

2. External Quality Assurance

As an independent, private provider, ICD Business School is subject to both the 'core statutory' (QQI 2016a) and 'sector specific' (QQI 2016b) QA guidelines developed by Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI), the statutory body responsible for the external quality assurance of the college. ICD received approval from HETAC for its Quality Assurance (QA) policies and procedures in 2006 and offered its first HETAC approved programme – the BA (Honours) in Accounting and Finance - in 2007. This was joined shortly after by the BA (Honours) in Business Studies in 2009. In 2012, ICD offered its first HETAC-validated level-nine programme in the form of the Master of Arts in Accounting and Finance.

This quality assurance framework is informed by QQI's *Core Statutory Quality Assurance Guidelines* (QQI 2016a), *Policy on Quality Assurance Guidelines* (2016c), and *Statutory Quality Assurance Guidelines developed by QQI for Independent/Private Providers coming to QQI on a Voluntary Basis* (QQI 2016b). This framework also takes account of QQI's *Code of Practice for Provision of Programmes of Education and Training to International Learners* (QQI 2015a), *Protection of Enrolled Learners: Protocols for the Implementation of Part 6 of the 2012 Act* (QQI 2013a), *QQI Policy Restatement: Policy and Criteria for Access, Transfer and Progression in Relation to Learners for Providers of Further and Higher Education and Training* (QQI 2015b), the NQAI's *Principles and Operational Guidelines for the Recognition of Prior Learning in Further and Higher Education and Training* (NQAI 2005), CEDEFOP's *European Guidelines for Validating Non-formal and Informal Learning* (CEDEFOP 2009). ICD's policies for information and data management follows QQI's *Notice to Voluntary Providers of Education and Training Programmes Leading to QQI Awards regarding the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the use of the Personal Public Service Number (PPSN)* (QQI 2018).

In addition to the college's internal programme management and quality assurance policy and infrastructure (see Appendix 2 for summary of QA infrastructure at ICD), ICD is subject to the following externally monitored controls:

QQI (Re) Validation: ICD must submit its programmes for quinquennial review to Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI) for the purpose of (re)validation. Validation is a regulatory process that determines if a QQI award can be offered in respect of an individual programme. As part of this process, an independent panel will prepare a report which determines each programme's quality and fitness for purpose, including its established quality assurance arrangements and procedures for the assessment of learners. Any modifications recommended by the independent panel will be integrated

into a revised programme which is fully compliant with QQI's core policies and criteria for validation (QQI 2017a). Quinquennial QQI revalidation – which is preceded by a (minimum) year-long process of internal review - is the main process by which ICD updates and modifies its existing programmes and associated QA procedures.

Cyclical Institutional Review: The College is subject to reengagement and reviews by QQI and must participate meaningfully in these processes to ensure continued enhancement of quality in line with external guidance and feedback.

Standards Verification and External Examination: A key external quality assurance mechanism, external examiners provide independent and impartial advice - and informed comment - on academic standards, assessment, and learner achievement. In addition to verifying marks and objectively judging student attainment against intended learning outcomes, external examiners also assist ICD by evaluating and critiquing its programmes and assessment strategies more generally. External examiners are independent experts working in other higher education institutions with disciplinary specialisations that are appropriate to ICD's course offerings.

ACCA: In addition to quinquennial QQI revalidation, ICD submits its accounting programmes to the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants for exemption accreditation. As part of this process, the college is required to provide detailed programme documents, syllabus materials, and examination papers to ACCA's professional qualifications approval team, who review ICD's offerings for quality and comparability. In this sense, ACCA acts as an effective external quality control for ICD's relevant programmes.

The BA (Hons) in Accounting & Finance has exemption accreditation from Association of Chartered Accountants (ACCA) for the following examination papers:

- Accountant in Business (AB)
- Management Accountant (MA)
- Financial Accounting (FA)
- Corporate and Business Law (LW)
- Performance Management (PM)

- Taxation (TX)
- Financial Reporting (FR)
- Audit and Assurance (AA)
- Financial Management (FM)

The BA (Hons) in Business Studies has ACCA exemption accreditation for:

- Accountant in Business (AB)
- Management Accountant (MA)
- Financial Accounting (FA)
- Corporate and Business Law (LW)
- Taxation (TX)
- Audit and Assurance (AA)

In order to receive exemption accreditation, ICD Business School must submit its programmes to ACCA's professional qualifications approval team for quinquennial review. Exemptions are offered by ACCA only after a full evaluation of the respective programme's syllabus and assessments.

