



# International Quality Review of Amity University, Uttar Pradesh

May 2023

## Contents

<b>About this review .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Key findings.....</b>	<b>2</b>
Executive summary.....	2
QAA's conclusions about Amity University, Uttar Pradesh .....	5
European Standards and Guidelines.....	5
Conditions .....	5
Good practice .....	5
Recommendations .....	5
<b>Explanation of the findings about Amity University, Uttar Pradesh.....</b>	<b>7</b>
Standard 1.1 Policy for quality assurance .....	8
Standard 1.2 Design and approval of programmes .....	12
Standard 1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment.....	16
Standard 1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification .....	19
Standard 1.5 Teaching staff .....	22
Standard 1.6 Learning resources and student support.....	24
Standard 1.7 Information management.....	26
Standard 1.8 Public information .....	28
Standard 1.9 Ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes .....	30
Standard 1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance .....	33
<b>Glossary.....</b>	<b>35</b>

## About this review

This is a report of an International Quality Review conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) at Amity University, Uttar Pradesh. The review took place from 25 April to 5 May 2023 and was conducted by a team of three reviewers, as follows:

- Prof Jeremy Bradshaw
- Dr Dave Dowland
- Matthew Kitching (student reviewer)

The QAA Officer for this review was Kevin Kendall.

International Quality Review (IQR) offers institutions outside the UK the opportunity to have a review by the UK's Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA). The review benchmarks the institutions' quality assurance processes against international quality assurance standards set out in Part 1 of the [Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area](#) (ESG).

In International Quality Review, the QAA review team:

- makes conclusion against each of the 10 standards set out in Part 1 of the ESG
- makes conditions (if relevant)
- makes recommendations
- identifies features of good practice
- comes to an overall conclusion as to whether the institution meets the standards for International Quality Review.

A summary of the findings can be found in the section: [Key findings](#) with a fuller commentary in [Explanations of the findings](#).

The QAA website gives more information [about QAA](#) and its mission. A dedicated section explains the method for [International Quality Review](#) and has links to other informative documents. For an explanation of terms see the [Glossary](#) at the end of this report.

## Key findings

### Executive summary

Amity University, Uttar Pradesh (the University) is part of the Amity University Education Group which is the biggest education provider in India and also has 12 overseas campuses delivering education at all levels from pre-school to doctoral level higher education with approximately 150,000 students across all its provision.

The University was established through the Amity University Uttar Pradesh Ordinance, 2005 passed by the State Legislature and assented by the Governor, notified vide UP Govt Gazette Notification No 403/VII-V-I-I(Ka)/I/2005 dated 24 March 2005. It functions under the umbrella of the not-for-profit Ritnand Balved Education Foundation founded in 1986 by Dr Ashok K Chauhan, Chairman of AKC Group of Companies.

The University has its main centre in Noida which was established in 2005, and campuses in Lucknow (2005) and Greater Noida (2013) in India, London (2013), Dubai (2011) in the United Arab Emirates, and Tashkent (2019) in Uzbekistan. The University has 17 Faculty of Studies containing 104 institutions, such as departments and research centres. The University has over 45,000 students studying over 400 programmes at bachelor, master and doctoral levels across a range of subjects, including business management, arts and humanities, social sciences, engineering and technology, biosciences and biotechnology, and health sciences. Over 8,000 students study by distance and online learning.

The University is led by the Vice-Chancellor supported by two Pro Vice-Chancellors, one at Noida, one at Dubai, one at Lucknow, and Directors at the Greater Noida and Tashkent campuses. There are also Deans and Deputy Deans of each Faculty of Studies and Heads of all the Institutions as well as Programme Leaders for each programme. The Vice-Chancellor, as the Principal and Executive Academic Officer, steers the University in fulfilment of its vision, leading the teams at all levels.

The University vision is:

Building the nation and the society through providing total, integrated, and trans-cultural quality education and to be the global front runner in value education and nurturing talent in which modernity blends with tradition.

The University mission is:

To provide education at all levels in all disciplines of modern times and in the futuristic and emerging frontier areas of knowledge, learning and research and to develop the overall personality of students by making them not only excellent professionals but also good individuals, with understanding and regard for human values, pride in their heritage and culture, a sense of right and wrong and yearning for perfection and imbibe attributes of courage of conviction and action.

The University has the following core values:

- Academic excellence
- Integrity and ethics
- Diversity and mutual respect
- Expanding horizons of knowledge
- Shared governance
- Social responsibility
- Environmental responsibility

- Service

In addition, the University states that the following 15 graduate attributes are focal points in the design, delivery and assessment of students' learning outcomes:

- discipline knowledge and expertise
- self-directed and active learning
- information and communication technology skills
- research and enquiry
- communication skills
- critical thinking and problem-solving abilities
- analytical and decision-making ability
- creativity, innovation and reflective thinking
- leadership and teamwork
- environment and sustainability
- integrity and ethics
- social and emotional skills
- lifelong learning
- employability, enterprise and entrepreneurship
- multicultural understanding and global outlook

The University has continued ambitions to expand its international profile and sees improving national and international rankings as a priority. The University is self-financed, with income primarily from tuition fees, and allocation and mobilisation of resources to support sustainable growth continues to be a challenge. Rationalisation of institutes has taken place recently to increase efficiency and merge committees and realigning processes and systems. The development of the new campus in Tashkent has been a challenge which has been successfully implemented and provides a valuable opportunity for students in Uzbekistan to attain a valued degree in a locally relevant subject area. The University is implementing multiple entry and exit points on its programmes to enable lifelong learning. This has been implemented for undergraduate programmes from 2021-22 and is being planned for postgraduate programmes from 2023 onwards. The University is also aware of the need to keep up to date with new technology and pedagogy and attracting competent teachers to keep pace with global developments in higher education and research. The University also has to comply with national education policy and has an updated strategic plan 2022-27 which sets goals to meet these challenges.

In reaching conclusions about the extent to which Amity University, Uttar Pradesh meets the 10 ESG Standards, the QAA review team followed the evidence-based review procedure as outlined in the handbook for International Quality Review (June 2021). The University provided the review team with a self-evaluation and supporting evidence. During the review visit, which took place from 25 April to 5 May 2023, the review team held a total of 20 meetings with the Vice-Chancellor, senior management team, academic staff, professional support staff, students, student representatives, alumni, employers and external stakeholders plus regular meetings with the Facilitator. The review team also had the opportunity to observe the University's facilities and learning resources at the Dubai, Lucknow, Tashkent, Noida and Greater Noida campuses. The Dubai and Lucknow meetings and observation of facilities were done virtually and Tashkent, Noida and Greater Noida were visited physically by the review team.

Amity University was previously accredited by QAA in April 2018, subject to a mid-cycle review in May 2021 and then applied for reaccreditation in December 2022.

In this report, the findings refer to all campuses unless stated otherwise.

In summary, the team found 10 examples of good practice and was able to make some recommendations for improvement/enhancement. The recommendations are of a desirable rather than essential nature and are proposed to enable the University to build on existing practice which is operating satisfactorily but which could be improved or enhanced. The team did not set any conditions.

Overall, the team concluded that Amity University, Uttar Pradesh **meets** all standards for International Quality Review.

## **QAA's conclusions about Amity University, Uttar Pradesh**

The QAA review team reached the following conclusions about the higher education provision at Amity University, Uttar Pradesh.

### **European Standards and Guidelines**

Amity University, Uttar Pradesh meets all of the 10 ESG Standards and Guidelines.

### **Conditions**

The team did not set any conditions.

### **Good practice**

The QAA review team identified the following features of **good practice** at Amity University, Uttar Pradesh.

- The University's commitment to equality and diversity, non-discrimination, social and educational inclusion, and disability support (ESG Standard 1.1).
- The Mentoring programme and the extent to which this supports student progression (ESG Standard 1.4).
- The breadth of valued initiatives that assist students in their transition to graduate employment (ESG Standard 1.4).
- The continued rapid and effective establishment of the Tashkent Campus (ESG Standard 1.6).
- The expeditious and student-centred response to the COVID-19 pandemic (ESG 1.6).
- The comprehensive arrangements for addressing student feedback, in particular at programme level (ESG Standard 1.6).
- The wide-ranging and comprehensive scholarships that support student retention (ESG Standard 1.6).
- The Amizone system is an example of good practice of interest to the international higher educational sector (ESG Standard 1.7).
- The enhanced Academic Planning Worksheet, which is an effective tool for supporting student course choices (ESG Standard 1.7).
- The extensive arrangements for stakeholder engagement that enable the University to respond to the needs of industry (ESG Standard 1.9).

### **Recommendations**

The QAA review team makes the following **recommendations** to Amity University, Uttar Pradesh.

- Construct and maintain a risk register to facilitate the management of the entire risk portfolio (ESG Standard 1.1).
- Include explicit reference to consideration of the implications for support service units in the process documents for approval of new programmes, and for periodic review of existing programmes (ESG Standard 1.2).
- Create integrated policies and procedures for the handling of mark reduction for late submission of assessed coursework, academic misconduct and extenuating circumstances to support the equitable treatment of students (ESG Standard 1.3).
- Create an explicit policy and procedure for academic appeals as distinct from other types of grievances (ESG Standard 1.3).

