



## **BRITISH ACCREDITATION COUNCIL INSPECTION REPORT**

### **SUPPLEMENTARY INSPECTION END OF PROBATION**

**INSTITUTION:** International University in Geneva

**ADDRESS:** 20 Route de Pre-Bois  
Geneva  
1215  
Switzerland

**HEAD OF INSTITUTION:** Mr Eric Willumsen

**TYPE OF ACCREDITATION:** Independent Higher Education

**ACCREDITATION STATUS:** Not accredited

**DATE OF INSPECTION:** 2-3 October 2017

**ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE DECISION ON ACCREDITATION AND DATE:** Accredited 19 October 2017

## **PART A - INTRODUCTION**

### **1. Background to the institution**

The International University in Geneva (the University) was established in 1997 as a for-profit institution. In 2003, it became a Swiss not-for-profit foundation. It aims to provide quality education for students who wish to progress to careers in business and management globally. It strives to foster a balance between academic and practical programmes that are delivered by faculty who have strong practical backgrounds in a variety of business and management fields.

The University delivers a range of undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. It has agreements with a large number of international higher education institutions around the world. Most of these are for student and staff exchanges but there are three agreements for joint degrees with institutions in Russia, Mexico and Columbia. It also has an agreement with the University of Plymouth, which enables its successful postgraduate students to progress to Doctoral programmes in Business Administration and Public Administration.

At the time of the initial accreditation inspection, plans were underway to extend the agreement with Plymouth to include undergraduate provision. In January 2017 an additional agreement was signed to enable the award of a dual degree for commencing with students entering their third year in September 2018. This will result in students potentially achieving a dual award comprising the University in Geneva business administration degree and the Plymouth BA (Hons) Business Management degree.

The University is located in a suburb of Geneva close to the airport. Its premises are located on the ground floor of a large convention centre which is occupied by a variety of other organisations.

### **2. Brief description of the current provision**

The University delivers a range of undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. At undergraduate level, it delivers a Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) together with a range of Bachelor of Arts awards in business and management-related subjects. At postgraduate level, it delivers a Masters of Business Administration, a Masters of Business Administration in Sales and Marketing and a range of Masters awards in business and management-related subjects. The vast majority of students are studying on a full-time basis.

The University's programmes are accredited by two external organisations. These are the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programmes (ASBSP) and the International Assembly for Collegiate Business Education (IACBE). Both these organisations are recognised by the Council on Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) in the United States of America.

Current student numbers are 142 full time equivalents. Students come from a wide range of countries within and outside of the European Union. A small majority of students are male.

### **3. Inspection process**

This second supplementary inspection was carried out by the original lead inspector over a two-day period. It involved a desk-based review of responses made by the University to the report of the first supplementary inspection and email correspondence with the University

### **4. Inspection history**

Accreditation inspection: 25-26 May 2016

Supplementary: 22 December 2016 & 2 & 10-11 January 2017

## 5. Background to supplementary inspection

The University was subject to its first accreditation inspection in May 2016. The inspection team's report contained a significant number of actions and some recommendations. The Accreditation Committee felt that the most appropriate outcome was to defer accreditation and provide the University with the opportunity to respond to the actions and recommendations. The University provided responses and associate documentation which resulted in the first supplementary inspection which took place in December 2016 and January 2017 via a desk-based review. This inspection concluded that whilst some actions had been addressed satisfactorily, two had not been met and others had been only partially met. This gave rise to some new actions and recommendations.

Following consideration of the report of this supplementary inspection, the Accreditation Committee conferred accreditation for a six-month period subject to the provision of an action plan and monthly reports to be made on progress in addressing the outstanding actions of the supplementary inspection. It also proposed that a second supplementary inspection should take place at the end of the six-month period to consider the University's progress. This took the form of a second desk-based review of responses and additional evidence as provided by the University. The supplementary inspection was carried out by the Lead Inspector from the initial inspection.

### PART B – JUDGMENTS AND EVIDENCE

**The following judgments and comments are based upon the additional evidence provided by the institution and seen by the inspector:**

#### 1. Response to high priority action points in the previous report, including areas still to be addressed:

*5.1 The University must articulate its validation and approval process for programmes to include the criteria which must be met for programmes to be validated to include the use of external reference points and the requirements for external academic input*

The University has clearly articulated its validation and approval process which is referred to in its IUG Academic Quality Management Overview and its Academic Scrutiny Diagram. The Programme Approval and Review policy provides the detail of the process which aims to ensure that all programmes meet the required academic standards. The policy applies to all programmes and includes criteria against which a validation panel evaluates the programme for approval. These criteria reflect those widely used in UK higher education. The constitution of a validation panel is set down and this includes external independent membership. The validation panel uses a range of documentation, including the programme specification in its approval decision. This documentation requires reference to external reference points including relevant benchmarks.