In order to assess for exemption from the ACCA Qualification, the Professional Qualifications Approvals team reviews the syllabus content and assessment methods for each module that contains relevance to any exam at the Applied Knowledge and Applied Skills levels. ACCA also expects all examinations submitted for exemption assessment to be unique to the institution applying for exemption accreditation. The assessments for any individual module or group of modules being considered towards exemption from a particular ACCA exam will be reviewed to ensure that:

- The balance of practice and theory is appropriate to the ACCA exam being considered
- The standard of examination questions and any other relevant assessment method is comparable to the ACCA exam being considered
- Significant areas of the syllabus and all core ACCA examination topic areas are covered
- The structure of the examination and any other relevant assessment method does not allow core ACCA examination topic areas to be avoided
- The mark allocation for individual examination questions is comparable to the ACCA exam being considered.

Exemptions are only awarded when ACCA's approval team are completely satisfied that a programme's learners will have an equivalent level of knowledge and skill matching that achieved by learners who have completed each of its respective papers. Programmes must also comply with the

International Federation of Accountant's (IFAC) provisions for entry requirements, programme content, and assessment methods.

Appendix 2: Reference Table of QA Infrastructure at ICD

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
Academic Council	Academic Council Meetings	Director of Academic Affairs (or Chair of Academic Council if different)	Academic Council Secretary coordinates meetings, collates agenda, convenes meetings, and invites attendees in collaboration with Chair of Academic Council and Head of Academic Development	Council Chair, Director of Academic Affairs, Council Secretary, Registrar, Head of Academic Development, Head of Quality Assurance, Programme Directors, College Librarian, Faculty Members (elected lecturer representatives), External Council Member. Learner Voice (ICD graduate) Learner Rep (currently enrolled learner elected by SRC)	Three meetings per academic year: 1. Prior to autumn semester; 2. Prior to spring semester; 3. After conclusion of college's end of academic year exam board	To Governing Body as appropriate. Minutes of meetings distributed to all staff via college document store (online). Student Representative Committee	Quality assurance, planning, coordination, development and oversight of all academic matters at ICD. An autonomous body that acts, as much as possible, independently of (while still taking prudent regard for) commercial considerations	Chair of Academic Council and Director of Academic Affairs (if different). Academic Council sub-committees as appropriate. Governing Body, as appropriate, e.g. assessing business cases for existing/new programmes, and resourcing requirements

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
Admissions services	Administration office	Prospective or transferring or progressing students	Admin staff	Registrar	During opening hours	Registrar & Academic Council	Enable and fully inform all prospective (and progressing) students about programmes, access requirements, completion requirements and progression routes	Registrar
Elected SRC member of Academic Council	One SRC member (currently enrolled learner) is elected by the SRC to the Academic Council	Head of Academic Development	SRC elects one currently enrolled learner (member of the SRC) to sit on Academic Council	All SRC members	Elected SRC member of Academic Council attends all Academic Council meetings (ordinarily held three times per year). Elected SRC members on Academic Council hold a term of office of one academic year	Academic Council Student Representative Committee	Ensure learner perspectives are considered as centrally important in all decision making at the college's most senior academic committee	Academic Council Student Representative Committee

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
Elected SRC members of Programme Boards	One SRC member per programme is a member of Programme Board	Programme Director	SRC elects one SRC member per programme to sit on Programme Board and attend Programme Board Meetings	All SRC members	Elected SRC members of Programme Boards attend all Programme Board meetings (ordinarily held once per semester). Elected SRC members on Programme Boards hold a term of office of one academic year	Programme Boards Academic Council Student Representative Committee	Ensure learner perspectives are considered as centrally important in all Programme planning	Programme Director All lecturers on Programme Board SRC

