Policy and procedures for the design, approval and quality management of collaborative provision

[For the purposes of the processes described in this document, in Henley Business School the Head of Programmes will be fulfilling the functions of the School Director of Teaching and Learning.]

Terms of reference

1 This document details the policy and procedures which should be followed for the design, approval and ongoing quality management of taught or research programmes operated in collaboration with other institutions in the UK or internationally. It forms part of the University’s Guide to policies and procedures for teaching and learning, Section 11: Working with other institutions.

2 This document draws heavily on the QAA Code of Practice on Collaborative Provision as a key external reference point, but also is heavily interdependent with other University policies and procedures relating to teaching and learning.

3 In addition to this general document, additional specific guidance is provided for collaborative activities which involve particular considerations - Specific guidance for Foundation Degrees, Specific guidance for jointly-awarded Degrees, and Specific guidance for international collaborative provision – these should be read in conjunction with this document when relevant.

Key contacts

4 Schools who are considering the development of a proposal for collaborative provision should contact the following at the earliest possible opportunity prior to developing a formalised relationship with a potential partner, to receive guidance and advice on the feasibility of developing such a proposal and the process for doing so:

- The relevant School Director of Teaching and Learning (where not directly involved in development of the initiative)
- The relevant Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning
- The Quality Support Office
  - For UK collaborations:
    Vicky Howard, Senior Quality Support Officer (ext. 4466), v.a.howard@reading.ac.uk
  - For international collaborations:
    Rachel Dearlove, International Quality Support Manager (ext. 6767), r.dearlove@reading.ac.uk
Where a proposal involves an overseas institution, Schools are also advised to contact the International Office.

Heather McKeever, International Partnerships Development Manager (ext. 8749), h.mckeever@reading.ac.uk

These contacts will support and guide Schools through the development process.

University policy on collaborative provision

The University currently has a relatively small portfolio of collaborative arrangements which reflect its strategic interests. It recognises the benefits of further developments in this area, but also the costs and potential risks, and therefore it considers proposals for collaborative provision on a case by case basis according to their merits.

Underpinning all of its present and future collaborative activity is a set of key principles which form the University’s policy on collaborative provision. All activities:

- must be consistent with the University’s strategic plans, (ideally) arise from School plans and be congruent with the School’s academic provision, bringing clear benefits to all those involved;
- support the University’s objective to be internationally recognised for our excellence in teaching;
- support the University’s status as a research-intensive university;
- should only be with other organisations, which have the academic standing to successfully deliver programmes of study to appropriate academic standards, the financial standing to sustain them, adequate infrastructure facilities and resources (including appropriate staffing) to support them and the legal standing to contract to their delivery;
- should be equivalent in quality and standards to comparable awards delivered solely by the University, and must be compatible with any QAA or other relevant benchmark information;
- should be comparable in student learning, support and experiences to those programmes based at the University;
- should give adequate opportunity for student representation and feedback;
- should be financially viable and feasible, and be fully costed and priced accordingly;
- should not be over-reliant on an individual member of staff, either within the University of Reading or the other organisation;
- should not be discriminatory, for example, should be compliant with internal and national (UK or EU) legislative requirements including the Human Rights Act, the Race Relations Amendment Act, and the Disability Discrimination Act;
- Except where the subject matter of the course is a language, English is normally the primary language of instruction and assessment. All modules which contribute to the final stage of an award of the University should normally be taught and assessed in English.

Defining collaborative provision

Building on the definition of collaborative provision given in the QAA Code of Practice on Collaborative Provision, the University defines collaborative provision as:
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“Any programme directly leading to an award of the University which is delivered in part or in whole through an arrangement with a partner organisation”

In this context “delivered” includes any combination of one or more of the following activities: admissions decisions, teaching, programme design, preparation of learning materials, and assessment.

Activities which fulfil this definition fall into three main categories:

- Validation (designed and delivered by the Partner Institution)
- Franchise (designed by the University but delivered by the Partner Institution)
- Joint awards (designed and delivered jointly with the Partner Institutions(s))
- Dual awards (normally designed and delivered by both Institutions, results in two awards for the same credit)
- Partner supported distance learning (designed by the University, but delivered with some academic support from the Partner Institution)
- Articulation arrangements (direct entry to an advanced point in a University programme)

The University would not normally enter into a dual award arrangement without good academic or strategic reasons.