*9.2 The University must provide evidence to demonstrate that module-specific assessment criteria are linked to the module outcomes*

The University has introduced a Module Specification and Assessment Brief which includes all aspects of the module in terms of module content and assessment. The assessment information clearly indicates the learning outcomes which are to be assessed via each of the module assessments.

*9.8 The University must provide evidence to demonstrate how it will implement internal scrutiny and moderation of assessment*

The University has articulated its process within the Module Specification and Assessment Brief Approval Policy. This requires that all assessments are subject to scrutiny and approval by the relevant head of department. An internal moderation is being phased in with the aim of having all modules on all programmes subject to internal moderation by the start of academic year 2018/19. The policy identifies internal and external moderators and

requires the moderation of 3 pieces of work from each assessment or 10 per cent where group sizes exceed 30 students. The policy includes reference to action to be taken where there are discrepancies between the marking of the first marker and the internal moderation. The outcomes of the internal moderation process are captured on the IUG Assessment Cover sheet which has been re-designed to provide for this. The process and policy provides for external moderation.

*25.6 The University must implement a periodic review process through which the University regularly reviews its provision*

The University has articulated its process for periodic review and this is contained in the IUF Programme Approval and Review Policy. This provides for periodic review on a 5-yearly cycle and uses external independent input. The process aims to ensure that programmes remain relevant to students and the market and maintains academic standards. The process begins with the provision of a Periodic Programme Review and Revalidation template which requires an initial evaluation of the programme(s) to date to include the use of relevant metrics and feedback from students and staff. This is considered by a periodic review panel which uses set criteria to reach its conclusions. The outcomes of a periodic review could require that a programme is revalidated although the policy does not state whether the periodic review panel has the power to revalidate or whether a programme is then required to follow the programme validation and approval process.

**2. Response to medium priority action points in the previous report, including areas still to be addressed:**

*25.7 The University must ensure that its periodic review process includes externality*

This action has been met in full through the University's response to the high priority action for key indicator 25.6 above

*25.8 The University must formally document its policies and procedures for academic quality management*

The University has documented all of its academic policies and procedures and this has resulted in a very comprehensive set of academic quality management policies and procedures. These cover everything from programme validation and approval, annual and periodic review, assessment marking and moderation, student and staff feedback, attendance and punctuality faculty appraisal and policy review.

**3. Response to low priority action points in the previous report, including areas still to be addressed:**

There were no low priority actions in the previous report.

**4. Response to recommended areas for improvement in last report:**

*The University may wish to review the practice of having the person who sets the examination as the sole invigilator.*

Faculty no longer invigilate examinations. The IUG Examination Regulations Policy clearly states that examinations are invigilated by a professor who is not responsible for teaching the course.

*The University may wish to articulate its requirements with regard to the modules which do require external examination, its criteria for the appointment of external examiners, the size of assessment samples for external moderation and the permitted length of service of external examiners.*

The role of external examiners is now clearly defined in the IUG Programme Approval and Review Policy and the process is defined in the IUG Module Assessment Moderation policy. This includes reference to the sample size for moderation.

*The University may wish to re-visit its new policies and procedures and ensure that, where relevant, they clearly indicate any specific processes which flow from the policy or procedure.*

The University has fully documented all its policies and procedures in a comprehensive set of documents which clearly indicates policy and process

*The University may wish to re-visit its academic appraisal process to clarify the difference or relationship between the staff appraisal and faculty appraisal. It may also wish to consider how the outcomes of faculty peer review will be captured within the staff appraisal process and inform decisions regarding performance evaluation, future development needs and targets.*

The University has defined the difference between what it defines as faculty and what it defines as staff within its IUG Staff and Faculty Appraisal templates. This provides for the occasions where University members may fall into both categories and are therefore subject to both appraisal processes. The University has updated and combined its Faculty Appraisal with its peer review process to ensure that faculty appraisal is informed by the outcomes of peer review.

*The University could enhance its annual monitoring process at programme level through the inclusion of student and staff feedback and a requirement for the setting of specific targets and actions.*

The University has now included a requirement for reference to staff and student feedback within its review processes as defined within its IUG Programme Approval and Review Policy. In particular, it has introduced an IUG Annual Faculty Feedback Survey. The annual review process also requires reference to programme-related targets.

**PART C – CONCLUSION, INCLUDING ANY ACTIONS OR RECOMMENDATIONS ARISING FROM THIS INSPECTION OR STILL REQUIRING ATTENTION FROM THE PREVIOUS INSPECTION**

The University has made very detailed responses to the actions and recommendations of the previous report. It has met all the actions with only one, which has given rise to a recommendation.

<b>ACTIONS STILL REQUIRED FROM PREVIOUS INSPECTION</b>	<b>Priority H/M/L</b>
None	

<b>ACTIONS REQUIRED FROM THIS INSPECTION</b>	<b>Priority H/M/L</b>
None	

<b>RECOMMENDED AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT</b>
The University may wish to re-visit its periodic review process to provide clarity over the process to be followed when the outcomes of a periodic review recommends that revalidation is required.