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
Elected Student Representatives	Students elect one representative (or more) at each stage on every programme	Head of Academic Development	Programme Director(s)	Students	First weeks of every programme stage	<p>Student representatives report to Student Representative Committee (SRC).</p> <p>Monitoring & ensuring student representatives are in place is carried out by, and reported by Programme Director(s) to Academic Council</p>	<p>Student representatives gather student feedback and represent student welfare and provide representation to students, where requested, as part of appeals, complaints, academic misconduct, general misconduct, or plagiarism processes</p>	SRC, Programme Director(s)

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
Examination and Assessment Regulations	Mandatory induction module, student Moodle document store, and student handbook inform students about examination and assessment regulations	Head of Academic Development & Head of Quality Assurance	<p>Mandatory induction module lecturer(s).</p> <p>Students follow regulations.</p> <p>Staff and students monitor to ensure regulations are followed.</p> <p>Registrar coordinates mechanisms for investigating examination and assessment regulation breaches</p>	<p>Staff</p> <p>Students</p> <p>Registrar</p> <p>Head of Academic Development</p>	Ongoing	Registrar, Director of Academic Affairs & Academic Council	<p>Ensure staff and students maintain academic integrity.</p> <p>Ensure staff and students protect all students' right to perform demonstration of learning outcomes in an environment of professionalism and equality</p>	Registrar, Academic Council, Director of Academic Affairs, Head of Academic Development

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
Examination Board	Meeting of internal assessors, external examiners, programme directors, and Registrar	Registrar convenes meetings	Registrar prepares broadsheets, invites internal and external (External Examiner) attendees	Board of Examiners: External Examiners, Registrar, Programme Directors, Lecturers (examiners / assessors)	Meets at all award and progression stages of programmes	Director of Academic Affairs & Academic Council	To consider and make deliberative decisions regarding all results of learners as recommended by assessors (examiners). Ensure internal and external oversight of assessment grades/results, grading procedures, progression, completion rates, failure rates, award classifications, & decisions around borderline and exceptional cases	Registrar, Academic Council, Director of Academic Affairs, Programme Directors, Lecturers

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
External Independent Academic Council & Governing Body Member	External Independent Academic Council Member Attends Academic Council & Governing Body Meetings	Chair of Academic Council	Academic Council	Governing Body and Academic Council	External Academic Council Member is also a member of Governing Body and is invited to all Academic Council & Governing Body Meeting	Academic Council Governing Body	Ensure the Academic Council has sufficient independence to discharge its obligations and responsibilities effectively. Provide independent oversight and advice to the Academic Council & Governing Body. Promote a culture of integrity, internal self-monitoring and quality improvement	Academic Council Governing Body

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
External Verification of Assessment Grades	Sample pack and Form 102	First marker distributes sample pack and Form 102 to Registrar	Registrar distributes sample pack and Form 102 to External Examiner	External Examiner provides assessment of grades and sample	After internal verification (second marking) of assessment grades is completed	Registrar and Exam Board Meetings receive report (and ideally attendance at Exam Board) from/by External Examiner	External verification of consistency, fairness, and level of all assessment grades	Exam Board Meeting attendees, Programme Director(s), Module Lecturer(s), Registrar
External Verification of Examination Papers	External Examiner Review of all final examination papers	Registrar informs all lecturers of due dates for all exam papers	Module Lecturer(s) provide internally verified exam papers to Registrar. Registrar distributes all final exam papers to External Examiner(s)	External Examiner(s) review(s) exam papers	Middle of every semester	External Examiner provides feedback (recommendations and requirements) regarding each exam paper to Registrar	External verification of quality of assessment instruments	Registrar provides External Examiner exam paper feedback to Module Lecturer who acts on feedback

ICD Business School QA Policy 28 Jan 2020

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
Governing Body	Governing Body meetings	Chair & Secretary of Governing Body	Chair & Secretary of Governing Body	Managing Director Registrar Director of Academic Affairs External Chair of Governing Body External Independent Member of Academic Council & Governing Body Third External Member of Governing Body Learner Voice (ICD Graduate)	At least twice per calendar year	To Board of Directors To Academic Council as appropriate regarding decisions related to academic affairs Annual report to all staff via Document Store (Moodle) To Student Representative Committee	Student recruitment and marketing planning. Resourcing allocations for all programmes and related academic and quality assurance infrastructure Risk monitoring (Risk Register) and mitigation	Managing Director of ICD Secretary & Chair of Governing Body Registrar Academic Council Management Team