Other types of arrangements with Partner Institutions which are felt to fall short (to a greater or lesser extent) of true collaborative provision include:

- Double or linked degrees (two separately delivered, but linked awards)
- Minor collaboration
- Off campus delivery
- Progression arrangements (entry to advanced point in a University programme subject to an academic admission hurdle)
- Recruitment arrangements (entry to the start of a programme)
- Student exchange and study abroad arrangements
- Placement learning

These arrangements will not normally be subject to the full in depth approval process which applies to collaborative provision arrangements, but are still subject to appropriate approval processes. These arrangements can be requested to undergo the full approval process at the discretion of the relevant Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning or the Quality Support Office.

Specific University policies exist for the establishment of articulation and progression agreements - *Procedures for the design, approval and quality management of articulation and progression agreements* – and all arrangements which require the signing of Memorandum of Understanding - *Procedure for the approval of Memoranda of Understanding and other non-collaborative arrangements*. For any other arrangements please contact the Quality Support Office for advice on how to proceed.

Full details of the various types of collaborative and non-collaborative arrangements that are recognised by the University are available in a *Typology of arrangements with partner institutions* available as Annex 1.

**Responsibility for quality and standards**

The arrangements for assuring the quality and standards of programmes delivered in collaboration with other institutions must be as rigorous, secure and open to scrutiny as those for programmes provided wholly within the responsibility of the University.
The University always retains responsibility for the standard of the award and the quality of the programme, although it will be necessary for it to delegate certain quality management functions to its partner(s). This introduces an additional element of risk, which must be countered by rigorous quality management and reporting processes.

Furthermore, Schools should be aware that collaborative arrangements with an overseas institution or organisation will require a greater level of initial scrutiny and on-going monitoring and review than would be the case with UK institutions, due to the different educational culture and context that the programme will be operating within and the difficulties caused by geographical location.

Initial approval process

The approval process for collaborative provision consists of two parts:

- **Initial approval** – a quick, responsive process designed to support the Proposing School develop the idea to a stage where the overall merits of the proposed collaboration can be assessed and a strategic decision taken whether to invest further time and resources in development. N.B. This is the minimum process to be completed when applying for external funding to support a collaborative activity.

- **Full approval** – an in depth process which examines all aspects of the proposed collaboration: academic suitability, business case and financial viability, and partner suitability.

The flowchart on page 5 outlines the major phases of both the initial approval and full approval processes.

Who to contact first

The first step if you have been approached or have an idea for a new collaborative provision venture is to contact the appropriate School Director of Teaching and Learning. ALL proposals must come forward with the support of the School from the outset. If you have support to develop the idea you then need to contact the Quality Support Office:

- If the proposal involves collaborating with a UK based partner: Vicky Howard, Senior Quality Support Officer (ext. 4466), v.a.howard@reading.ac.uk
- If the proposal involves collaborating with a partner based outside of the UK Rachel Dearlove, International Quality Support Manager (ext. 6767), r.dearlove@reading.ac.uk

For international collaborations, if you have not already done so, you will also need to make contact with the International Office:

- Heather McKeever, International Partnership Development Manager (ext. 8749), h.mckeever@reading.ac.uk

The proposal will also need support and input from the Faculty, so it is important to also contact the appropriate Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning early on.

The proposal

The proposal takes the form of three key documents:

- *Proposal for new collaborative provision* (annex 2)
- *Risk Assessment for new collaborative provision* (annex 3)
• Partner Profile for new collaborative provision (annex 4)

21 These will need to be completed by the proposing School with support from the appropriate member of the Quality Support Office, and input from the International Office when relevant.

22 If the proposal also involves application for funding from an external body then the application form and any associated documentation should also be completed alongside the proposal documents, and will be discussed as part of the approval process.
Approval of Collaborative Provision

1. Initial proposal documents prepared by school/dept & QSO
2. Initial proposal discussed by proposer, FDTL, SOTIL/HoS, QSO (& RIO)*
3. Proposal withdrawn
4. Proposal documents with recommendations submitted to STRAP
5. Sent back for further development
6. Proposal rejected
7. Proposal granted initial approval

Programme approval

- Academic scrutiny
  - Appropriate scrutiny process depending on nature of programme development
  - Consideration by FDTL