- Amend the academic staff appraisal form to ensure that there is an explicit record of the reflective discussion between the appraiser and the appraisee (ESG Standard 1.5).
- Consider the inclusion of all teaching staff in peer observation to promote consistency of good practice in teaching and learning (ESG Standard 1.5).
- Establish greater involvement among professional support staff in the development of strategy for student support in order to ensure all employees understand and can articulate the University's approach (ESG Standard 1.6).
- Ensure that each support service unit is comprehensively reviewed on a periodic basis (ESG Standard 1.9).

## Explanation of the findings about Amity University, Uttar Pradesh

This section explains the review findings in more detail.

Terms that may be unfamiliar to some readers have been included in a [brief glossary](#) at the end of this report. A fuller [glossary of terms](#) is available on the QAA website, and formal definitions of certain terms may be found in the operational description and handbook for the [review method](#), also on the QAA website.



## **Standard 1.1 Policy for quality assurance**

**Institutions should have a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of their strategic management. Internal stakeholders should develop and implement this policy through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.**

1.1 Amity University's Quality Policy supports the organisation of the quality assurance system. The University states that it is committed to creating a culture of quality assurance, institutional learning, and improvement through a quality policy and related processes. Its core values are described as: Academic Excellence, Integrity, and Ethics, Diversity and Mutual respect, Expand Horizons of Knowledge, Shared Governance, Social Responsibility, and Service.

1.2 There is an explicit framework of quality assurance policies and organisational structures, at local and university level. The quality assurance framework is based on the institutional vision and mission and goals. The University has a Quality Manual, describing the quality management system of the University. It is available on the public website. There is also a guidance document to the policy. The policy is designed to ensure that the necessary governance and management frameworks are in place. The policy is consistent with the vision and mission of the University, in alignment with the University's objectives and its Broad-Based Goals.

1.3 The Quality Policy and its underlying processes and structures are heavily regulated by the government through the University Grants Commission and the Ministry of Education, including the National Education Policy 2020, the University Grants Commission Quality Mandate, and the standards and criteria of international quality agencies.

1.4 Local jurisdictions for overseas campuses and national and international professional and statutory bodies are also a significant reference point. Amity University Dubai has been licensed by the United Arab Emirates Ministry of Education since 2022 and the Amity University Dubai Business School programmes have been recognised by the Commission for Academic Accreditation.

1.5 Overall management of academic quality rests with the university-level Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) that was established in compliance with the requirements of the University Grants Commission and the national accreditation body, the National Assessment and Accreditation Council.

1.6 Internal guidelines define the objectives, purpose, strategies, functions, and composition of the IQAC. The IQAC carries responsibility for improvement of the academic and administrative performance of the University. This includes the development and application of quality benchmarks, oversight of the learning environment, organisation of inter and intra-institutional training workshops and seminars, monitoring enhancement initiatives and activities, maintenance and development of the institutional database, periodic academic and administrative audit and follow-up, and preparation of the Annual Quality Assurance Report (AQAR). It also has responsible for periodic review of the Quality Policy and its Guidelines. IQACs exist at university, domain and institutional levels.

1.7 The 2018 IQR report included the recommendation 'Clarify the Policy Guidelines for Quality Assurance to articulate how the various quality assurance processes are either discrete or integrate across Amity University Uttar Pradesh'. The mid-cycle review noted that, following cross-campus consultation, the University had made considerable changes to the document, addressing the applicability of policy to the campuses. That provided a reference point for the opening of the Tashkent campus. During the current IQR, staff at all

campuses were clear about where responsibility lay for all aspects of academic quality and standards as also stated in the Tashkent and Lucknow presentations.

1.8 The 2018 IQR report also included the recommendation 'Strengthen the approach to minuting committee business so that discussion and decisions are captured consistently'. While recognising that progress had been made, the mid-cycle review noted that further work would be required to meet this recommendation fully. Committee papers supplied before and during the current IQR record discussion and decisions with clearly identified actions and responsibilities. Actions and matters arising from previous meetings are reviewed. The team considers this recommendation to have been addressed satisfactorily.

1.9 While there was evidence of a clear understanding of the major challenges facing the University, and individual perceived risks are managed by the relevant unit within the University, the team was unable to identify any documented, systematic approach to identify, manage and monitor risks to the University, including those that could impact on the delivery of academic programmes or the quality of the student experience. There is no risk register that allows the executive and governance functions to monitor the entire portfolio of risks that the University faces, and to assure itself that any necessary action to reduce or mitigate the risks have been taken. The team therefore **recommends** that the University should construct and maintain a risk register to facilitate the management of the entire risk portfolio.

1.10 Departments, schools, faculties and other organisational units as well as those of institutional leadership, individual staff members and students take on their responsibilities in quality assurance. The Institutional Quality Assurance Cell plays a key role in coordinating quality assurance activity in the University. As required by the University Grants Commission, the University has appointed Quality Supports, who are responsible for supporting the development of a quality culture by providing guidance, assistance and documentation. The IQAC is responsible for reviewing the annual academic and strategic plan to identify relevant priorities, purposes, core functions and resources. It ensures that the Academic Standards of the courses offered by the University are in accordance with the guidelines of the University Grants Commission.

1.11 The University-level IQAC includes members for each campus of the University. The three levels of IQAC, Institute, Domain and University, communicate with each other to coordinate activity across the campuses. There are good intercampus communications. There are structured interactions with the main (Noida) campus, and many types of interaction with the other campuses. These include an annual conference of campuses, which staff found helpful for the sharing of good practice. Convocation is attended by all campus heads. Each board of studies includes representation from all campuses, as does the course curriculum design process.

1.12 Teaching staff confirm their role in the maintenance of quality and academic standards, including gathering student feedback, monitoring learning outcomes, and regular reporting to the IQACs. Staff are able to give examples of changes in response to student feedback, including the introduction of the electronic admissions process. They ensure that teaching material for the learning management system is prepared well in advance and that learning outcomes are clearly defined and applied. They report that their role in quality assurance and academic standards was explained to them during their orientation, that they are clear about the philosophy and their responsibilities, and that they refer to a more senior member of the faculty if they have any uncertainties.

1.13 Any changes to policy or process are notified to all staff by email. New versions of policies are circulated by email, and the online copy is updated. Student-facing policies are available on Amizone and are covered during the orientation sessions.

1.14 The University is vigilant against academic fraud and guards against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against the students or staff. It is committed to the academic freedom of faculty and students. There are commitments to various developmental and social service activities to facilitate equality and diversity in the next strategic plan.

1.15 The plagiarism policy describes the University's approach to the detection of plagiarism and its consequences. The NTCC Review Committee considers any cases and makes recommendations to the Vice-Chancellor.

1.16 Students confirm that they received guidance about academic misconduct at the orientation session and before each assessment. They are able to use plagiarism-detection software to check their work before submission. Any kind of cheating leads to a warning and assistance, including instruction on strategies to avoid academic misconduct. A second offence will lead to the student failing the assessment.

1.17 Research students confirm they were taught how to cite and reference the work of others and they know about the need to obtain ethical approval for their research projects. Applications are handled by an Institutional Ethics Committee that is supported by an Animal Ethics Committee, an Institutional Biosafety Committee, and an Institutional Committee for Stem Cell Research.

1.18 Faculty staff confirm that they have academic freedom for their research and teaching, within the bounds of any local rules, regulations or requirements. Every campus has particular areas of research strength. The Research Committee, with members from every school, considers applications for funding and advises if local regulations would make the proposed research difficult.

1.19 The University states that it regards diversity and mutual respect as core values and that it safeguards against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against the students or staff. There is an explicit policy on Equity Diversity and Non-Discrimination and the University celebrates diversity.

1.20 Students and staff at all campuses are aware of this policy and are able to confirm that it is followed by their teachers and other staff. They are able to provide numerous examples of ways in which the policy is applied to ensure that every student was given an opportunity and to prevent discrimination based on gender, nationality, religion, educational level or any other characteristic. A similar picture was painted by the teaching staff, who are able to explain how the policy impacts on their daily work. Application of the policy extends to the provision of support for students with disabilities, including physical adaptations to the campus, and there is an open-door policy for support services. Teachers take into account any dyslexia or dyscalculia and further support is provided by the mentor system. The team therefore concludes that the University's commitment to equality and diversity, non-discrimination, social and educational inclusion, and disability support is a feature of **good practice**.

1.21 A range of external stakeholders are involved in the quality assurance processes at Amity University. There are external members on the Academic Council, the University IQAC, and Governing Body for enhancing quality and bringing transparency and fairness to the system. The committees, including the Area Advisory Board and the Board of Studies, include external members from industry, academia, research organisations and government organisations.

1.22 Practical examinations and the assessment of dissertations and projects include external examiners. External examiners are also appointed for the review of programmes, resources, and the quality of teaching and learning and assessment, including the quality of question papers. External evaluators audit degree programmes on a regular basis to assess

the quality of the academic systems and processes that lead to the award of a degree. Academic and Administrative Audits are conducted on an annual basis by external auditors.

1.23 Each campus has a Department of Industry Collaboration, to ensure the contribution of industry expertise to all aspects of programme design and development.

