

Part 11

Collaboration with Other Institutions

1 Introduction

- 1.1 UEL is involved in a range of collaborative relationships with other institutions. The following range of models defines the ways in which we can collaborate with other institutions:
- 1.2 UEL is involved in a range of collaborative relationships with other institutions. The following range of models defines the ways in which we can collaborate with other institutions:
- 1.2.1 **Franchise:** UEL may license other institutions to deliver whole programmes, or stages of programmes, designed by UEL staff, leading to an award or the award of credit by UEL. Core modules will be as set out in the UEL programme specification for the programme, save that differences in curriculum content in core modules may be permitted to reflect cultural and regional differences as long as learning outcomes remain consistent. The collaborating institution may be permitted to develop a different set of optional modules, as long as they enable the programme learning outcomes to be met. Additional optional modules would need to be approved through the UEL approval procedures;
- 1.2.2 **Joint:** A programme developed jointly with at least one other institution, which may also have degree awarding powers, leading to a UEL award, or a degree awarded jointly by the institutions, or a comparable award from another institution (but not to awards from both - see 1.1.6 below). Joint collaborative programmes may either be delivered wholly by the other institution or be delivered jointly by UEL and the other institution;
- 1.2.3 **Validation:** UEL may accredit a programme developed by another institution as equivalent to a UEL award, or leading to the award of a specific number of credits;
- 1.2.4 **Autonomous Franchise:** A programme either developed jointly by UEL and at least one other institution or developed entirely by another institution and accredited by UEL. Students studying on an autonomous franchise programme will be included by UEL in its HESES and HESA returns;

- 1.2.5 **Distance learning:** A programme of study whereby a student would not normally attend a UEL campus or that of a collaborating institution. Attendance may be required for residential sessions, for study support or for assessment purposes. Collaborative programmes offered by distance learning may apply the franchise, validation, autonomous franchise, joint or double model. The collaborating institution may manage elements of delivery, support and/or assessment, as agreed at validation;
- 1.2.6 **Distributed Delivery:** (*also known as ‘flying faculty’*) A programme of study, or part thereof, leading to a UEL award, whereby programme delivery and assessment is undertaken by UEL staff at the collaborating institution site. The collaborating institution may provide certain specialist resources, as approved by the University;
- 1.2.7 **Double award:** a programme of study leading to the granting of both a UEL award and that of a collaborating institution. The programme may be offered under either a franchise or a validation agreement; or offered as an integrated programme of study, in accordance with regulations for ACL; or via an articulation arrangement. UEL will be responsible only for the elements of the programme delivered by UEL that contribute to a UEL award;
- 1.2.8 **Articulation:** an arrangement whereby programmes and modules delivered by a collaborating institution are formally recognised for the purposes of advanced standing towards a UEL award (arrangements for articulation are set out in Part 12 of this manual).
- 1.3 The Academic Framework, Assessment and Feedback Policy and the Skills curriculum apply to the various models as follows:
- For **franchise and distributed delivery** agreements, all will apply.
- For **joint, validation and autonomous franchise** agreements, the Assessment and Feedback Policy applies. The Academic Framework and Skills curriculum would normally be expected to apply with scope for negotiation.
- For **double and distance learning awards**, the requirements for the model adopted (franchise or a validation) will apply.
- For **articulation** agreements, none apply
- 1.4 UEL has ultimate responsibility for the quality of all programmes offered as a result of these collaborative arrangements unless the institution with which collaboration is taking place has degree awarding powers itself. If the latter is the case, responsibility for quality may be shared.
- 1.5 In some circumstances UEL staff are contracted to teach on programmes designed, validated and delivered at another institution. In this context it is usually the collaborating institution that takes responsibility for the quality of the

programme offered and UEL's quality assurance procedures do not come into operation.

- 1.6 In the context of this section of the Quality Manual, the term 'institution' is used to describe any educational establishment (e.g. college of further education, college of higher education, university) within the UK or overseas. It also embraces industrial, commercial or public sector organisations that wish to offer courses in collaboration with UEL, or purchase a programme from it.