- Activity approval
  - Full business plan with costing
  - Full risk assessment (when required)
  - Decision by STRAP

Partner approval

- Due diligence
- Site visit
- Draft agreement prepared by QSO

Report submitted to UBTIL for consideration

- UBTIL recommends approval of proposed collaboration to Senate
- Approved by Senate
- Agreement finalised and signed by VC
The proposal will then be discussed at a meeting involving: the proposing School (School Director of Teaching and Learning, originator of the proposal, and if desired the Head of School), Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning, the involved member of the Quality Support Office and, when applicable, a member of the International Office. The group will discuss the merits of proposal and may send it back for further development or ask that the proposal is withdrawn. If they feel that the proposal is fundamentally sound and in line with the School and University’s strategic they will submit it for formal initial approval.

**Initial approval**

The three proposal documents and external funding application documents (when applicable), along with a written recommendation statement approved by the School Director of Teaching and Learning, Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning, Quality Support Office (and International Office when relevant) will be submitted to STRAP for consideration.

At this stage STRAP may either: reject the proposal outright, grant it initial approval (with or without suggested revisions/areas for attention), or in exceptional circumstances return the proposal for further development (proposals should be in their full form before this stage so further development should rarely be an option).

If granted initial approval the proposal may proceed to the full approval process. Full approval is, of course, not guaranteed, but this initial scrutiny process means that for successful proposals, at this early stage, they can be assured of University support for the fundamental elements of the proposal. In turn the University can ensure that time and resources are directed at the proposals which are most likely to succeed.

As stated above, this is the minimum approval process which a proposal for collaborative provision involving external funding must undergo before the application is submitted to the funding body. If the proposal is approved by STRAP, any suggested revisions should be made and a final copy of the application documentation submitted **in good time** to the Quality Support Office. It will then be submitted for signature by the Vice-Chancellor or Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching & Learning) as appropriate. Application documents should under no circumstances be submitted to the Pro Vice-Chancellor or Vice-Chancellor’s office directly. It is up to proposing School to ensure that enough time is allowed for the initial approval process to take place before any external funding deadline.

**Full approval process**

The full approval process is composed of three elements:

- **Academic scrutiny** – to ensure that all programmes offered by the University are of an appropriate quality and standard and to comply with the approval process followed for new programmes and programme amendments set out in **Support for and approval of programme initiatives and revisions to programmes**.

- **Activity approval** – to ensure that the collaborative venture is undertaken on a sound business basis.

- **Partner approval** – to ensure the proposed Partner Institution is of an appropriate standing.

Supporting this process are a number of key documents which form the proposal:
- The appropriate proposal form relating to programme development (as detailed in *Policies and procedures for the approval of new programme initiatives and revisions to programmes*).
- Business Plan, including full costings (and where appropriate pricings).
- Report of a formal visit to the Partner Institution produced by the Quality Support Office.
- Due diligence portfolio produced by the Quality Support Office.

In addition, as the process progresses a draft agreement will be produced by the Quality Support Office (with significant input from the School), incorporating all the academic, financial and logistical arrangements. This will then be finalised should the proposal be approved (see paragraphs 63 to 66).

**Academic scrutiny**

30 Programmes must be developed and approved in line with the University’s procedures relating to *Support for and approval of programme initiatives and revisions to programmes* and if applicable in relation to relevant sections of the collaborative provision *Specific Guidance*... documents.

31 Schools will need to identify a Programme Director early on who is prepared to lead on the development of the programme and manage it after approval.

32 Schools must ensure that:
- The Programme is placed at the appropriate level of the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications and that academic standards are equivalent to programmes delivered at the University.
- Where appropriate relevant Subject Benchmarking Statement(s) are utilised in its development.
- Arrangements for assessment comply with the University’s *Code of Practice on the assessment of taught programmes*.
- Procedures for external examining align with the University’s *Code of Practice on the external examining of taught programmes*.
- Where the programme is to be accredited by a professional, statutory or regulatory body (PSRB) that programme design delivery in conjunction with a partner still fulfils the PSRB’s requirements.

33 Schools will be required to prepare a Programme Specification, developed in line with the University’s template.

**Activity approval and business planning**

34 Alongside the academic content of the proposed programme the viability of the collaborative activity as a whole needs to be assessed i.e. the demand for the qualification, the market for graduates, the costs and benefits to the University (including additional demands on resources), the risk involved etc.