1.24 There are student members on many of the deliberative committees at the University, though not on Academic Council. The University considers that there is sufficient opportunity for students to provide their opinions through the class representative system, including their contributions to curriculum review and the development of new programmes. Students report they are generally content with the level of representation on the University committees and accepted that, although there would be value in them attending Academic Council, they did provide input through their surveys and their contributions to the reports from other committees.

1.25 A guidance document to the Quality Policy and a Quality Manual describes how it translates into practice through a variety of internal quality assurance processes that allow participation across the institution. Further detail is provided in the underlying policies, and may be found in the subsequent sections of this report. The Quality Policy and its underlying policies are overseen, revised and updated by the University IQAC and there is a clearly defined decision-making structure for all types of quality decisions.

1.26 The quality policy and processes at Amity University are the main pillars of a coherent institutional quality assurance system that forms a cycle for continuous improvement and contributes to the accountability of the institution. They support the development of quality culture in which all internal stakeholders assume responsibility for quality and engage in quality assurance at all levels of the University. The policy has a formal status and is publicly available. It translates into practice through a variety of internal quality assurance processes that allow participation across the University. Therefore, the team concludes that Standard 1.1, Policy for quality assurance, is **met**.

## Standard 1.2 Design and approval of programmes

**Institutions should have processes for the design and approval of their programmes. The programmes should be designed so that they meet the objectives set for them, including the intended learning outcomes. The qualification resulting from a programme should be clearly specified and communicated, and refer to the correct level of the national qualifications framework for higher education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area.**

2.1 Programmes are designed with overall programme objectives that are in line with the institutional strategy and have explicit intended learning outcomes. There is a defined process for the design and approval of new academic programmes, supported by templates. The curriculum is set according to national regulations and policy and the requirements of professional and statutory bodies, as described in the UGC Gazette Notification for Specification of Degrees, National Education Policy 2020, and Guidelines for Starting New Academic Programmes in the Existing Institutions Departments and Establishment of New Institutions.

2.2 Regulation R-17 specifies the requirements for the design and development of curricula. It defines the key terminology and explains the elements that need to be considered when developing a new programme. Among the 30 areas defined are mode of teaching, course and programme objectives, learning outcomes, assessment strategy, credits, course load, employability of graduates and graduation requirements.

2.3 A detailed programme structure sets out programme-wide educational objectives leading to the specified qualification, programme learning outcomes, and semester courses with credit as well as any placement requirements. All academic programmes at the University must:

- comprise a broad base of curricula while developing relevant, challenging and well taught programmes that engage with theory and practice and with teaching supported by research
- respond swiftly to new learning opportunities and lead the development of new areas within the curricula
- support the growth of programmes, particularly at postgraduate level, that focus on work-based learning and continuing professional development.

2.4 Each proposal should also include the following information:

- name of the programme
- nomenclature of the degree, which should conform to the nomenclature specified by UGC and AICTE
- whether approval of specified regulatory body or council has been obtained (if required)
- proposed intake capacity proposed
- minimum and maximum duration of the programme
- eligibility conditions prescribed for admission (educational qualification, age, experience, etc)
- proposed fee structure of the programme
- source of intake
- career opportunities and employability after completion of programme
- number of students required for viability of the programme
- justification for proposing the programme

- source of programme, that is, whether the proposed programme is run by any other national or international universities.

2.5 Curriculum review and development is centralised at the Noida campus. While the portfolio of programmes delivered differs between the campuses, each programme has the same title, syllabus and course codes irrespective of the campus of delivery. The delivery of a programme may be contextualised according to the availability of teaching materials, the labour market, and other aspects of the local situation. The local Industry Advisory Board may recommend adjustments according to the local market needs. Such adjustments may be no more than 20% of the programme, must not change the learning outcomes, and must be approved by the Noida campus. The delivery for Noida and Lucknow is similar as they are both in India but there is some contextualisation in Dubai and Tashkent.

2.6 Following approval, a programme specification is prepared, to provide a formal record of the programme, its mission, description, educational objectives, semester-wise course plan, learning objectives, skills development and educational outcomes. The exception to this is that some programmes at the Dubai campus have undergone accreditation by the local accreditation agency, the CAA. Business programmes are, therefore, now offered in two forms at this campus, the original, international, version designed at the Noida campus, and a Dubai-specific version developed at the Dubai campus. Students may elect which option they wish to take.

2.7 Programmes are designed by involving students and other stakeholders in the work. Proposals for new programmes must be backed by reliable market research and industry demand, and show evidence of consideration of advice and guidance from various stakeholders. The Regulations on Curriculum Design specify that curricula must take into account inputs from students, alumni, course faculty and employers. Regular contact with industry should inform the current demand requirements from the industry, student feedback should be sought by Amizone, there should be an analysis of current trends in the market, and the industry advisory board should be consulted.

2.8 Evidence provided to demonstrate compliance with these regulations included an example proposal for a new programme showing evidence of consideration of industry demand, a report of feedback on a programme proposal from external stakeholders, an approval of a new programme by an Area Advisory Board, which has external members, and a document approving a new programme by an Area Advisory Board, approval by a Board of Studies.

2.9 Staff, students and external members of University committees are able to confirm that student opinion is sought during the development of proposals for new programmes through feedback, focus groups, and through their membership of IQACs.

2.10 Programmes benefit from external expertise and reference points. They are designed in alignment with the guidelines and expectations of relevant statutory bodies, such as the University Grants Committee, All India Council for Technical Education, Bar Council of India, Pharmacy Council of India, Rehabilitation Council of India, and the Council of Architecture.

2.11 Programmes reflect the four purposes of higher education of the Council of Europe. While there appears to be no deliberate, explicit alignment, the University has defined graduate attributes which, along with the University's educational model, implicitly align with the Council of Europe purposes, namely preparation of the labour market, active citizenship, personal development through extracurricula activity, and the development of a broad and advanced knowledge base.

2.12 Many programmes include exposure to industry through placements and internships, industrial cells and guest speakers from industry. The effectiveness of these activities is

confirmed by students, graduates and employers. Good practice in supporting the student transition to employment is referred to in Standard 1.4 Student Admission, progression, recognition and certification.

2.13 Students and graduates are able to provide the team with several examples of the way in which their programmes prepare them for active citizenship, including value-added courses in behavioural science and psychology, foreign language courses, human value clubs, activities linked to non-governmental organisations, military training camps, human values outreach courses, citizenship and patriotism, and voluntary service. Value-added courses include social responsibility, professional conduct, language courses, and communications skills with different types of people.

2.14 Personal development activities are provided by a Course Review Committee, the value-added courses, and through the mentor system. These include interview skills training, workshops on building a curriculum vitae, internships, start-up support, seed funding, and an entrepreneurial incubation cell. The embedding of value-added courses into programmes providing wide-ranging personal development opportunities for all students was noted as good practice in the 2018 IQR report. The University's graduate attributes include preparation for lifelong learning, and programme learning outcomes reflect social responsibility and mutual respect, which are part of the values of the University. Graduates are able to confirm the effectiveness of these personal development activities, including the value-added courses, and other life skills training embedded in each programme of study.

2.15 Students confirm that their programmes are designed so that they enable smooth progression. Each subject is developed throughout the programme with subsequent years building upon the previous one. The academic probation method for progression from year to year is clearly understood, ensuring that each transition is smooth and progressive in terms of subject matter and level.

2.16 The Academic Planning Worksheet, recognised as good practice in the 2018 IQR report, has been expanded to include a wider range of course types, including core courses, supervised independent learning courses, specialisation elective courses and others, such as entrepreneurship, professional ethics, outdoor activities including sports, and massive open online courses (MOOCs) delivered by the National Programme on Technology Enhanced Learning (NPTEL). Programme leaders, academic advisers, and faculty mentors help students to select their courses and Amizone includes a function to prevent timetable clashes. Each student has a full choice as recorded in the academic planning worksheet and are clear about what they have to achieve each semester. The Academic Planning Worksheet is referred to as good practice in Standard 1.7, Information management.

2.17 Programmes define the expected student workload, for example using the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS). The University's Model Framework provides the basis for student workload for credit hours, minimum credits required for the completion of the programme, and course types which are offered in the programme. The University has adopted the Choice Based Credit System (CBCS) as the basis of the curriculum, with emphasis on flexible learning, employability, multidisciplinary study and links with industry. The system has the support of the University Grants Commission as a means of addressing national priorities for higher education.

2.18 Programmes include well-structured placement opportunities where appropriate. The majority of programmes delivered by Amity University include professional or industry placements. In accordance with the Regulations for Programme Design and Development, employability and the provision of suitable placement opportunities is a consideration at programme approval. Placement providers report that students are well prepared for their

placements by the University and that the University takes regular feedback on student performance.

2.19 Programmes are subject to a formal institutional approval process. The proposal for new programmes are prepared at institutional or departmental level. A Programme Review and Outcome Assessment Committee (PROAC) is established to consider the programme structure based on feedback from internal and external stakeholders, including alumni and industrialists. The PROAC also designs the outcome assessment plan for the programme.

2.20 There is initial scrutiny by the University Standing Committee which considers the strategic and business case for the proposal, which is then approved by Academic Council. Proposals for new programmes, including details of the programme structure, curriculum, a detailed syllabus, and a scheme of evaluation of the programme by the appropriate Board of Studies, are then submitted for review by the University Standing Committee. The recommendations of the University Standing Committee are reported to Academic Council for approval.