2 Summary of the Approval Process

- 2.1 The following procedures apply to all forms of collaborative arrangement, with the exception of articulation, for which see Part 12 of this manual.
- 2.2 Before UEL can offer programmes in collaboration with a collaborating institution, an Institutional Approval and Programme Approval process must be completed. The criteria for approval are as follows:
 - 2.2.1 the arrangement is consistent with the UEL vision and strategy and policy on collaboration;
 - 2.2.2 Education and Student Success Committee has determined that the collaborating institution has met the criteria for institutional approval;
 - 2.2.3 there is evidence to suggest that there will be adequate resources available to support the collaborative arrangements proposed;
 - 2.2.4 the proposal has academic benefit for UEL and is financially viable;
 - 2.2.5 the collaborating institution is of appropriate standing and is capable of providing a suitable learning environment for the delivery of programmes of study leading to UEL awards;
 - 2.2.6 there is confirmation from official sources that official recognition will be granted, or of the limitation or conditions applying in respect of recognition (overseas programmes only);
 - 2.2.7 there is no evidence to suggest that the collaborating institution will be prepared to place quality and standards at risk for financial gain.
- 2.3 A brief summary of the process is given below:
 - 2.3.1 All proposals, irrespective of the model that applies, must be accorded Initial Approval. Once this is granted, development teams can proceed with the detail of the development.
 - 2.3.2 For institutions with which UEL has not worked before, with the exception of articulations, Institutional Approval is required for all models of collaboration listed in 1.2 above. This includes proposals where collaborating institutions

assist in, or facilitate the delivery of a UEL programme by distance learning. Institutional Approval normally involves an Institutional Approval Site Visit to the collaborating institution. The cost of institutional visits is normally borne by the collaborating institution (see 19.1). A waiver for an Institutional Approval Site Visit can be applied for provided the criteria for a waiver can be satisfied (see 4.12.1 – 4.12.2):

- 2.3.3 Discussions will also take place with the collaborating institution with regard to the Memorandum of Co-operation, to agree the commercial and financial terms, and an outline of the allocation of responsibilities between UEL and the collaborating institution.
- 2.3.4 The Programme Approval Process comprises a Planning Meeting, at which an initial review of documentation takes place, and if a decision is made to proceed, is followed by the Validation Event, normally involving a site visit. Following the event, the proposal will be approved, approved subject to conditions, or not approved. Where conditions are set a deadline will be imposed. Validation and Review sub-Committee, acting on behalf of Academic Board, will formally validate the proposal, having considered the report of the approval panel. The programme may not run until all conditions are met and validation has been completed.

3 Initial Approval

- 3.1 Before a new programme or partnership is developed, Initial Approval must be obtained. The aim is to ensure that time is spent productively on developing proposals that are viable, accord with the UEL vision and strategic plans and are likely to succeed at approval and validation. No proposal may proceed to approval unless it has Initial Approval.
- 3.2 The Initial Approval process should be completed at least a year before the first intake of students and eighteen months is the suggested lead in time. Exceptions with tighter timescales may be approved if an appropriate rationale is received by Education and Student Success Committee.
- 3.3 Applications for Initial Approval for proposals relating to collaborative partnerships are completed using the Collaborative Initial Approval Form.
- 3.4 Where a proposal is for a new collaborative partnership, the programme proposer should contact the Academic Partnership Office at the earliest opportunity for advice in completing the form.
- 3.5 The Collaborative Initial Approval Form will be submitted to the School quality committee in the first instance. The School quality committee will either unconditionally approve the proposal or reject the proposal with feedback. Rejected proposals may be resubmitted to relevant School committee at a later date.

- 3.6 Following approval by relevant School committee the Collaborative Initial Approval Form will be submitted to the International Development Committee for consideration.
- 3.7 The International Development Committee will either unconditionally approve the proposal or reject the proposal with feedback. Rejected proposals may be resubmitted to International Development Committee for consideration at a later date.
- 3.8 Once approval has been granted by the International Development Committee the proposal is forwarded to Quality Assurance and Enhancement who will ensure that it is considered by Education and Student Success Committee. The Education and Student Success Committee will either unconditionally approve the proposal or reject the proposal with feedback. Rejected proposals may be resubmitted to the Education and Student Success Committee for consideration at a later date.
- 3.9 A decision by the Education and Student Success Committee to grant Initial Approval is confirmation that, at an institutional level, it is considered that the proposal accords with the UEL strategic plan and that the proposal may be developed further towards Programme Approval.
- 3.10 Following approval by the Education and Student Success Committee, Initial Approval is granted and will remain valid for two years from the date of approval.
- 3.11 The Education and Student Success Committee, when confirming that a proposed programme has been granted Initial Approval, will inform the relevant stakeholders including:
- The proposing School;
 - Facilities Services;
 - Academic Registry;
 - Strategic Planning;
 - Quality Assurance and Enhancement;
 - Library and Learning Services.
- 3.12 Once Initial Approval has been granted, the proposal is added to the validation and review schedule and progress in terms of Programme Approval is monitored by the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee. The Quality Assurance Officer associated with the School will be available to provide advice and guidance and assist in the development of the proposal.