35 These elements need to be captured in a business plan submitted to STRAP - in parallel with the academic scrutiny process - who will then assess the overall viability of the proposal. The University does not specify a set format or template for a “good” business plan, but a number of key areas need to be included.

**Demand and market conditions**
36 The business plan needs to demonstrate that you have identified a sufficient demand for the programme. This is likely to involve answering some or all of the following questions about who your students will be:

- How many students do you expect to enrol each year, and why? Give projected figures for at least the first three years of the course.
- Where are they going to come from:
  - Local or international?
  - Direct from education or from the workforce?
- How are they likely to finance their studies (government/employer sponsored or self-financed)?
- Where will they work after they finish the programme i.e. what evidence exists for demand for this qualification?

37 It is also important to consider the current market:

- Who are your main competitors? What do they offer which is comparable?
- Is there a unique selling point of the programme?
- If it appears to be an entirely novel venture, why hasn’t this been undertaken before?
- Is the demand likely to continue in the future?

38 Market information will also help determine the level of fees that may be charged, and how this income will be split with the proposed Partner Institution. All this information will contribute to the assumptions underlying the financial analysis.

Resources

39 The business plan will also need to outline the resources involved in the delivery of the programme and operation of the collaboration, including:

- Overall staff resources – time and personnel required to handle all aspects of the collaboration: recruitment, admissions, administration, travel time, teaching, assessment etc.
- Learning resources - hardcopy resources, licenses, software etc.
- Delivery resources - teaching space, information technology, laboratory equipment, travel and accommodation etc.
- Support resources – drawn on from outside the School (staff time, travel and accommodation) i.e. quality assurance, external examining etc.

40 With regard to the learning resources required the following should be contacted for information and advice:

- Information Technology Services
- Library
- Centre for the Development of Teaching and Learning

41 By thinking through all the resource implications of the activity it will enable the financial analysis to be undertaken accurately.

Risk analysis

42 As part of the initial approval process a simple risk assessment tool was used. This may have highlighted particular risk factors involved in the proposed collaboration. This information, along with the process of developing the business plan should have provided an insight into areas of uncertainty or concern in the collaboration.
43 As part of the business plan, an analysis should be included as to what impact these risk factors might have on achieving the objectives of the collaboration – in particular the key areas of financial viability and potential risks to standards and quality.

44 The risk analysis should also include an indicative exit strategy for how the collaboration could be wound down in the event that it is felt to be no longer worth pursuing.

Financial analysis

45 The financial analysis should be prepared, showing revenue streams, all direct staff and non-staff costs required to deliver the activity and if appropriate a contribution to departmental and central overhead costs. In addition to staff directly employed to deliver the programme, staff costs should also include a proportion of the costs of any existing staff, who will be involved in delivery as identified in the resource analysis.

46 As a general principle, programmes should be self-financing on a full economic cost basis taking one year with another. Costing on this basis aims to ensure that the programme is fully covering costs, as well as making a contribution to the University's sustainability and is not being cross-subsidised.

47 In certain circumstances, it may be permissible for modest losses to be borne in the early years, as marketing/development costs are front-loaded and as student numbers need to build up. The extent to which it is appropriate to incur up-front costs should be assessed with regard to the level of risk associated with the activity. Where there is a possibility that the programme may not proceed, for example due to lack of demand, up-front costs should be kept to a minimum.

48 The business plan should clearly state the assumptions underpinning the figures and provide evidence of how market demand has been evaluated. It is particularly important that the robustness of student number projections is adequately demonstrated.

Who to contact for help

49 Support for business planning and costing is available from:
- Peter Osborne, Head of Financial Planning and Analysis (ext. 8100), p.m.osborne@reading.ac.uk

Partner approval

50 In addition to consideration of the academic suitability and business viability of the collaborative arrangement the University will need to be assured that any proposed new partner institution is of an appropriate standing. This involves two separate processes:
- a visit to the prospective partner institution by relevant staff; and
- a ‘Due Diligence’ investigation of a range of relevant information relating to that institution.

Visits to prospective Partner Institutions

51 The visit to the prospective partner institution will normally be undertaken by an appropriate member of staff of the relevant School or Department and also by a member of the Quality Support Office. Other staff, such as the relevant Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning may also, from time to time, accompany them.