2.21 The stream coordinator then establishes Course Review Committees to develop the course curriculum, including faculty members and an area or stream co-ordinator. The Course Review Committees design the detailed curriculum, including course objectives, prerequisites, detailed course content and course learning outcomes; skills development activity, course pedagogy and evaluation strategy.

2.22 Each stage of the programme approval process prompts consideration of the academic and business case, and the matching of the proposal with the institutional strategy, the University's goals, core values, professional, research and industrial requirements and the requirements of statutory bodies and national educational frameworks. Additional requirements for resources must be specified and approved.

2.23 However, while there is a requirement for the consideration of resource implications, together with the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders, including students, faculty and external members, neither the regulations nor the proposal template explicitly require consultation with the professional and support service units. This could lead to those units being unprepared for an increased demand upon their resources when a new programme starts. As noted in the section on Standard 1.9, a similar lack of explicit reference to the professional and support services exists in the documentation for periodic review of academic programmes. The team therefore **recommends** that process documents for approval of new programmes, and for periodic review of existing programmes, should include explicit reference to consideration of implications for support service units.

2.24 In summary, the University has processes for the design and approval of its programmes that ensure that they are designed so that they meet the objectives set for them, including the intended learning outcomes. The qualification resulting from each programme is clearly specified and communicated with reference to the correct level of the national qualifications framework for higher education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area. The team therefore concludes that Standard 1.2, Design and Approval of Programmes is **met**.



### **Standard 1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment**

**Institutions should ensure that the programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in creating the learning process, and that the assessment of students reflects this approach.**

3.1 The University has a philosophy of student-centred learning, realised through opportunities for flexible learning, multidisciplinary study, blended learning and the use of technology. There is emphasis on the development of hard and soft skills, independent and experiential learning. There are University-wide graduate attributes.

3.2 The Choice Based Credit System (CBCS), with a Model Framework that the University has adopted as the basis of the curriculum, is updated through the University committee structure and IQAC. Each programme has a defined programme structure specifying the teaching plan. There are core courses, skill enhancement courses, professional ability enhancement courses, value-added courses, non-teaching credit courses, and a research component on each course. The studio courses include professional skills development activities to give students practical training and exposure to industry. The University offers outdoor activity-based courses to support experiential learning. There is a mandatory Human Values Community Outreach course to facilitate extracurricula development and social commitment.

3.3 The University promotes interdisciplinary study, skills for employment and international opportunities, including Study Abroad. There are multiple entry-exit options which allow students to chart their own learning pathways. Students can take NPTEL and MOOC courses as electives. Students who met the review team speak positively of the support they have received with online courses.

3.4 Students are encouraged to present papers at conferences and to publish papers from early in their academic journey. The team saw evidence of the research-related work produced by students. Students told the team about the valuable support that they had received to develop their research skills, including writing review papers, case studies, notably with patents filed with teaching staff members in nanotechnology and support from the University Incubation Centre.

3.5 The University has programme specifications which give a description of the intended learning outcomes of every programme offered by the University. The programme specifications are approved by Academic Council and made publicly available on the website and through Amizone.

3.6 The University welcomes students through an orientation programme, when they are introduced to teaching materials and assessment expectations. Students are given access to an online Student Handbook and are supported by academic advisers. Each student is assigned a teaching staff mentor and an industry mentor, in addition to a parent and peer mentor support. The mentoring arrangements are subject to evaluation. Programme Coordinators and Programme Leaders are appointed to coordinate student batches. The students also have access to professional support services.

3.7 There is an online proficiency test in the first semester to assess academic preparedness. There is support for underperforming students through bridge courses, remedial coaching, and mentoring, as well as first semester English communication and IT skills. There is also support for advanced students to encourage excellence of achievement.

3.8 Students select Class Representatives. There are guidelines on appointment and feedback arrangements for the Class Representatives. Students have opportunities to give

feedback through multiple surveys, membership of committees and directly to teaching staff. The team heard of multiple examples of action taken in response to student feedback.

3.9 There is a procedure to address student grievances at the campus and University level, through an online system. Grievances are addressed to the next higher level if not addressed within three days, with referral to the Vice-Chancellor for ultimate decision.

3.10 Programmes are subject to annual assessment plans, overseen by the programme review committee, the Board of Studies, the Area Advisory Board and Academic Council. The plans feed into the wider University operational planning process. The assessment plans for each programme include assessment criteria and specified minimum attainment levels. The links between assessment and learning outcomes are also monitored through course files and module boxes.

3.11 Teaching staff receive professional development on teaching, learning and assessment through an orientation programme and other sessions, including a programme arranged by Amity Staff College. Teaching staff participation in professional development activities is monitored through annual appraisal.

3.12 Programme learning outcomes are assessed through a range of direct and indirect methods of assessment as well as exit feedback from students. At the course level, student learning is assessed throughout the semester through a continuous evaluation process. There are end-of-semester examinations; there is significant input from industrialists for studio and practical-based courses, seminars and Non-Teaching Credit Courses (NTCC). Internships and practical training are embedded within the curriculum, including capstone projects. Students take programme-level examinations against programme learning outcomes. The end-of-term student results are reviewed and analysed by the Programme Review and Outcome Assessment Committee (PROAC). Student assessment performance is also tracked through the institutional implementation report under the oversight of the Institutional Quality Assurance Committee (IQAC) as part of the annual cycle of quality management. Not all learning outcomes have to be met in full to pass an assessment but there is a threshold requirement to pass an assessment.

3.13 There are regulations on examinations, overseen by examination committees at University and institutional level. There is a class attendance requirement for students to attend examinations: attendance of 100% is expected in each course with students with 75% attendance allowed to appear in the end-of-semester examinations. There is a moderation process for question papers defined in the University examination regulations. The University regulations include standard systems for grading and for determining progression and awards.

3.14 The University uses external evaluators for each programme. They advise on academic standards, technical balance of programmes and the appropriateness of learning resources. They serve on Boards of Studies, Area Advisory Boards and the Programme Review Committees. The departments make changes to the curriculum, teaching methods, and examination processes in response to the reports of the external evaluator.

3.15 The University regulations include provision for concessions for students with extenuating circumstances. Adjustments are made for students with disabilities. Students speak favourably about the support they receive from teachers. There is, however, no overarching, discrete, integrated extenuating circumstances policy, including a full definition of extenuating circumstances, checks and balances such as rights of review of decisions for students or provision for concessions for the late submission of coursework.

3.16 Similarly, the team found variability in University practices on the imposition of mark reductions for the late submission of work. Some students and teaching staff told the team

that there was no policy for mark deduction but that it depended on the decision of individual teaching staff. The University provided evidence of a mark deduction policy applying to some but not all courses. The team heard only positive feedback from students on how they had been treated. There should, however, be an explicit and comprehensive mark deduction policy across the University.

3.17 There are academic misconduct procedures and students told the review team that they were well aware of the principles of academic integrity and the need to avoid academic offences. There is, however, a lack of fully developed procedures, including explicit provision of checks and balances to ensure a fair hearing for students. For example, the right for a student to be accompanied by a friend or supporter at a hearing is not clear. Senior managers state that there is a procedure for a programme leader to accompany a student to a hearing but the role of the programme leader as a source of independent support for the student is questionable and the procedural guidance is not explicit. The team heard only positive feedback on the University's care and attention to the welfare of students but there should be comprehensive policy and procedure for the handling of misconduct cases. The team therefore **recommends** that the University should create integrated policies and procedures for the handling of mark reduction for late submission of assessed coursework, academic misconduct and extenuating circumstances to support the equitable treatment of students.

3.18 Students are able to raise concerns about the examination process through the University grievance and examinations procedures and the Vice-Chancellor has authority to review examination decisions in case of procedural errors or other relevant circumstances. There appears, however, to be no comprehensive definition of academic appeals for all kinds of assessment as distinct from other types of complaints, nor a regulatory statement on the extent to which academic judgement may be challenged. There is only partial guidance on checks and balances, for example, to ensure a fair hearing, to preclude anyone from hearing a case more than once and to enable a student to be accompanied to a hearing by a friend. The review team saw no evidence that students are treated unfairly but the University's apparently sound practice is not fully captured in regulations. The team therefore **recommends** that the University should create an explicit policy and procedure for academic appeals as distinct from other types of grievances.

3.19 The team concludes that, overall, the University supports and encourages students to take an active role in the learning process and has an effective approach to the assessment of students. The University has in place clear policies and guidelines for learning, teaching and assessment, effectively monitored through the University quality assurance systems. The team concludes that Standard 1.3 is **met**.

## **Standard 1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification**

**Institutions should consistently apply pre-defined and published regulations covering all phases of the student "life cycle", e.g. student admission, progression, recognition and certification.**

4.1 The University states that the institution has established global systems and procedures to ensure consistent and equitable delivery of student admission, progression, recognition and certification across its different campuses. The University's approach is guided by commitments to equality and diversity, where, through the establishment of a series of Broad-Based Goals 2022-27, the University has incorporated an explicit commitment to 'foster inclusivity, diversity, accessibility and equity'. This approach aligns with its strategy to consider student support at four separate stages: pre-admission, on joining, during programme, and after graduating.

