

IEU Internal Quality Assurance Framework

Public reference for academic quality controls, quality responsibilities, programme oversight and continuous improvement.

1. Purpose, scope and principles

This public quality framework explains how IEU intends to design, evidence, review and improve the services and academic pathways within its direct control. It covers programme information, digital learning provision, learner support, academic records, assessment coordination, partner communications and governance controls. It does not replace the regulations of an authorised awarding institution.

- Accuracy: claims about programme availability, qualifications, ECTS, partners and awards must be documented and programme-specific.
- Student-centred practice: learning outcomes, support channels, access and fair assessment are considered together.
- Evidence over assertion: quality decisions rely on records and verifiable indicators, not promotional claims.
- Proportionality: review intensity reflects risk, programme level and mode of delivery.
- Continuous improvement: every material issue has an accountable owner, action and follow-up review.

2. Academic quality architecture

Control domain	Core expectation	Typical evidence
Programme design	Learning outcomes, curriculum mapping, level, workload and award description are explicit.	Approved programme specification; study-plan map
Admission and progression	Entry requirements, permitted credit decisions, progression rules and transfers are transparent.	Criteria; admission decisions; records
Learning and teaching	Content, assessment, teaching supervision and digital accessibility are fit for purpose.	Course review; rubrics; support records
Quality and student voice	Surveys, suggestions, complaints and academic appeals use distinct channels.	Survey log; case handling records
Awarding-partner coordination	Academic authority, teaching roles, records and certificates are contractually defined per pathway.	Partner agreement; approved pathway facts
Review and improvement	Programmes and delivery are periodically reviewed and actions are tracked to closure.	Review record; improvement plan

3. Responsibilities and decision rights

The following are functional responsibilities. They describe the intended operating model and do not assert that particular offices, committees or individuals have already been formally appointed.

Role or function	Responsibilities
Governing authority	Approve institutional quality commitments and review material institutional risks.
Academic oversight function	Approve or coordinate academic standards, review findings and programme change proposals within its mandate.
Programme owner	Maintain accurate programme specifications, assessment maps, student information and an action log.
Quality coordination	Maintain evidence registers, measurement definitions, review calendar and annual quality synthesis.
Student support and operations	Manage secure communications, wellbeing escalations, service feedback and response tracking.
Awarding institution or partner	Retain the academic authority and regulatory responsibilities stated in the applicable executed arrangement.

4. The five-stage quality cycle

Stage	Quality gate
01 Design	Define student need, level, intended outcomes, eligibility, assessment principles and support model.
02 Verify	Check authority, contractual evidence, curriculum, delivery capability and public representations.
03 Deliver	Deliver only authorised services with recorded staff competence, accessible resources and student support.
04 Measure	Collect appropriate engagement, attainment, feedback and service data from real cohorts.
05 Improve	Assign corrective action, implement it, verify completion and record the next review.

5. Quality assurance across study levels

Level	Specific quality questions
Diploma / professional	Is the intended outcome professional, non-degree or academic? Who issues any certificate and what is its exact scope?
Undergraduate	Is workload and progression appropriate to the documented programme level? What degree and awarding institution are authorised?
Postgraduate	Are advanced outcomes, academic depth, specialised assessment and research components appropriately specified?
Doctoral / research	Who supervises and awards; what governs ethical clearance, research methods, originality, examination and thesis records?

6. Student-centred learning and academic integrity

- Assessment tasks should map explicitly to published learning outcomes and marking criteria.
- Students should receive clear academic integrity rules, including expectations for the responsible use and disclosure of artificial intelligence.
- Academic appeals relate to review of academic decisions; service complaints relate to provision, treatment or processes.
- Reasonable adjustments and accessibility needs should be addressed through a secure, documented process.
- Where partner academic regulations control decisions, IEU should direct the student to the proper responsible institution and track the referral when permitted.

7. Quality data, privacy and publication

Evidence is collected only for a lawful and defined purpose and access is limited by role. Public dashboards present validated, appropriately aggregated measures. Metrics must disclose definitions, the measurement period and material limitations. Where there are no completed cohorts or reliable records, the university does not publish implied performance results.

8. External reference framework

The Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG 2015) offer a useful structure for internal quality practices, especially public policy, programme design, student-centred learning, academic staff, support, information management and periodic review. This framework references those themes; it does not assert that IEU has passed an external ESG review. Current reference: <https://www.eqar.eu/kb/esg/>.

Status of external recognition

External accreditation, authority to award degrees, legal programme approval and registered quality labels require distinct decisions and evidence. A published internal quality framework does not confer any of these statuses.