ICD Business School QA Policy 28 Jan 2020

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
<p>Grade Appeals</p> <p>* Please note: students cannot appeal grades due to a disagreement or dissatisfaction with the judgment of the examiner. However, students can seek feedback or a recheck or a review by the examiner.</p> <p>If a student has a complaint regarding the assessment process or assessment procedures, they can make a complaint by following the complaints policy (section 7.2.1 of the QA policy)</p>	Grade Appeals Policy	Student follows grade appeals policy specified in QA document. At stage 1 and stage 2, the student must contact the lecturer (examiner). At stage 3, the student must contact the Registrar and the Lecturer (examiner).	<p>Stage 1: Feedback is provided to the student by Examiner (e.g. lecturer).</p> <p>Stage 2: Recheck is carried out by Examiner (e.g. lecturer).</p> <p>Stage 3: Review is carried out by Examiner (e.g. lecturer) and coordinated by Registrar</p>	<p>Examiner and student in stages 1-2.</p> <p>Examiner rechecks (and Registrar coordinates process) in stage 3.</p>	<p>Stage 1: student must seek feedback within two weeks of receiving grade</p> <p>Stage 2: student must seek recheck within one week of stage 1 completion</p> <p>Stage 3: student must seek review within one week of stage 2 completion</p>	<p>Student receives report of outcome from lecturer/examiner at stages 1-3.</p> <p>External Examiner to be notified and/or consulted with if any change in classification is decided at award level as a result of a recheck or a review</p>	<p>Ensuring fairness, consistency, integrity and transparency of the grading system and ensuring students receive formative and summative feedback</p>	<p>Lecturer (Examiner)</p> <p>Registrar</p>

ICD Business School QA Policy 28 Jan 2020

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
Internal Verification (Second Marking) of Assessment Grades	Form 102	Module lecturer distributes sample to second marker	Second marker provides feedback on grades	First and second marker agree all grades	After grading is completed by the first marker for an assessment element and/or module	Registrar is sent final grades, sample pack, and Form 102 by the Module Lecturer (first marker)	Internal verification of consistency, fairness, and level of all assessment grades	Programme Director, Registrar
Internal Verification of Assessment Briefs	Form 101	Module Lecturer(s)	Second Marker / Internal Verifier	Second Marker / Internal Verifier and Module Lecturer	Before assessment briefs are distributed to students	Programme Director, Registrar, External Examiner	Internal monitoring and verification of all new and continuing assessment instruments	Module Lecturer(s), Academic Council, Programme Director(s)
Learner Voice (graduate) on Academic Council and Governing Body	Academic Council and Governing Body appoint Learner Voice (ICD graduate) as full member of both committees	Academic Council and Governing Body	Academic Council and Governing Body appoint a learner voice who holds a term of office of one year duration	Academic Council and Governing Body	Learner Voice is invited to all Governing Body & Academic Council Meetings.	Academic Council Governing Body	Learner Voice sits on Academic Council & Governing Body to represent student needs/welfare and voice/feedback to be included in ongoing programme, module, and broader QA reviews and decision making	Academic Council, Director of Academic Affairs Academic Council Governing Body

ICD Business School QA Policy 28 Jan 2020

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
Lecturer Feedback Survey	Qualitative Survey of lecturer feedback and reflection on every module's delivery, assessments, and resourcing	Programme Director	Programme Director sends survey to all module lecturers on that programme	Module lecturers	At the end of every module	Head of Academic Development, Programme Development sub-committee and Academic Council	Inclusion of lecturer voice and feedback in all programme & module monitoring, review, and improvements	Programme Director and Head of Academic Development