4.2 The institution's management of admissions is governed by the Regulations for Admission & Enrolment of Students (for regular programmes), Regulations for Research Degree Programmes and Post-Doctoral Programmes and Regulations for Admission & Enrolment of Students and Examination & Evaluation for Distance Learning Programmes. The University has established admissions departments at all its campuses, including in Noida, Greater Noida, Lucknow, Dubai and Tashkent, and these units implement the centrally approved regulations. The University states that it operates programme-specific admissions processes, that adhere to professional, statutory and regulatory bodies (PSRBs) specifications where relevant, and that offer students optional career aptitude tests. Students can seek admission for two degrees simultaneously, the first under 'regular' mode and the second online.

4.3 International students seeking admission to Amity must submit an Equivalence Certificate from the Association of Indian Universities. The University also has its own, internal, Equivalence Committee, whose membership includes a Pro-Vice Chancellor, Dean, Head of Campus, a Head of Department, up to three senior faculty members from the discipline area, the Controller of Examinations and the Director Admissions. International students informed the team that the process is clear and expeditious.

4.4 Regulations for Lateral Entry Admissions and Transfer of Credits and Regulations and Guidelines for Credit Transfer Policy, provide a detailed and appropriate overview of the process through which students seeking accreditation of prior learning can apply to have credit recognised. Students who had sought accreditation for prior learning informed the team that the process is clear, timely and well communicated.

4.5 Students with disabilities who seek admission are invited to present before a special committee who conducts a needs assessment and considers any additional support requirements. A number of students informed the team about reasonable adjustments that had been made as part of the University's admissions and support systems. These included additional time in exams and changes to the built environment.

4.6 Overall, students confirm that they found the admissions process fair and accessible. The Regulations for Admission & Enrolment of Students (for regular programmes) are relevant, clear and comprehensive and cover topics such as the procedure for admissions, fee payment and refunds and the admission of foreign students. The University also carries out an Admission Trend Analysis at the end of each academic session that informs future action plans and thereby ensures robust monitoring of the admissions process.

4.7 The Student Handbook is detailed and contains explicit sections on Examination and Academic Progression and Student Career Aspirations, Support & Progression. The

institution has an appropriate and comprehensive induction programme in place for students on 'regular' programmes; this includes an introduction to academic planning and the institution's academic philosophy, sessions on life skills, student welfare, careers and security. To assist progression, students must complete an online proficiency test to test their preparedness for the chosen programme. Where students secure a grade of less than 60% in this test, they are required to take a bridging course. Students progress from Level 4 to 5 having met the minimum semester grade point average (SGPA) and cumulative grade point average (CGPA) scores. Where a student fails to achieve the required level they may still progress, based on the recommendation of the Head of Campus, providing they have cleared 60% of the credits, but will be placed on Academic Probation, although this is not available for progression from Level 5 to 6. The University also provides additional support in English and IT skills. Those who are identified as slow learners, following admission and enrolment, are supported with bridging courses, remedial coaching and mentoring.

4.8 Mentoring is conducted by trained University faculty, who provide academic and pastoral advice to their mentees. Training for mentors includes sessions about workload, recording and reporting. Students informed the team that the mentoring system provides a bridge for feedback between students and teachers, helps communicate course changes and serves as an opportunity to signpost students to additional support and provide advice on course selection. The review team therefore considers the mentoring programme and the extent to which this supports student progression to be a feature of **good practice**.

4.9 The University has clear guidelines for student learning outcomes and assessment at course level that outline its approach to translating its academic philosophy and approach, including core graduate attributes, differentiated at undergraduate and postgraduate level, into programme educational objectives using assessment schemes and rubrics. The University also has a range of support materials to assist staff in setting assessment, for example the Policy Guidelines for Setting of Question Papers. In addition, it has regulations covering the Scheme of Evaluation, which are detailed in regulations pertaining to conduct and discipline in exams. Staff are readily able to articulate their responsibilities in relation to assessment and recognition of students' learning outcomes.

4.10 The University has a wide range of activities and arrangements designed to support student progression to employment and further study. It has strategically structured careers support around five defined pathways in accordance with national regulatory requirements (corporate jobs, higher education, competitive examinations for government jobs, starting their own venture, joining family businesses). Students then receive 30 hours additional support clustered around these pathways, including from the Corporate Resource Centre (CRC). Further to this, students studying within the Choice Based Credit System (CBCS) can opt to take elective courses across different disciplines, providing them with further knowledge and expertise than can be used to differentiate themselves from others in the job market with similar qualifications. In order to maintain programme coherency, the University has regulations in place to govern the management of the CBCS system.

4.11 In addition to these courses, students are able to access Value Addition and General Education Courses. Students speak highly of the benefit of these courses, informing the team that they contributed to the development of 'soft skills', language acquisition, industry experience and presentation skills. Graduate destinations are tracked and recorded using the Amizone system. The University maintains a database of students' current companies and details of any further study undertaken. The review team therefore considers the breadth of valued initiatives that assist students in their transition to graduate employment as a feature of **good practice**.

4.12 The University's Controller of Examinations is responsible for producing students' academic transcripts and diploma certificates. The University provided examples to the

team, including transcripts that contain clear reference to a student's award, courses, grades and location of study. The University also has Guidelines for Awards of Alternate Degree/Diploma/Certificate. These guidelines set out arrangements for awarding exit awards in instances where students do not attain the necessary grades and credit to be awarded the qualification upon which they are registered.

4.13 The team found that the University consistently applies predefined and published regulations covering student admission, progression, recognition and certification and therefore concludes that Standard 1.4 is **met**.

## Standard 1.5 Teaching staff

**Institutions should assure themselves of the competence of their teachers. They should apply fair and transparent processes for the recruitment and development of the staff.**

5.1 The University Human Resource Department coordinates recruitment and the induction of teaching and support staff. There are policies and procedures for recruitment defining professional requirements for teaching and support roles, in line with national regulations. The recruitment process is overseen by a Manpower Planning Committee which monitors workload planning and national regulatory requirements and reports to the Teaching Staff Council Executive Council. The selection process leads to a final round with the Selection Committee, chaired by the Vice-Chancellor. The University maps the competencies of teaching staff against qualifications and experience. The University uses a range of interactive selection methods of members of teaching staff, including presentations and multiple interviews. These arrangements are supportive of the University's commitment to build a dynamic approach to teaching, learning and research.

5.2 Approximately 60% of the teaching staff have a PhD, with 19% pursuing PhDs; 21% of the teaching staff are visiting lecturers and 4% adjuncts. There are procedures for the use of visiting lecturers, including authorisation arrangements, controls on workload and checks before any re-employment, including consideration of student feedback. Guest lecturers from industry and other sectors are also used to bring a practical dimension to teaching. The team considers that the University is making thorough and effective use of visiting and guest lecturers.

5.3 There is a performance-based system for teaching staff which, in line with University Grants Commission (UGC) regulations, annually assesses involvement in professional and scholarly as well as research activities. The appraisal process provides for close monitoring of teaching staff performance against workload, including contribution to institutional strategic priorities for teaching, student support and research and commitment to professional development. The appraisal is based on a points-based system although there is a reflective discussion between appraiser and appraisee on the qualitative aspects of performance. The appraisal form, however, includes no space to record the conclusions of that reflective discussion. The team therefore **recommends** that the University should amend the academic staff appraisal form to ensure that there is an explicit record of the reflective discussion between the appraiser and the appraisee.

5.4 The team found that the University had made some progress in response to an observation in the IQR mid-cycle report, that there should be an expansion of a scheme to facilitate the development of new teaching staff in learning, teaching and higher education assessment. This IQR report noted that, while the established teaching staff development programme was of considerable value, there was scope for further work to develop the pedagogic competencies of new teaching staff. The University will, no doubt, consider how to address new teaching staff development further. Nevertheless, new teaching staff are supported through an induction programme, the assignment of mentors and access to professional development opportunities.

5.5 More generally, there is a substantial framework for professional development, including teaching and learning and research. There is financial provision for teaching staff to attend internal and external events, including seminars and conferences and industry training programmes. Teaching staff are encouraged to participate in and attend programmes organised both in-house by various institutions/departments and outside the University. In-house programmes are organised by Amity Academic Staff College, including coverage of teaching and learning methodologies, student-centred learning and the use of

technology, briefings on quality management systems, regulations and assessment. There are also institution and domain sessions addressing specific needs. There are also opportunities for professional development to support co-working with industry. There are evaluation systems to gauge the effectiveness of the programmes.

5.6 The University requires each member of teaching staff to spend time on scholarly and professional development activities with weightage given in the annual appraisal. There is provision for 'on duty leave' to enable attendance at professional development events and funds to support conference attendance and research activities, including research infrastructure development and financial grants contributing to the development of the institutional research profile. The University has a significant research profile. The team heard repeatedly from teaching staff of the support they receive from the University for the support for their research activities, including the development of commercial applications and patents. The University uses international resources to support the development of case studies, including links to the UK Case Study Centre.

5.7 The University runs a peer observation scheme, under the oversight of peer review teams and IQAC. The scheme involves more experienced teachers observing new teaching staff and those who are considered in need of remedial support. More experienced staff, however, are not currently subject to observation. The team **recommends** that the University should consider the inclusion of all teaching staff in peer observation to promote consistency of good practice in teaching and learning.

