitment procedure v2.pdf
131_2019-20_Management_External Examiner Annual Report.pdf
132_2019-20_Economics_External Examiner Annual Report.pdf
133_2019 Teaching Observation Form.pdf
134_09 April 21 Student Representatives Meeting_Key Actions.pdf
135-19 April 21 Student Representatives Meeting_Key Actions.pdf
136_BEM cohort indicators.pdf
137_Special Education Needs Report.pdf
138_June 2019 Board of Directors Agenda.pdf
139_January 2020 Board of Directors Agenda.pdf
140_June 2021 Newsletter.pdf
141_2020-21_Employability skills student survey.pdf
142_2020 Teaching Observation Form_English and Communication 201.pdf
143_2021 Teaching Observation Form_Ecological challenges for the 21st century.pdf
144_2021 Teaching Observation Form_Microeconomics.pdf
145_Lecturer Observation Form_Template.pdf
146_2019-20_Employability skills student survey.pdf
147_2019-20 S1_BEM3_Introduction to Marketing module handbook.pdf
148_2020-21 S1_BEM2_Microeconomics module handbook.pdf
149_2020-21 S2_BEM2_GCI module handbook.pdf
150_2019-20 S1_BEM1_English and Communication module handbook.pdf
151_2019-20 S1_BEM1_Computer Science module handbook.pdf
152_2019-20-S1_BEM3_Introduction to Marketing final exam.pdf
153_2020-21 S1_BEM2_Microeconomics final exam.pdf
154_2020-21 S1_BEM2_GCI final exam.pdf
155_2019-20 S1_BEM1_English and Communication final exam.pdf
156_2019-20 S1_BEM1_Computer Science final exam.pdf
157_HR and Quality Manager_Job description.pdf
158_2019-20_English and Communication_Module Leader Annual Report.pdf
159_2020-21_English and Communication_Module Leader Annual Report.pdf

Evidence submitted 1 November 2021

[SS] Student Submission

160_Finance Summer School_Programme Booklet.pdf
161_BEM Examination Board Procedure.pdf
162_2019-20_Marketing_External Moderation.pdf
163_2019-20_Macroeconomics_External Moderation.pdf

164_2020-21_Global Contemporary Issues_External Moderation.pdf
165_2019-20_Computer Science_External Moderation.pdf
166_2020-21_Linear Algebra_External Moderation.pdf
167_BEM Marking Criteria for Presentations.pdf
168_BEM Marking Criteria for Course Participation.pdf
169_BEM Marking Criteria for Essays Reports.pdf
170_Universite Paris-Dauphine London- Strategy of Community Engagement.pdf
171_Career and future study conference.pdf
172_██████████_Internship offers.pdf
173_██████████_Internship offer.pdf
174_██████_nternship offer.pdf
175_██████_Internship offer.pdf
176_████████████████████_Internship offer.pdf
177_Find internship in London.pdf
178_Alumni breakfast.pdf
179_Job Description for Student Tutors.pdf
180_Cover Letter Applications Introductory Workshop 2021.pdf
181_Soft Skills and Employability BEM3.pdf
182_2021_Career forum booklet.pdf
183_Mock interviews feedback.pdf
184_CV to land an internship.pdf

Evidence submitted 10 November 2021

185 14. 2020 Trustees report.pdf
186 2021-22 Bursary Commission July 2021_V1 (1).xlsx
187 20210305_Access_and_participation_statement_fv.pdf
188 Student Ambassador Training 2021 22.docx
189 Student Ambassador Training Agenda.docx
190 Education Coach JD (2).docx
191 ██████████ 2020 Student Ambassadors training.pdf
192 PROGRAMME FINAL LIVRET V4 SEMINAIRE 2019.docx

Evidence submitted 11 November 2021

193 Final exam feedback request 2.pdf
194 Final exam feedback request 3.pdf
195 Final exam feedback request.pdf
196 Academic essay writing for new arrivals in S2.pptx
197 Academic essay writing workshop with teacher info.pptx
198 YEAR 1 - STUDY SKILLS INTRO.pptx
199 YEAR 3 - Study Skills.pptx
200 YR2_WORKSHOP - ESSAY FOR ANALYSIS with teacher notes.docx
201 YR2_WORKSHOP - ESSAY FOR ANALYSIS.docx
202 YR2_WORKSHOP - ESSAY FOR ANALYSIS.odt
203 Harmonisation evidence.pdf

204 Harmonisation evidence Digital humanities Final grades 2021- updated2.xlsx
205 BEM applicants and students indicators.xlsx
206 136bis_BEM cohort indicators in number.pdf
207 Moodle_General Information space.pdf
208 Final grade feedback (002).pdf
209 2017_Convention PDI-UPD English.pdf
210 Statement of decision_President_March 2021_English_translation (1).pdf
211 Teaching Observation Policy_21-22 v1.docx
212 Jury Points Statement 11.11.21 v1.docx

Evidence submitted 12 November 2021

213 Continuous Assessment Feedback Monitoring.xlsx

Meeting with students [M1]

Meeting with senior staff from UPD-PSL [M2]

Meeting with staff PDI and UPD-PSL around assessment, grading and harmonization [M3]

Meeting with PDI senior staff [M4]

Meeting with Academic staff [M5]

Meeting with professional staff [M6]

Final meeting with senior staff [M7]

Virtual tour of the PDI campus [VT]

Teaching observations [OBS]

Assessed Student Work [ASW]

QAA2697 - R13210 - Sep 22

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2022
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB
Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786

Tel: 01452 557000
Web: www.qaa.ac.uk