ICD Business School QA Policy 28 Jan 2020

Mandatory Student Induction Module	Mandatory student induction module for every stage 1, semester 1 learner on every programme	Head of Academic Development	Module lecturer(s)	Module lecturer(s) and students (at stage 1, semester 1). Stage 2 (or later) students are given an open invitation to attend.	Semester 1 of Stage 1 of every programme, every academic year from September 2019 onwards	Head of Academic Development, Programme Director(s), Registrar, Director of Academic Affairs, and QQI as appropriate	Inform students about all aspects of academic and student life at ICD including: a. academic study, research, & writing skills b. IT skills (e.g. Moodle & MS Office) c. use of Library Resource centre and other ICD physical and online learning environment facilities d. English language education & supports e. citing & referencing, assessment regulations, academic integrity, misconduct & plagiarism prevention	Head of Academic Development and students themselves
Plagiarism Detection &	Urkund and Plagiarism	Module lecturers	Registrar implements stages	Stage 2: If a viva voce is called with	Urkund can be used by all	Student, Registrar, Lecturer, Head of	Prevent and detect plagiarism	Head of Academic

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
Investigation	Detection Handling Process	<p>create Urkund assignment submission boxes in Moodle (as appropriate), analyse Urkund reports and follow Plagiarism Detection Handling process when detections occur. This requires the lecturer to alert the Registrar (stage 1)</p> <p>Use of Urkund is not a requirement for a plagiarism detection process to result (e.g. the lecturer can manually plagiarism check)</p>	of plagiarism detection handling process in sequence	<p>plagiarism concerns on the agenda, there must be two (or more) staff in attendance.</p> <p>Stage 3: plagiarism review meeting constitutes two (or more) staff. Staff present at stage 2 cannot be present at stage 3.</p> <p>The student is invited at both stage 2 and 3 but is not required to attend for a possible sanction (due to plagiarism) to result.</p> <p>Student representation is available on request for stage 2 & 3 above</p>	<p>lecturers to receive assignments where appropriate.</p> <p>Plagiarism detection handling process is used when plagiarism is detected (either through Urkund or otherwise)</p>	Academic Development, Director of Academic Affairs, Academic Council	in order to promote and maintain academic integrity	Development, Lecturer, and Registrar

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
Plagiarism Detection software upgrade	Urkund	Head of Academic Development	Software management, ongoing staff training & support provided by Head of Academic Development. Plagiarism detection carried out by lecturers	Head of Academic Development. Module Lecturers	Ongoing plagiarism detection following migration to Urkund system (summer 2019)	Head of Academic Development, Director of Academic Affairs, Academic Council	Prevent and detect plagiarism in order to promote and maintain academic integrity	Head of Academic Development

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
<p>Plagiarism Prevention Awareness Initiative</p>	<p>Prevention through mandatory induction module.</p> <p>Prevention through cyclical plagiarism prevention and referencing classes.</p> <p>Prevention through distribution of plagiarism awareness building resources via ICD Moodle, accessible to all students enrolled.</p>	<p>Head of Academic Development</p>	<p>Head of Academic Development</p>	<p>Mandatory induction module lecturer(s).</p> <p>All module lecturers.</p> <p>Head of Academic Development.</p> <p>Consultations with QQI</p>	<p>Mandatory induction module during semester one, stage one, of every programme.</p>	<p>Head of Academic Development, Academic Council, and QQI (as appropriate)</p>	<p>Promote academic integrity and prevent plagiarism</p>	<p>Director of Academic Affairs, Head of Quality Assurance, and Head of Academic Development</p>

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
Programme Boards	Programme Board Meetings	Programme Director	Programme Director	Programme Director All lecturers involved with programme Elected SRC programme representative	Twice per year (once per semester, to meet at beginning of the semester)	Academic Council (and Programme Development Subcommittee)	Continuous coordination and implementation of programmes. Continuous monitoring and review of programmes to ensure quality deliver and to recommend changes to improve programmes	Programme Director and programme board members

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
Programme Development Subcommittee	Programme Development Subcommittee meetings	Head of Academic Development	Head of Academic Development	Head of Academic Development Programme Director(s) Academic staff members (lecturers)	Ad hoc	Academic Council and Governing Body	<p>Continuous monitoring of implementation of programmes.</p> <p>Continuous monitoring and review of programmes to ensure quality deliver and to recommend changes to improve programmes.</p> <p>Considering proposals (received and made) for modifications to programmes.</p> <p>Considering and creating proposals for new programmes.</p> <p>Making evidence-based recommendations regarding programme development</p>	Head of Academic Development