5.8 There are procedures for staff promotion, based on overall performance, length of service and annual appraisal. The Vice-Chancellor chairs the selection committee.

5.9 The team noted the significant and creative commitment of the University to the professional development of teaching staff. The team considers that the University assures the competence of its teachers and applies fair and transparent processes for the recruitment and development of staff and therefore concludes that Standard 1.5 is **met**.



## Standard 1.6 Learning resources and student support

**Institutions should have appropriate funding for learning and teaching activities and ensure that adequate and readily accessible learning resources and student support are provided.**

6.1 The University adopts a strategic approach that considers student support at four stages: pre-admission, on joining, during programme, and after graduating. Institutions and departments of the University submit annual plans, as part of an established business cycle, linked to the five-year strategic plan, which cover learning resources. These plans are scrutinised by IQAC and then considered by the Planning Board, Finance Committee and Executive Council for approval and implementation.

6.2 Despite the stated strategic approach to learning resources and student support, which senior staff are able to recount, the team found that other staff, including those responsible for the management of support services and campuses, were unable to clearly and consistently articulate the same approach. In particular, staff could not describe how targets related to University strategy and/or how these were contextualised across campuses to monitor the effectiveness of services. The team therefore **recommends** that the University establish greater involvement among professional support staff in the development of strategy for student support in order to ensure all employees understand and can articulate the University's approach.

6.3 The University provided the team with a range of examples evidencing its investment in appropriate technology, infrastructure and library resources. The main library at Noida houses a large collection, with individual libraries operating on all campuses. Students also have access to an extensive e-library. The University operates an online catalogue (OPAC) that serves as a single database for all Amity University students. The Library Guidelines set out a clear procedure for the procurement of books and these arrangements were well understood by staff. Students are informed about library services in the Student Handbook. The team determined that these arrangements were appropriate and well communicated to students.

6.4 The University has an extensive number of computer laboratories in place. Requirements for which are overseen by the Laboratory Equipment Assessment Committee (LEAC). LEAC is also responsible for the approval of new laboratories. Students in Computer Science Engineering, Electronics and Electrical Engineering, Electronics and Communication Engineering, and Biotechnology also benefit from a wide range of virtual labs. The team found that the extent of physical and virtual labs, as evidenced by campus tours and documentation, is sufficient to effectively support student learning opportunities.

6.5 The University's campus in Uzbekistan was opened in Tashkent under a Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan dated 7 January 2019 and students were admitted for the first time in 2019. The development of this campus was a product of a strategic collaboration with the country's government and the new facilities were established quickly and to a high standard. The campus now benefits from appropriate accommodation, catering and technical infrastructure. Students informed the team that they are highly satisfied with their experience and senior staff described the institution's intention to further develop the campus estate. The review team therefore considers the continued rapid and effective establishment of the Tashkent campus as a feature of **good practice**.

6.6 The University operates the Amity Learning Management System (ALMS), which provides students with a range of e-content, video lectures, learning resources, forums and self-assessment tools designed to support their learning. Amizone also provides students with access to learning resources, academic planning, timetables and reading materials.

These systems are highly valued by students as detailed elsewhere in this report and are noted as good practice under Standard 1.7.

6.7 The International Students Facilitation Centre (IFC) provides a range of clear and appropriate information on its webpages. The institution has students from 53 countries studying at the University and offers a wide range of support, including airport transfers, briefing and orientation, a buddy system and accommodation assistance. International students confirm that they are satisfied with the support they receive from the institution.

6.8 The University runs a range of further services for students, including the Counselling and Guidance Centre, which was established to provide support to students on various matters ranging from academic, personal and financial issues to finding a suitable job. The University also has a Women's Help Desk that supports female students by raising awareness of safety and security on campus. It also operates the Directorate of Distance and Online Education who, in particular following the COVID-19 pandemic, provides support to optimise the University's online provision.

6.9 During the pandemic, the University provided an even wider range of additional assistance in the area of learning resources and student support. This included further investment in online labs, recorded teaching and learning sessions, investment in technology, equipment loans, changes to assessment, the introduction of instalment plans for tuition and 100% fee waivers for any student who suffered a parental bereavement. The review team therefore considers the expeditious and student-centred response to the COVID-19 pandemic as a feature of **good practice**.

6.10 Feedback forms are in place to gather data from students, parents, faculty, staff and alumni and the institution also operates a student exit interview. The team viewed evidence of feedback, designed to 'close the loop', being provided to a range of stakeholders, including industry and alumni. In addition, the University produced summary reports on Student Satisfaction Survey data. Students informed the team about several examples of action taken in response to their feedback, including changes to transport services and assessment. The University also has a published 'Escalation Matrix' that informs students about how to progress concerns where they fail to receive satisfactory resolution; this Matrix is available on Amizone. Amizone also contains a messaging function for students to raise issues in an expeditious manner, as well as a record system that details action taken in response to previous feedback. The review team therefore considers the comprehensive arrangements for addressing student feedback, in particular at programme level, as a feature of **good practice**.

6.11 The University provides a range of financial scholarships, including the On Admission Merit Scholarship, Merit cum Means Scholarship, Sports Scholarship and Martyr's Scholarship. The University maintains trend data on students in receipt of University scholarships. The total number of students who received one or more scholarships rose from 3,881 in 2018 to 6,196 in 2022. Students and graduates characterised the generous and important nature of the University's financial support packages as playing a central role in student retention and achievement. The review team therefore considers the wide-ranging and comprehensive scholarships that support student retention a feature of **good practice**.

6.12 The review team identified a range of good practice relating to learning resources and student support. The team determined that the University maintains appropriate funding for learning and teaching activities and ensures that students are provided with adequate and readily accessible learning resources and student support. The team therefore concludes that Standard 1.6 is **met**.

## Standard 1.7 Information management

**Institutions should ensure that they collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management of their programmes and other activities.**

7.1 The University uses a wide range of data sets for quality assurance and enhancement, to track the student journey through the institution and to fulfil regulatory requirements. The University units central to the management of data include the Institutional Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC), which seeks to establish a culture of empirical, evidence-based assessment, evaluation and continuous improvement across the University. IQAC has several data management responsibilities, including the running of the institutional database through the MIS system and the management of feedback from stakeholders. IQAC is assisted by the Research Planning and Statistical Services (RPSS) and the Quality Assurance and Enhancement (QAE) unit. RPSS collects, analyses and disseminates data to stakeholders at all levels to aid decision-making. RPSS is also responsible for coordinating data for national and international league tables exercises.

7.2 Amizone is the system that services communication and all aspects of academic delivery. It hosts the Amity Learning Management System (ALMS). The QAA mid-cycle report noted that Amizone had been enhanced by increased functionality, including linkage to the admissions system, loop-closing on student feedback, hosting the teaching staff appraisal systems, enabling results processing and progression and the generation of electronic graduation certificates and transcripts which are produced to a standard template. Amizone enables the tracking of graduate destination data. The team received a detailed presentation of the Amizone system and noted its vital role in the sharing of consistent, high quality, transparent data and as a tool of accountability for the use of data at all levels.

7.3 Amizone hosts the Academic Planning Worksheet, which has been enhanced since the 2018 Institutional Quality Review as a valuable and accessible tool to enable students to plan their studies. The worksheet now accommodates course types, including entrepreneurship, professional ethics, extracurricula activities and MOOCs delivered by the National Programme on Technology Enhanced Learning, India. The team considered the Amizone system an example of **good practice** of interest to the international higher educational sector.

7.4 The team recognises Amizone as an effective and comprehensive system for learning management and supporting the student journey and also considers the enhanced Academic Planning Worksheet, which is an effective tool for supporting student course choices, to be a feature of **good practice**.

7.5 The University has a cycle of data reporting and analysis, linked to each stage of the student lifecycle, including programme monitoring and triggering action to correct issues or prompt enhancement activities, under the oversight of University committees. There is a cycle of data reporting and analysis relating to teaching staff, including the monitoring of teaching staff recruitment, performance and development. Institutional performance is monitored through data reports, for example on league tables, partnership development with industry and the growth of international connections. Academic and Administrative Internal and External Audits are conducted annually, including coverage of a range of evidence of the effectiveness and performance of academic programme.

7.6 The University makes extensive use of feedback from students, alumni, peer review and industrial practitioners, as well as academic performance and assessment results. Each member of teaching staff is subject to close monitoring through the annual appraisal system, with the extensive use of data, drawn through peer review and feedback from students. The

team heard evidence of many examples of changes made to University services in response to feedback from stakeholders.

7.7 There is a policy on information security. The Information Technology Department has received ISO 27001, information security management system certification from the British Standards Institute (BSI). A backup policy is also in place for systems that host data connected to the University. The data is stored in a Relational Database Management System (RDBMS) hosted on enterprise-class servers and storage, as well as on Amazon Web Services' public cloud. The applications are run on virtual servers, backed by multiple servers virtualised using VMware. The set-up is protected using a firewall system. The University has various techniques for data validation and assuring accuracy. Student data are checked through various levels of approval and moderation checks. There are various data validation checks within the Amizone student management system. The extensive use of online systems for data collection, including the processing of examination marks and the central role of Amizone, all help to ensure the integrated management of data.