52 The visit to the prospective partner institution will involve the following:
• consideration of the quality of the teaching and learning facilities in relation to the proposed programme(s), including library and IT resources. The member of staff of the relevant School or Department will have a particular responsibility in this area;
• meeting key teaching and other staff of the proposed partner;
• consideration and discussion of a range of academic issues relating to the partnership including:
  • the Partner Institution’s existing quality assurance arrangements;
  • arrangements for managing the partnership (including the committee structure);
  • proposed quality assurance arrangements for the programme(s), including Annual Programme Reports and future Periodic Review and Revalidation;
  • arrangements for seeking the views of student (representation and evaluation);
  • assessment arrangements, including External Examiners;
  • student complaints and appeals procedures;
  • student welfare support and facilities;
  • admissions arrangements, including admissions criteria, English language provision (where appropriate) and the minimum and maximum size of a cohort;
  • arrangements for marketing of and recruitment to the programme (including website and publicity material);
  • staff training and development, and staff appraisal;
  • discussion of a draft Memorandum of Agreement (based, particularly, on discussions related to issues set out in (c) above);
  • where appropriate, an observation of teaching;
  • where appropriate, meeting a group of existing students.
53 Following the visit, the representative of the Quality Support Office will produce a Report for consideration by the University Board for Teaching and Learning.

Due Diligence investigations of prospective Partner Institutions

54 As part of the process of considering whether to work with a partner institution, the University will carry out a ‘Due Diligence’ investigation in order to assure itself that the proposed partner is one with which it would be happy to collaborate. Such Due Diligence is the norm in similar situations in the commercial world and, in relation to higher education, one of the precepts of the QAA Code of Practice on Collaborative provision and flexible and distributed learning states that:

  “An awarding institution should undertake, with due diligence, an investigation to satisfy itself about the good standing of a prospective partner or agent, and of their capacity to fulfil their designated role in the arrangement. This investigation should include the legal status of the prospective partner or agent, and its capacity in law to contract with the awarding institution.”

55 The Quality Support Office will ask prospective partners to supply the following documentation:
  • An Annual Report (akin to the University’s Annual Review);
  • A set of Annual Accounts;
  • Details of Professional Indemnity insurance cover, such as a letter from the partner Institution’s brokers confirming this cover and its extent;
• CVs of staff who will be teaching on relevant programmes.

56 Other sources of information will be investigated as follows:

• The Quality Support Office will undertake a check of the proposed partner institutional website, including investigation of institutional mission;
• The Quality Support Office will undertake a review of the QAA website to investigate whether there have been any reports relating to the proposed partner;
• Where applicable, the Reading International Office will seek information from appropriate organisations in the UK and abroad (including the British Council) about the standing of the proposed partner and whether they have any existing collaborations with other UK HEIs;
• Where applicable, the Reading International Office will seek information from appropriate organisations about the legal standing of the proposed partner and its ability to operate within its national legislative and cultural requirements.

Consideration and approval of Due Diligence information

57 On receipt of the relevant documentation and other pieces of evidence, these will be considered as follows:

• The Finance section of Finance and Corporate Services will consider the set of Annual Accounts and provide a brief report to the Quality Support Office indicating whether these are satisfactory;
• Where applicable, the Reading International Office will provide a report to the Quality Support Office relating to its discussions with the British Council;
• The Insurance Office will confirm whether the partner Institution’s Professional Indemnity insurance cover is appropriate;
• The Quality Support Office will produce a summary report on the complete Due Diligence process for consideration by the University Board for Teaching and Learning and also, in relation to the financial aspects of due diligence, the Committee on Strategy for Student Recruitment and Academic Provision.

Timing of Due Diligence investigations

58 Whilst there is the potential for the Due Diligence process to take a little time, the University will seek to ensure that this does not stop innovation and proposals for partnership coming forward. The Due Diligence process is intended to run in parallel with the development of a Business Plan and with the programme approval process for a partnership and can begin as soon as Initial Approval has been granted.