4 Institutional Approval

- 4.1 Where Initial Approval has been granted and the proposal is for a collaborative programme with a collaborating institution with whom UEL have not already granted Institutional Approval, then it will be necessary to undertake Institutional Approval.

- 4.2 The purpose of Institutional Approval is to:
- 4.2.1 confirm there is strategic alignment and consistency with the UEL vision;
 - 4.2.2 ensure that the collaborative arrangement is financially viable;
 - 4.2.3 ensure that the collaborating institution is financially stable;
 - 4.2.4 ensure that the collaborating institution has appropriate mechanisms for governance;
 - 4.2.5 ensure that the collaborating institution is of appropriate standing and unlikely to put standards and quality at risk;
 - 4.2.6 ensure that the collaborating institution has effective quality assurance mechanisms;
 - 4.2.7 ensure that the collaborating institution has appropriate resources and policies for student support;
 - 4.2.8 ensure that where government approval is required, this has been obtained or is likely to be obtained.
- 4.3 The level of scrutiny will be determined on the basis of the complexity and volume of provision as well as perceived risk. Nevertheless, initial enquiries will cover the following areas:
- Public and legal standing of the prospective collaborating institution in their own country and in the case of a collaborating institution in the UK, via reports of public bodies;
 - Standing of prospective collaborating institution in the light of experience of other UK institutions;
 - The financial stability of the prospective collaborating institution;
 - The ability of the prospective collaborating institution to provide the human and material resources to operate the provision successfully;
 - The ability of the prospective collaborating institution to provide an appropriate and safe working environment for students;
 - The ownership of the prospective collaborating institution, its governance structures and its range of business interests and links, and its appropriateness to support the proposed arrangement;
 - The ability of the prospective collaborating institution to manage processes for quality assurance and to meet the expectations of the UK Quality Code.

- 4.4 As part of the Institutional Approval process Quality Assurance and Enhancement will undertake Due Diligence checks in liaison with UEL's Governance and Legal and Finance teams. The Due Diligence process is detailed under paragraph 4.6.
- 4.5 If no major concerns are identified as part of the Due Diligence checks then Quality Assurance and Enhancement will undertake an Institutional Approval Site Visit. Details of the Institutional Approval Site Visit are outlined under paragraph 4.7
- 4.6 **Due Diligence**
- 4.6.1 Quality Assurance and Enhancement will work with the prospective collaborating institution to gather relevant information. Normally, the following information will be gathered for a collaboration institution with a UK based institution which is a publicly funded body:
- 4.6.1.1 a brief history of the collaborating institution including details of its ownership.
- 4.6.1.2 documents which help to determine the nature of the collaborating institution:
- mission statement;
 - strategic plan;
 - prospectus.
- 4.6.1.3 details of the collaborating institution's governance and management structure including membership and terms of reference of its governing body and important internal committees, including a diagrammatic representation of the organisational and internal structure;
- 4.6.1.4 relevant financial information:
- budget statements;
 - management accounts;
 - audited published financial statements including income and expenditure account, balance sheet, cash flow statement and notes to the accounts).
- 4.6.1.5 a detailed description of the academic and administrative resources available at the collaborating institution to support the collaborative arrangements proposed (to include provision for welfare, support services and pastoral care available to students);
- 4.6.1.6 evidence about the quality of provision at the collaborating institution:

- reports from funding bodies;
- reports from external quality assurance bodies;
- details of any other UK HEI or educational bodies with which the institution has, or has previously had, collaborative arrangements, if applicable.

4.6.1.7 staff development policy and details for monitoring the performance of teaching staff.