7.8 The University ensures that relevant data and information are collected, analysed and used to enable the effective management of programmes and other activities, and therefore the team concludes that Standard 1.7 is **met**.

## **Standard 1.8 Public information**

**Institutions should publish information about their activities, including programmes, which is clear, accurate, objective, up-to date and readily accessible.**

8.1 The University publishes a wide range of information, including through the website, Amizone, the Amity Learning Management System, social media and in printed publications. This information is produced in accordance with the institution's Website Policy. Information provided through the website includes content regarding the University's governance, management and programme information, including course fees. The website also details entry criteria, programme objectives and clear information pertaining to the qualifications offered. Each campus of Amity University has its own homepage on the website. Information pertaining to individual campuses is initially approved by the Head of the Institution before being sent to the Noida campus for final approval and publication. Individual campuses also take account of regional regulatory requirements with respect to information, for example from the Commission for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in the United Arab Emirates. The University's Quality Assurance and Enhancement (QAE) department assumed responsibility for monitoring the website in October 2021 and perform quarterly checks. The team found arrangements for the production of published information to be appropriate and that staff understood their responsibilities. The quarterly checks are effective, and the team found that information supplied to stakeholders was accurate and comprehensive.

8.2 Every applicant benefits from their own, personalised admission microsite. The microsite keeps students updated throughout, from submission of their application form and the selection process, to the issuance of an Admission Letter and payment stage. Students confirm that they found information regarding the admission process clear, fair and straightforward to navigate.

8.3 The University maintains a dedicated orientation page on the website, which serves as a step-by-step guide on how to complete the registration process and what documents they are required to submit. In addition, the orientation page contains information about student life at the University, including details on academic programmes, campus facilities, student services and extracurricular activities.

8.4 New students are provided with the University's Student Handbook, which outlines the student support services run by the University as well as other aspects of student life, including health and well-being. The Student Handbook outlines the roles and responsibilities of students and provides guidance on how to access student support functions, academic support and student services. It also provides information on the use of the University library and student clubs and associations. Information on academic misconduct is also included in the Handbook. The Dean of Student Welfare's (DSW) Office is responsible for reviewing the content of the handbooks with the relevant business units to ensure their accuracy and consistency. Students confirm that information supplied in the handbook is comprehensive, accurate and helpful. The team therefore determined that the Student Handbook was an accurate, comprehensive and effective reference point for students.

8.5 The majority of systems and services that students access during their studies, at every stage of the student life cycle, are supported by the University's Amizone system, which is a web-based portal developed by the University, that serves as an online platform for students and faculty members to access a range of academic and administrative services. These services include online course registration, exam schedules, class timetables and academic calendars. Students can also access their attendance records, grades and academic transcripts, and download various forms and documents related to

their studies. In addition, Amizone has a messaging function that enables staff and students to communicate with one another. Amizone also contains an e-learning platform, which provides students with access to a range of online learning resources, such as lecture notes, video tutorials, and e-books. Students can also participate in online discussions and quizzes and submit assignments and projects through the portal. Students stated that Amizone is critical in enabling them to navigate their studies and staff find the system to be an effective central source for managing their programmes and wider support services. The comprehensive nature of the Amizone system was demonstrated to the team during the site visit and was noted as good practice in Standard 1.7.

8.6 Information provided to the team demonstrates that Amity University has effective policies in place, that are well understood by staff and implemented consistently. Consequently, published information is clear, accurate, objective, up to date and readily accessible. The team therefore concludes that Standard 1.8 is **met**.

## **Standard 1.9 Ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes**

**Institutions should monitor and periodically review their programmes to ensure that they achieve the objectives set for them and respond to the needs of students and society. These reviews should lead to continuous improvement of the programme. Any action planned or taken as a result should be communicated to all those concerned.**

9.1 The University regularly monitors, reviews and revises its study programmes to ensure that the provision remains appropriate and to create a supportive and effective learning environment for students. There is a process of annual review before the commencement of each academic year and a major review of programme is undertaken every three years.

9.2 The regular progress of teaching and learning during the semester is monitored by the institutional Quality Assurance Committee by checking a variety of sources of evidence, including course delivery measures, student attendance data, student and peer feedback and examination outcomes. A comprehensive scrutiny is conducted at the end of the academic session to check on the performance of the programme.

9.3 There is a process for programme review, that is based upon the regulations for curriculum design and development. The Programme Review Outcome Assessment Committee (PROAC) reviews the programme structure, taking account of the programme mission, graduate attributes, multidisciplinary aspects, industry requirements, local, regional, national and global needs, attainment of programme learning outcomes, result analysis, the implementation report of the outcome assessment plan, and the core, professional and research competencies.

9.4 PROAC commissions the Course Review Committee (CRC) to begin the review process. CRC will then seek feedback from the stakeholders, including staff, students, alumni and the relevant industry.

9.5 The recommendations from the Course Review Committee and an analysis of the feedback from stakeholders are sent to the Area Advisory Board for review. The recommendations of the Area Advisory Board are then sent to the institutional Board of Studies which is chaired by the head of the campus and also includes senior faculty, alumni and members from industry and research organisations. The recommendation of the Board of Studies is then sent for approval of the Academic Council. Finally, the programme specifications are updated and the revised programme is delivered. PROAC and CRC constantly interact with each other during the curriculum review process.

9.6 An audit trail of periodic programme review showed that the process includes the evaluation of the content of the programme in the light of the latest research in the given discipline, thus ensuring that the programme is up to date and includes the evaluation of the changing needs of society. Further evidence to support this includes a schematic diagram of the process, and minutes of a meeting of PROAC.

9.7 The annual and periodic review processes include the evaluation of students' workload, progression and completion. The University has a student workload system that is defined through the Model Framework. This framework defines timetabling and credit hour policy, in alignment with the expectations of relevant regulatory bodies. Examples provided breaks down the credit units for each course across the six semesters of study.

9.8 The Model Framework allows students to choose courses via the Students' Academic Planning Worksheet, while ensuring they meet the credit unit workload for the semester and

create their own timetable by selecting courses based on the University's Choice Based Credit System.

9.9 Progression and completion requirements are defined in the University Regulations, R 01. Each student's progression is monitored at course level through continuous evaluation and the end-of-semester examination. The examination typically has a weighting that ranges from 50% to 70%. The passing criterion in each course is also defined, and a student is required to secure minimum 30% marks to pass the examination and minimum aggregate marks of 35% in undergraduate and 40% in postgraduate courses to be considered as having passed each course.

9.10 For the completion of a programme a student must achieve a minimum semester Grade Point Average (GPA) and a minimum cumulative GPA at the end of the final year of the programme. The required GPAs are defined for undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. The minimum and maximum time period for completion of each programme is also defined.

9.11 The annual and periodic review processes include the evaluation of the effectiveness of procedures for assessment of students. The effectiveness of the assessment procedures is carried out at course and programme level. This involves mapping the Programme Educational Outcomes and Programme Operational Outcomes across the courses of each programme. An example Course Curriculum Coherence Matrix shows how the course learning outcomes are mapped to with Bloom's Taxonomy, Programme Learning Outcomes and Graduate Attributes, and an example Outcomes Assessment Plan maps outcomes to assessments for a domain within a programme.

9.12 The University engages a wide range of stakeholders, including employers, external academics and alumni as part of their approach to the development, delivery, monitoring and review of programmes and support services. In particular, employers and external academics are members of Department Research Committees, Board of Studies and Area Advisory Boards. The University also distributes employer and alumni surveys. Stakeholders seen by the team stated that the University was highly consultative and acted on their feedback to enhance overall provision. As well as eliciting feedback through these formal structures, the University gathers the views of employers when students attend internships and/or placements. Throughout the review visit, employers described their satisfaction with the University's graduates and that they actively recruit from the institution. The review team therefore concludes that the extensive arrangements for stakeholder engagement that enable the University to respond to the needs of industry is a feature of **good practice**.

9.13 Staff and students were able to confirm that the procedures for review ensured that programmes continued to meet the student expectations, needs and satisfaction in relation to the programme. Student feedback is collected and analysed and used to inform programme development by the Course Review Committee and Area Advisory Board. Staff report that student feedback encourages them to update their teaching regularly and helps them to benchmark both horizontally and vertically.

9.14 An evaluation of the learning environment forms part of the annual and periodic review processes. However, while the team was told that the review processes include consideration of the support services and their fitness for purpose for the programme, there is no explicit reference to this in the guidance documentation. This is referred to as a recommendation in Standard 1.2. Support service units are monitored annually by IQAC, in a process that includes consideration of key performance indicators, but do not undergo comprehensive periodic review. In order to ensure optimisation of the support service units for the current and projected future demands placed upon them, and to provide an external viewpoint on their effectiveness, a formal periodic review process should be introduced. The



team therefore **recommends** that the University should ensure that each support service unit is comprehensively reviewed on a periodic basis.

9.15 The University has annual Academic and Administrative Audits (AAA) as a means of using experienced peers and National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) reviewers to assess the robustness of institutional practices. The University IQAC is responsible for action.