Reciprocal Due Diligence

59 The University is aware that the Due Diligence process is sensitive, both politically and culturally. The investigation will therefore be conducted with appropriate tact and diplomacy, particularly as it is the expectation that any future partner will be a well-established institution with an excellent reputation. Nevertheless, a Due Diligence investigation is something which the University is obliged to carry out and this should be made clear to prospective partner institutions at the outset. However, in order to act in a transparent way and to encourage the development of a partnership, the University will provide the following documents to a proposed partner on a reciprocal basis:

• The Annual Review;
• The Annual Accounts (Financial Statements);
• The University Calendar;
• A copy of the University’s most recent QAA Institutional Audit report;
• Confirmation of the University’s Professional Indemnity insurance;
• A standard note setting out the legal standing of the University and its power to award degrees.

Timing

60 On most occasions, the three processes outlined above may be completed in parallel in order to reduce the time required for the approval of a new collaborative programme. The dates of committee meetings, such as STRAP and UBTL, are set prior to the commencement of the Session, however, and Schools should consider these dates when establishing their timetable.

61 Schools should note that developing a collaborative programme will necessarily require involved, and often complex and lengthy, discussions with staff at both partner institutions and within the University. Such discussions should take part prior to the programme being submitted for Full Approval. Where due consideration has not been paid to academic, financial, operational and quality assurance issues, a proposal is likely to be referred back to the School for further work.

62 Once a proposal for a collaborative programme has been approved by the Scrutiny Panel and by STRAP, it will be referred to the Faculty Board for Teaching and Learning, and then on to the University Board for Teaching and Learning, and ultimately the Senate. The proposal cannot be considered to have received approval by the University until it has been passed by the Senate.

Post approval

The agreement

63 As early as possible in the process the agreement will be drafted by the Quality Support Office. Following the approval of the Senate, the Quality Support Office will finalise the agreement between the University and the partner institution. Agreements should not be drawn up, signed, or otherwise agreed by the School, as they constitute a legal contract between the University as a whole and the partner institution. All agreements will be signed by the Vice-Chancellor or the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching & Learning).

64 Key elements of the agreement and its annexes include:
• Fundamental contractual terms – period of operation, exit process etc.
• Academic terms – the nature of the programme, admissions, assessment, minimum and maximum student numbers, obligations of the University, obligations of the Partner Institution etc.
• Financial terms – student and validation fees, terms of payment etc.

65 In collaboration with the relevant Faculty Director for Teaching and Learning and the Quality Support Office, the School will also need to consider how quality assurance arrangements for the proposed programme are to be handled, paying particular attention to the monitoring of those quality management functions which have been delegated to the partner institution and which need to be outlined in the agreement (and provided in more detail in the Provider’s Handbook, see below).
This will include arrangements for:

- the operation of the Board of Studies and Examinations Board, and the provision of annual reports to the Faculty on an equivalent basis to that for programmes delivered at Reading;
- regular monitoring of the programme and related learning facilities, including frequency and purpose of visits to the partner institution by the School;
- mechanisms for students to provide feedback and to make complaints/appeals;
- on-going and regular contact between the University and its partner, and the management of operational issues;
- periodic review and revalidation (in line with the Requirements for periodic review and revalidation of programmes).

Advertising and recruitment

Programme recruitment, publicity and marketing materials for collaborative programme may be produced by the University or by the Partner Institution, or both, subject to the conditions in the agreement. Advertising and recruitment for the programme should not, however, formally begin until the agreement has been finalised and signed by the Vice Chancellor and Partner Institution.

The Quality Support Office has a responsibility to maintain oversight of the advertisement of collaborative programmes. At regular intervals relevant websites will be checked and it would be helpful if a copy of any printed material produced be passed on as it is produced.

Provider’s Handbook

The Quality Support Office will work in consultation with the School and the partner institution to devise an operational handbook which will detail all operational and quality assurance procedures, and forms part of the formal Agreement.

This should ideally be completed before recruitment begins but should definitely be in place before the first students are enrolled. The Provider’s Handbook should be reviewed annually.

Ongoing management and monitoring

Management Framework

The School is responsibility for the day to day management of all elements of the collaborative programme and relationship. The Programme should either be brought under the aegis of an existing Board of Studies or, if felt necessary, a new Board of Studies created to provide oversight. A day to day Steering or Management Group is also likely to be advisable, and in most cases, and particularly where involvement of the Partner Institution is substantial, the Partner Institution should be represented in some capacity on all managing bodies.