ICD Business School QA Policy 28 Jan 2020

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
RPL / APEL Appeals	RPL / APEL Appeals Process	(Prospective) student intending to appeal contacts Registrar	Registrar and admin staff convene appeal board meeting and invite attendees	Ad-hoc RPL/APEL Appeal Board: Two (or more) academic staff. Person making appeal. Student rep, on request	Ad-hoc	Registrar and admin staff receive RPL/APEL Appeal Board decision. Report to Academic Council (and External Examiner where required) Student making appeal	Ensure all (prospective) students receive fair, consistent, appropriate, and transparent outcomes from RPL/APEL applications	Registrar and Academic Council
RPL / APEL Applications	RPL / APEL Applications Process (described in ICD QA policy)	(Prospective) student intending to apply for RPL / RPEL recognition / approval contacts Registrar or admin office	Registrar and admin staff guide student applying through application process	Applicant (student or respective student), and admin staff or Registrar	Ad-hoc	Registrar and/or admin staff report RPL/APEL application outcome to the applicant and Academic Council (and External Examiner where required)	Ensure all (prospective) students receive fair, consistent, appropriate, and transparent outcomes from RPL/APEL applications	Registrar and Academic Council

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
Staff Development	Staff Development and Training Initiatives	Head of Academic Development	Head of Academic Development plans annual schedule of staff development initiatives in conjunction with Management Team, Academic Council and Governing Body as required.	All staff	Ongoing	Head of Quality Assurance, Director of Academic Affairs, Registrar, Academic Council and Governing Body as appropriate	Promoting continuous professional development of all staff (academic and non-academic) in order to maintain the highest possible quality faculty and staff, which ultimately delivers on the overall quality assurance objective of continuous improvement of teaching and learning at ICD	Head of Academic Development and Director of Academic Affairs

ICD Business School QA Policy 28 Jan 2020

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
Student Complaints (does not include appeal of grades)	Student Complaints handling procedure (covers student complaints about academic process, or academic opportunities, or non-academic complaints)	Student with complaints or concerns (regarding student protection or unfair or unequal treatment) contacts any member of ICD staff (of their choosing). If the student is not satisfied with the outcome, they should contact the Registrar	Registrar will try to find a solution to solve the issue with the student (Stage 1). If not satisfied with the outcome of stage 1, the student may request stage 2 : a complaints committee	Stage 1: Registrar and student Stage 2: Chair of Academic Council (or nominee) and two other members of staff will meet the student to work towards a solution At both stages 1 & 2, the student may request student representation	Ad-hoc	Registrar and Academic Council	Student protection, and fair and equal treatment of all students	Registrar, Academic Council, & Chair of Academic Council

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
<p>Student Misconduct Sanctions</p> <p>*This is NOT the process for plagiarism investigations. Plagiarism detections must follow the Plagiarism Detection & Investigation procedure, known as the Plagiarism Detection Handling Process</p>	Disciplinary Committee	<p>Staff or students report instances of misconduct to the Registrar. This includes either:</p> <p>a. academic misconduct (including breaches of academic regulations) (but not plagiarism)</p> <p>or b. non-academic general misconduct (e.g. a student endangering, bullying, or harassing another student or member of staff)</p>	<p>Stage 1: Registrar invites two (or more) staff to form disciplinary committee. Student is invited to discuss issues relating to potential misconduct.</p> <p>If the student is not satisfied with the outcome of stage 1, the Registrar activates stage 2, a disciplinary review involving two (or more) staff. None of the staff from stage 1 may be present. Student is invited to discuss the issue.</p> <p>Student has right to representation on request at stage 1 & 2</p>	Registrar, two (or more) staff, the student, and student representation (on request)	<p>Disciplinary committees are formed ad-hoc when misconduct issues arise.</p> <p>For stage 2 to occur, the student must request a review within one (1) week of receiving the outcome from stage 1</p>	Registrar and student and Academic Council	Promoting and maintaining respect and good conduct at ICD, to protect all staff & students from other students' possible misconduct. To ensure academic and assessment regulations are followed so that all students have equal opportunity to learn and demonstrate learning. To maintain academic integrity.	Registrar & Academic Council