4.6.2 If the proposed collaboration is with an organisation which is privately funded, or of charitable status, the following documentation will be required in addition to those listed in 4.6.1 above:

4.6.2.1 the constitution of the collaborating institution which gives it legal status, e.g. Articles of Association, Trust deed, Act of Parliament;

4.6.2.2 audited accounts (including director's notes) for the preceding 3 financial years;

4.6.2.3 corporate plan/business plan/financial forecasts;

4.6.2.4 a list of names under which the organisation/institution trades;

4.6.2.5 litigation and disputes, i.e. details of any proceedings (civil, criminal or arbitration), dispute or complaint, any order or judgement, if relevant;

4.6.2.6 a written statement from prospective collaborating institution confirming the organisation's/institution's ability to enter into contract with UEL;

4.6.2.7 liability insurance e.g. copies of valid insurance certificates;

4.6.2.8 health and safety policy;

4.6.2.9 equality and diversity policy, including policy on disabled students;

4.6.2.10 employment policies and profile (to include details of staff numbers broken down separately for academic and administrative staff);

4.6.2.11 policy on the admission of students and a profile of the student body;

4.6.2.12 quality assurance arrangements currently in place for: curriculum development, approval, monitoring and review of

programmes, collection and evaluation of student feedback, management and administration of assessment processes, feedback to students on assessed work, tracking students progression and achievement, student consultation and representation systems;

4.6.2.13 independent evidence of the institution's reputation and standing, including checking any previous association of the institution with another UK higher education institution;

4.6.2.14 documentation about any legal or regulatory requirements (including the institution's legal capacity to award 'Joint' or 'Double' awards, if relevant) to which the collaborating institution must conform.

4.6.3 For UK based collaborating institutions intending to recruit international students, an accreditation report from one of the approved accreditation bodies and evidence of sponsor status from the UKVI will be required.

4.6.4 If the collaboration is with an overseas collaborating institution the following information will be required in addition to that identified in 4.6.1 and 4.6.2 above:

4.6.4.1 details of government approval/accreditation/recognition of the collaborating institution (copies of approval letters or certificates issued by the local ministry of education, the national quality assurance agency, etc).

4.6.4.2 the Quality Manager (Collaborations) will obtain any information on the collaborating institution or on the cultural, legal, financial and political environment of the country in which the collaborating institution is based, which might impact on UEL's ability to exercise its responsibilities, particularly in relation to academic standards and quality, available from government offices or agencies in that country or the British Council;

4.6.4.3 an evaluation of the implications of any language issues provided by the programme proposer;,,

4.6.5 Quality Assurance and Enhancement will present financial information from the prospective collaborating institution to the Assistant Director of Financial Management for an assessment of the financial stability of the prospective collaborating institution and an overview of the financial costs/benefits to UEL. The Assistant Director of Financial Management will prepare a written report providing the necessary assurance to the University as to the financial standing of the institution.

4.6.6 Quality Assurance and Enhancement will present documentation relating to the governance and legal standing of the collaborating institution to the Assistant Director for Governance and Legal for an assessment of the

governance and legal standing of the collaborating institution. The Assistant Director of Governance and Legal will prepare a written report providing the necessary assurance to the University as to the governance and legal standing of the collaborating institution.

4.6.7 The Quality Manager (Collaborations) and Head of the Academic Partnership Office will review the reports prepared by the Assistant Director of Financial Management and by the Assistant Director for Governance and Legal and make an assessment as to whether there is sufficient risk posed to UEL by the collaborating institution to cease with Institutional Approval or whether to proceed to an Institutional Approval Visit. If the Education and Student Success Committee approves Institutional Approval Site Visits may be waived (see 4.7.2-4.7.6).

4.7 Institutional Approval Site Visit

4.7.1 The Institutional Approval Site Visit is normally undertaken by a chair and the Quality Manager (Collaborations) or nominee as officer for the event and normally lasts for one day. Chairs for Institutional Approval Site Visits will normally be senior members of university staff with extensive experience of the university's quality assurance processes. Senior members of staff that can chair Institutional Approval Site Visits include School Collaborative Leaders, Subject Area Heads, Directors of Service and Heads of Centres.

4.7.2 The requirement for an Institutional Approval Site Visit may be waived where prospective collaborating institution is recognised as high quality provider of higher education provision and can demonstrate that rigorous internal academic quality assurance and enhancement mechanisms are in place.