Annual report

All Boards of Studies are required to produce a report in the Spring Term on the programmes for which they are responsible. Collaboratively provided programmes can either be included in the main Board of Studies report, or as a separate report to be considered by the Faculty Board for Teaching and Learning or other Committee.
The contents of all material relating to collaborative provision is brought together and analysed annually in an overview report, compiled by the Quality Support Office. It is an opportunity to highlight good practice and identify any problems or issues that might have wider relevance beyond the individual programme.

Periodic review and revalidation

The policies and procedures for the periodic review of collaborative programmes mirror those for non-collaborative programmes and are detailed in Requirements for periodic review and revalidation of programmes.
Annex 1: Typology of arrangements with partner institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>CP?</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Joint award                   | Joint  | Joint    | Joint | Yes | Two or more awarding institutions together provide a programme leading to a single award made jointly by both, or all, participants.                                                                                                               | • MSc in Network and E-Business Centred Computing, with Carlos III University, Spain and Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece.  
• MSc Food Science and Technology with Chiang Mai University, Thailand             |
| Dual                          | Joint  | Joint    | Both  | Yes | Two or more awarding institutions together provide a programme or programmes leading to an award from each institution for the same credit (equivalent to join awards but with separate awards issued). |                                                                                   |
| Double or linked awards       | Varies | Both     | Both  | No  | Two or more awarding institutions together provide a programme or programmes leading to an award from each institution for the credit elements they deliver. These may be two existing programmes which are then offered as a linked package to students; or two programmes which are designed to be complimentary from the outset. |                                                                                   |

1 Whether the type of arrangement meets the University definition of Collaborative Provision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>CP?</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Validation                    | Partner  | Partner (whole/part) | University | Yes | The University validates programmes or parts of programmes of study which have been devised by other institutions. This means that the other institution is responsible for the delivery and design of a programme or part of a programme of study. The University remains responsible for standards of awards and quality assurance of validated programmes. Students are normally registered with the Partner Institution. | • MMet with a Year in Oklahoma, 3rd Year at University of Oklahoma is validated as part of the overall degree.  
• Programmes delivered at the College of Estate Management |
| Franchise                     | University | Partner (whole/part) | University | Yes | The University franchises delivery of programmes or parts of programmes of study that it has designed (sometimes in partnership with the franchisee) to another institution. This means that the other institution is responsible for delivery of a programme or parts of a programme of study. The University remains responsible for the standards of awards and quality assurance of the programme. Students are normally registered with the University. | With varying partners:  
• FDEd Early Years Development & Learning  
• FDEd Supporting Children’s Development and Learning  
• FDSc Computer Engineering  
• FDSc Horticulture  
• FDSc Information Communication Technology |
| Combination of Franchise & Off campus delivery | University | University | University | Yes | A programme is designed and delivered by the University but offered under a contract with an external client. University staff deliver 100% of the programme, with facilities for the programme provided by the external client | • LLB Law with Taylor’s University College, Malaysia  
• MSc Applied Informatics with Beijing Institute of Technology, PRC |
| Off campus delivery           | University | University | University | No  | A programme is designed and delivered by the University but offered under a contract with an external client. University staff deliver 100% of the programme, with facilities for the programme provided by the external client | • MA in International Relations and Strategic Studies taught in Oman  
• Some continuing education programmes |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>CP?</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Partner supported distance learning | University | University | University | Yes | Programme is delivered 100% by University staff (including via e-learning) but is supported by input from a local provider in respect of tutorials and/or pastoral support.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | With the ITM Group, India  
• MSc in Financial Risk Management  
• MSc International Securities, Investment and Banking  
• MSc in Investment Management  
• MSc in Finance and Real Estate                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
<p>| Articulation                | Partner (part) | Partner (part) | University (final award) | Yes | Arrangement to directly admit students to an advanced point on a specific University degree programme (i.e. direct entry into 2\textsuperscript{nd} or 3\textsuperscript{rd} year), after a period of study on a particular programme at the Partner Institution. May be subject to non-academic admissions criteria i.e. English language, pre-University qualifications etc. (\textit{This is effectively a specific form of validated provision}) | None at present                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Progression                 | Partner (part) | Partner (part) | University (final award) | No  | Arrangement to admit students to an advanced point on a specific University degree programme (i.e. direct entry into 2\textsuperscript{nd} or 3\textsuperscript{rd} year), after a period of study on a particular programme at the Partner Institution \textit{subject to an academic admissions hurdle}. May also be subject to non-academic admissions criteria i.e. English language, pre-University qualifications etc. | • BSc Food Biosciences with Henan University of Technology &amp; Southern Yangtze University, China                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Minor collaboration         | Varies | Partner (minor part) | University | No  | Programmes which involve a very small element of delivery by a partner institution will not normally regarded as collaborative provision, as they do not represent a significant delegation of responsibility for quality and standards.                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Recruitment agreement       | n/a    | n/a      | n/a           | No  | Invitation to apply on same admissions terms as any other applicant (normally to the start of a degree programme).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>CP?</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Placement learning           | Varies or n/a | Varies or n/a | University | No  | All categories of academic activity that are formal parts of a programme and take place off University premises, including work-based and work-related learning, practice placement, teaching practice, project work, sandwich years, years abroad for language students, day activities away from the University campuses | All programmes involving a:  
  - Year in industry  
  - Year abroad for language students |
| International student exchange or Study Abroad agreement | Either partner | Either partner | Either partner | No  | Mutual exchange of students for specified periods of time. | Many student exchange arrangements including:  
  - Erasmus  
  - Junior Year Aboard |
| Research collaboration       | Joint  | n/a      | n/a            | No  | Formal arrangement for joint research activity.                                                                                                                                                    | No Formal arrangement for joint research activity.                                                                                                                                                          |
| Other                        | n/a    | n/a      | n/a            | No  | Any other form of arrangements with another Institution relating to the common pursuit of academic and educational interests i.e.: staff exchange, student exchange, organisation of conferences, informal research relationships (N.B. separate agreements should be drawn up if arrangements extend beyond a less formal level). | No Any other form of arrangements with another Institution relating to the common pursuit of academic and educational interests |
## Proposal for new collaborative provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposer details:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner details</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution address</td>
<td>(including website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of collaboration:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of collaboration*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(please refer to the Typology of arrangements with other institutions and outline the specifics of this collaboration)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme(s) involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast number of students (headcount)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale for collaboration*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Why should the University enter into this partnership? What are the potential benefits? How does it fit with the school’s official plans?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business case*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Is there evidence of demand for the programme? How will the development of the partnership be funded? Will it be a profit making activity? etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to date*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(What discussions have been held with the proposed partner? Has a formal visit been made?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Maximum 150-200 words description
To be attached by QSO: Risk assessment of new collaborative provision, Partner profile for new collaborative provision
## Risk assessment of new collaborative provision