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
Student Representative Committee (SRC)	SRC meetings	Head of Academic Development	Student representatives	Student representatives	Once per semester	SRC elected members of Programme Boards Academic Council	Ensure student representatives are actively procuring student feedback and representing student needs. Gather student feedback to be communicated to Programme Boards and Academic Council	Director of Academic Affairs, SRC members of Programme Boards, Head of Academic Development, Programme Directors Programme Boards
Student Services	Administration office	Student or prospective student contacts administration office	Admin staff	Admin staff acting on behalf of the student with Registrar as chief point of contact and consultation	During opening hours	Registrar & Academic Council	Maintain quality through ensuring students have full access to all required and requested information, facilities, and supports (including specific learning needs and extenuating or personal circumstances)	Admin staff

QA Infrastructure (What)	QA Instrument (How)	Who Initiates (responsible for action)	Who Implements	Who Contributes / Participates	When	Reports of Outcome(s) Delivered to (Who)	Key Outcome Objective(s)	Key Outcome Owner(s) (Who Acts on Outcomes)
Student Survey	Quantitative Survey of Student Feedback	Registrar	Admin staff	Students (survey for every module)	Final weeks of every semester	Registrar, Programme Director(s), Relevant Lecturer(s), Head of Quality Assurance, Academic Council	Include student voice in all module & programme reviewing, planning, & improvements	Programme Director(s), Lecturer(s), Registrar, Head of Quality Assurance
<p>Viva Voce</p> <p>*A viva voce may be called as a general viva voce to discuss an assessment with a student (this requires just one member of staff)</p> <p>*If a viva voce is called with plagiarism on the agenda, it must be attended by two (or more) academic staff. See plagiarism detection & investigation.</p>	Viva Voce Meeting(s)	Examiner	Examiner invites student to attend	<p>Examiner (other staff may be invited).</p> <p>Student.</p>	<p>Ad-hoc (based on discretion of examiner/ assessor)</p> <p>Before grading process completes</p>	<p>Student</p> <p>Examiner may contact other staff as required for consultation or assistance</p>	<p>Ensure integrity, accuracy, transparency, and fairness (equality) within assessment and grading through facilitating a two-way dialogue between student and examiner(s) about the assessment submission</p>	Examiner

REFERENCES

- Andrews, J. and Higson, H. (2008) Graduate employability, 'soft skills' versus 'hard' business knowledge: A European study. *Higher education in Europe*, 33(4), pp. 411-422.
- Baker, J. Wesley (2000) The classroom flip: becoming the guide by the side. Council for Christian Colleges & Universities (CCCU) Annual Technology Conference, June 23. Available from: http://classroomflip.com/files/baker_2000_06_23_classroom_flip_CCCU.pdf
- Bowl, M. (2001) Experiencing the barriers: Non-traditional students entering higher education. *Research papers in Education*, 16(2), pp.141-160. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Marion_Bowl/publication/248995300_Experiencing_the_barriers_Non-traditional_students_entering_higher_education/links/55b7539508ae9289a08be032.pdf
- CEDEFOP (2009) European Guidelines for Validating Non-Formal and Informal Learning. European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. Available from: https://www.cedefop.europa.eu/files/4054_en.pdf
- Durden, G. C., & Ellis, L. V. (1995) The effects of attendance on student learning in principles of economics. *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings*, 85(May), pp. 242-346
- European Committee on Culture, Science and Education (2003) Council of Europe Contribution to the Higher Education Area Report. European Parliamentary Assembly, Doc. 9880, 16 July. Available from: <http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/X2H-Xref-ViewHTML.asp?FileID=10237&lang=en>
- Grand-Clement, S. (2017) *Digital Learning: Education Skills in the Digital Age*, Cambridge; Santa Monica, CA.
- HEA (2016) *Enhancing Student Engagement in Decision-Making. Report of the Working Group on Student Engagement in Irish Higher Education*, Higher Education Authority, April. Available from: <http://www.iaa.ie/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/HEA-IRC-Student-Engagement-Report-Apr2016.pdf>
- Karakaya, Fahri, Ainscough, Thomas L., and Chopoorian, John (2001) The effects of class size and learning style on student performance in a multimedia-based marketing course. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 23(2) August pp. 84-90
- Lamdin, D. J. (1996) Evidence of student attendance as an independent variable in education production-functions. *Journal of Educational Research*, 89(3), pp. 155-62.
- Martin, A. & Grudziecki, J. (2006) *DigEuLit: Concepts and Tools for Digital Literacy Development*. *Innovation in Teaching and Learning in Information and Computer Sciences*, 5(4), pp. 249-67.
- NQAI (2005) *Principles and Operational Guidelines for the Recognition of Prior Learning in Further and Higher Education and Training*. National Qualifications Authority of Ireland. Available from: <https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Principles%20and%20Operational%20Guidelines%20for%20RPL%202005.pdf>
- OECD (2016) *Skills for a Digital World: Policy Brief on the Future of Work.*, Paris. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/employment/future-of-work/>
- OECD (2017) *OECD Digital Economy Outlook 2017*, Paris: OECD Publishing.
- QAA (2013) *UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Part B: Assuring and Enhancing Academic Quality, Chapter B9: Academic Appeals and Student Complaints*. Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, UK. Available from: https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/quality-code/chapter-b9_-_academic-appeals-and-student-complaints.pdf?sfvrsn=c002f781_8