9.16 In summary, regular monitoring, review and revision of study programmes at Amity University aim to ensure that they achieve the objectives set for them and respond to the needs of students and society, leading to continuous improvement of the programmes. Therefore, Standard 1.9 is **met**.

## **Standard 1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance**

### **Institutions should undergo external quality assurance in line with the ESG on a cyclical basis.**

10.1 The University participates in cyclical external quality assurance that takes account of the requirements of the legislative framework in which it operates. The University's quality assurance policies and structures are heavily regulated by the government, through the University Grants Commission and the Ministry of Education, including the reference points of the National Education Policy 2020, the UGC Quality Mandate and the local jurisdictions for overseas campuses. There is significant investment in accreditation and the University is subject to scrutiny by professional and statutory bodies.

10.2 The University is frequently reviewed and evaluated by external agencies and by accreditation bodies such as the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC), the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), and the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA). Individual programmes are reviewed by accreditation bodies such as the Institute of Engineering and Technology (IET), the Bar Council of India (BCI), the Pharmacy Council of India (PCI), the Rehabilitation Council of India (RCI), the Council of Architecture (CoA), the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE), and UNWTO TedQual.

10.3 The National Accreditation and Assessment Council periodically conducts an accreditation exercise in accordance with national regulations. The accreditation exercise evaluates higher education institutions for their compliance with the standards of quality related to educational processes and outcomes, curriculum coverage, teaching-learning processes, faculty, research, infrastructure, learning resources, organisation, governance, financial well-being and student services. The last accreditation visit was in 2019 and action plans were prepared in response.

10.4 The Western Association of Schools and Colleges last accredited the University in 2022 and action was taken on the recommendations.

10.5 The Uttar Pradesh State Council of Higher Education (UPSCHE) conducted a review of the University in November 2021, with a positive outcome.

10.6 The UK Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) last visited the University in 2018. Action was taken on the recommendations received from QAA and there was a satisfactory mid-cycle report in 2022.

10.7 The QAA mid-cycle report noted the continuing engagement of the University with PSRBs and that the University had responded positively to recommendations arising from PSRB periodic reviews, although the University had had to be prompted, on occasion, to follow the established rules of the PSRBs. The report also noted that the University had no formal mechanism to coordinate responses to external accreditation and resultant recommendations and suggested that the University could develop a mechanism. The University had, however, taken a systematic and effective approach to the implementation of UGC Quality Mandates in 2020. All responses to external review and accreditations are coordinated by the Noida Campus.

10.8 Amity University Dubai was initially licensed by the Knowledge and Human Development Authority. Subsequently, it applied for licensing by the United Arab Emirates Ministry of Education and was granted licensure in 2022. All Amity University Dubai Business School programmes are accredited by the Commission for Academic Accreditation (CAA), with the other programmes belonging to both the School of Humanities, Arts, and Applied Sciences and the School of Engineering, Architecture, and Interior Design due for accreditation visits in the first half of 2023. This means that business degrees are now

offered in Indian or Dubai (International) form. Students may elect which option they wish to take.

10.9 Programmes delivered on the Tashkent campus are all fully aligned with those on the Noida campus. They are accredited by the Uzbek Government every five years. When the campus was established, the University received a special dispensation to allow the Noida campus programmes to be delivered without modification.

10.10 The University Grants Council has begun a number of reforms to higher education in India. These include 10 mandates that the University is required to implement. They address various national priorities for quality assurance. The University is engaging with the 10 mandates and has an action plan for each. The action plans have been updated annually.

10.11 The University ensures that the progress made since the last external quality assurance activity is taken into consideration when preparing for the next one. Reports and action in response to accreditation is monitored through the Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) or the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Department (QAE) and overseen by the Registrar's Office/Vice Chancellor. There are time-bound action plans in response to issues raised.

10.12 Where individual programmes are accredited by a professional body, they are subject to that body's regulatory processes. The University acts on the recommendations given by PSRBs and external reviewers during their visit or inspection. Action plans are prepared and submitted to the agency concerned. The actions are completed within the prescribed timescales and are monitored by the Internal Quality Assurance Cell or Quality Assurance and Enhancement Department and overseen by the Registrar's Office and Vice Chancellor.

10.13 Staff confirm that they are informed of relevant recommendations arising from external reviews and accreditations. The notification comes via the Heads of Campus and the Deans and is discussed at faculty meetings.

10.14 In summary, Amity University participates in numerous forms of cyclical external quality assurance. It acts upon the external feedback or report with a follow-up process that ensures that the progress made since the last external quality assurance activity is taken into consideration when preparing for the next one. The team concludes that the University undergoes external quality assurance in line with the ESG on a cyclical basis and therefore that Standard 1.10 is **met**.

## Glossary

### Action plan

A plan developed by the institution after the QAA review report has been published, which is signed off by the head of the institution. It responds to the recommendations in the report and gives any plans to capitalise on the identified good practice.

### Annual monitoring

Checking a process or activity every year to see whether it meets expectations for standards and quality. Annual reports normally include information about student achievements and may comment on the evaluation of courses and modules.

### Collaborative arrangement

A formal arrangement between a degree-awarding body and another higher education provider. These may be degree-awarding bodies with which the institution collaborates to deliver higher education qualifications on behalf of the degree-awarding bodies. Alternatively, they may be other delivery organisations who deliver part or all of a proportion of the institution's higher education programmes.

### Condition

Conditions set out action that is required. Conditions are only used with unsatisfactory judgements where the quality cannot be approved. Conditions may be used where quality or standards are at risk/continuing risk if action is not taken or if a required standard is not met and action is needed for it to be met.

### Degree-awarding body

Institutions that have authority, for example from a national agency, to issue their own awards. Institutions applying to IQR may be degree-awarding bodies themselves, or may collaborate to deliver higher education qualifications on behalf of degree-awarding bodies.

### Desk-based analysis

An analysis by the review team of evidence, submitted by the institution, that enables the review team to identify its initial findings and subsequently supports the review team as it develops its review findings.

### Enhancement

See **quality enhancement**.

### European Standards and Guidelines

For details, including the full text on each standard, see [www.enqa.eu/index.php/home/esg](http://www.enqa.eu/index.php/home/esg).

### Examples of practice

A list of policies and practices that a review team may use when considering the extent to which an institution meets the standards for review. The examples should be considered as a guide only, in acknowledgment that not all of them will be appropriate for all institutions.

### Externality

The use of experts from outside a higher education provider, such as external examiners or external advisers, to assist in quality assurance procedures.

### Facilitator

The member of staff identified by the institution to act as the principal point of contact for the QAA officer and who will be available during the review visit, to assist with any questions or requests for additional documentation.

**Good practice**

A feature of good practice is a process or way of working that, in the view of a QAA review team, makes a particularly positive contribution to the institution's higher education provision.

**Lead student representative**

An optional voluntary role that is designed to allow students at the institution applying for IQR to play a central part in the organisation of the review.

**Oversight**

Objective scrutiny, monitoring and quality assurance of educational provision.

**Peer reviewers**

Members of the review team who make the decisions in relation to the review of the institution. Peer reviewers have experience of managing quality and academic standards in higher education or have recent experience of being a student in higher education.

**Periodic review**

An internal review of one or more programmes of study, undertaken by institutions periodically (typically once every five years), using nationally agreed reference points, to confirm that the programmes are of an appropriate academic standard and quality. The process typically involves experts from other higher education providers. It covers areas such as the continuing relevance of the programme, the currency of the curriculum and reference materials, the employability of graduates and the overall performance of students. Periodic review is one of the main processes whereby institutions can continue to assure themselves about the academic quality and standards of their awards.

**Programme of study**

An approved course of study that provides a coherent learning experience and normally leads to a qualification. UK higher education programmes must be approved and validated by UK degree-awarding bodies.

**Quality enhancement**

The process by which higher education providers systematically improve the quality of provision and the ways in which students' learning is supported.

**QAA officer**

The person appointed by QAA to manage the review programme and to act as the liaison between the review team and the institution.

**Quality assurance**

The systematic monitoring and evaluation of learning and teaching, and the processes that support them, to make sure that the standards of academic awards meet the necessary standards, and that the quality of the student learning experience is being safeguarded and improved.

**Recognition of prior learning**

Assessing previous learning that has occurred in any of a range of contexts including school, college and university, and/or through life and work experiences.

**Recommendation**

Review teams make recommendations where they agree that an institution should consider developing or changing a process or a procedure in order to improve the institution's higher education provision.

**Reference points**

Statements and other publications that establish criteria against which performance can be measured.

**Self-evaluation document**

A self-evaluation report by an institution. The submission should include information about the institution as well as an assessment of the effectiveness of its quality systems.

**Student submission**

A document representing student views that describes what it is like to be a student at the institution, and how students' views are considered in the institution's decision-making and quality assurance processes.

**Validation**

The process by which an institution ensures that its academic programmes meet expected academic standards and that students will be provided with appropriate learning opportunities. It may also be applied to circumstances where a degree-awarding institution gives approval for its awards to be offered by a partner institution or organisation.

**QAA2789 - R13525 - Aug 23**

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2023  
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB  
Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786

Email: [accreditation@gaa.ac.uk](mailto:accreditation@gaa.ac.uk)  
Website: [www.gaa.ac.uk](http://www.gaa.ac.uk)