This document is intended to be a tool to help facilitate a quick and straightforward assessment of the potential risk involved in pursuing a proposal for the establishment of collaborative provision. It has been designed to cover areas of potential risk which are common to many forms of collaborative provision.

The assessment results in an overall score, and rating:
- 12 - 24 = Low
- 25 - 34 = Medium
- 35 - 44 = High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of partner</th>
<th>Proposed programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk area</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK or international; English as first language</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK based; English as second language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International; English as second language</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural and educational context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner’s status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (Taught &amp; Research degrees)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic etc. (Taught degrees only)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly funded FE college</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private college/organisation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner’s strength</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large, generally well-resourced*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small, generally well-resourced*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any size, with generally limited resources*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Resources in this context include financial, estate, staff and learning related.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk area</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role of partner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support centre only</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner support centre (i.e. distance learning)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching centre (partial delivery)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching centre (100% delivery)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner’s expertise in this subject area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has programmes at this level</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has programmes at a lower level</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has no experience in this field</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partners previous collaboration with UK HEIs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this qualification level</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a lower qualification level</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Host unit’s experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of same type of collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sending school/dept’s experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of same type of collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established collaborative programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established on campus only</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualification level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters or PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional body recognition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme leading to a recognised award</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Host country political climate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very stable</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Host country social climate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent to UK</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locality health and safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very safe</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Partner profile for new collaborative provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>xxxxxx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>History</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.e. date established; changes over time, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Public, private, charitable, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major funding sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.e. state, tuition fees, profit-making activities etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree awarding powers &amp; accreditation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(None, UG only, PG only etc &amp; state/other accreditation or recognition.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission statement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Range of subjects taught at different levels)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student profile</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No. of UG, PG etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff profile</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No. of teaching staff, support staff etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Links with UK HEIs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIO commentary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for international collaborations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>