QQI (2013a) Protection of Enrolled Learners: Protocols for the Implementation of Part 6 of the 2012 Act. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin. Available from:

<https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Policy%20for%20Protection%20of%20Enrolled%20Learners%20V2%20Sep%202013.pdf>

QQI (2013b) Assessment and Standards, Revised 2013. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin. Available from:

https://www.qqi.ie/Publications/Publications/Assessment_and_Standards%20Revised%202013.pdf

QQI (2015a) Code of Practice for Provision of Programmes of Education and Training to International Learners. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin.

<https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Code%20of%20Practice.pdf>

QQI (2015b) QQI Policy Restatement: Policy and Criteria for Access, Transfer and Progression in Relation to Learners for Providers of Further and Higher Education and Training. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin.

<https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/ATP%20Policy%20Restatement%20FINAL%202018.pdf>

QQI (2016a) Core Statutory Quality Assurance Guidelines. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin. Available from:

<https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Core%20Statutory%20Quality%20Assurance%20Guidelines.pdf>

QQI (2016b) Sector-specific Quality Assurance Guidelines for Independent/Private Providers. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin. Available from:

<https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Sector%20Specific%20Quality%20Assurance%20Guidelines%20V2.pdf>

QQI (2016c) Policy on Quality Assurance Guidelines. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin. Available from:

<https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Policy%20on%20Quality%20Assurance%20Guidelines.pdf>

QQI (2017a) Policies and Criteria for Validation of Programmes. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin. Available from:

https://www.qqi.ie/Publications/Publications/Initial_Validation_policy_7_10_13.pdf

QQI (2017b) Quality within Higher Education 2017: A Summary Report. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin. Available from: <https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Quality%20within%20Higher%20Education%202017%20Summary%20report.pdf>

QQI (2018) Notice to Voluntary Providers of Education and Training Programmes Leading to QQI Awards regarding the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the use of the Personal Public Service Number (PPSN). Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin. Available from: [https://qhelp.qqi.ie/providers/gdpr-additionalresponsibilities/PProvider%20DP%20Letter%20010820_18%20\(002\).pdf](https://qhelp.qqi.ie/providers/gdpr-additionalresponsibilities/PProvider%20DP%20Letter%20010820_18%20(002).pdf)

QQI (2019a) Re-engagement with QQI: Process Guide for Independent and Private Providers. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin. Available from:

<https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Reengagement%20Application%20Guide%20may%202019.pdf>

QQI (2019b) Access, Transfer, and Progression. QQI Website, Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin. Available from: <https://www.qqi.ie/Articles/Pages/Access,-Transfer-and-Progression.aspx>

Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act (2012, Revised 2014) Government of Ireland. Available from

[https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Qualifications%20and%20Quality%20Assurance%20\(Education%20and%20Training\)%20Act%202012%20-%20Revised%20November%202014.pdf](https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Qualifications%20and%20Quality%20Assurance%20(Education%20and%20Training)%20Act%202012%20-%20Revised%20November%202014.pdf)

StudentSurvey.ie (2018) The Irish Survey of Student Engagement (ISSE): Results from 2018. Available

from <http://studentsurvey.ie/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/ISSE-Report-2018final.pdf>