4.7.3 If the Education and Student Success Committee approves, Institutional Approval Site Visits may be waived for UK based collaborating institutions such as UK universities and other higher education institutions with degree awarding powers in their own right; higher education institutions without degree awarding powers but previously approved by another UK university; further education colleges with existing expertise in delivering higher education provision and reputable and financially sound privately funded education providers with recent expertise of collaboration with another UK higher education institution in the delivery of higher education provision.

4.7.4 If the Education and Student Success Committee approves, Institutional Approval Site Visits may be waived for overseas institutions such as reputable state-funded overseas universities with internationally recognised degree awarding powers in their own right whose educational ethos is compatible with that of UEL with or without experience of delivering UK higher education provision.

4.7.5 If the Education and Student Experience Committee approves, and the collaborating institution does not meet the criteria outlined in 4.7.3 and 4.7.4,

Institutional Approval Site Visits may be waived for collaborating institutions where a relevant member of staff from the School with the necessary subject expertise has previously undertaken a site visit and has completed the Site Visit Report Form. The site visit report form should make clear whether there is evidence that the collaborating institution has sufficient academic, pastoral and physical resources to deliver a programme leading to a UEL award.

- 4.7.6 A waiver application is made by the programme proposer using the Institutional Visit Waiver Request Form. The application and relevant evidence is reviewed and the Quality Manager (Collaborations) who compiles a report outlining the evidence that indicates that the visit may be waived for the prospective collaborating institution. This report is presented to the Education and Student Success Committee which will make a decision as to whether or not to waive the requirement for an Institutional Approval Site Visit.
- 4.7.7 On receipt of complete documentation (see 4.6.1, 4.6.2 and 4.6.4 above) and the reports from the Assistant Director of Financial Management and the Assistant Director of Governance and Legal, the Quality Manager (Collaborations) will make all arrangements for the Institutional Approval Site Visit and confirm arrangements with appropriate staff at the prospective collaborating institution. The Institutional Approval Site Visit lasts one day and will be convened at the prospective collaborating institution.
- 4.7.8 Following the Institutional Approval Site Visit, the Quality Manager (Collaborations) drafts an Institutional Approval Site Visit Report summarising the site visit team's findings and making a recommendation as to the suitability of the collaborating institution's academic, pastoral and physical resources to deliver a programme leading to a UEL award.
- 4.7.9 The Quality Manager (Collaborations) or his/her nominee will draft an Institutional Approval Report which will include the reports from the Assistant Director of Financial Management and the Assistant Director for Governance and Legal and the Institutional Approval Site Visit Report. The report will make a recommendation to the Education and Student Success Committee as to whether or not Institutional Approval should be granted. If there are outstanding requirements but it seems likely that the criteria for Institutional Approval will be met, the Education and Student Success Committee may set 'conditions' that must be met before the Programme Approval event can take place. Further issues may also be identified as 'recommendations', these must be responded to in the Programme Approval documentation presented to the planning meeting and would be given detailed consideration during the Programme Approval process.
- 4.7.10 The Education and Student Success Committee is responsible for granting Institutional Approval and will do so following consideration of the Institutional Approval Report and responses by the collaborating institution to any conditions set for the granting of Institutional Approval. The Quality

Manager (Collaborations) writes formally to the collaborating institution to confirm the decision of the Education and Student Success Committee and maintains a register of all approved collaborating institutions.

4.7.11 Institutional Approval once confirmed will remain in place subject to satisfactory outcomes from the annual Review and Enhancement Process (Part 7), Repeat Due Diligence (see 7 below) and Collaborative Reviews (see 15 below).

5 Programme Approval Process for Collaborating Institutions

5.1 All collaborative programmes will be evaluated through a process that will normally include an approval event, at the location of delivery, before it is offered to students. The purpose of the process is to confirm that:

5.1.1 the collaborating institution is able to provide a suitable learning environment for the delivery of programmes of study leading to UEL awards;

5.1.2 that adequate resources are available to meet both the academic and support needs of the students;

5.1.3 the arrangements for collaboration set down in the Memorandum of Co-operation are appropriate, understood and accepted by all parties.

5.2 Details of the criteria against which the collaborative models outlined in section 1 will be evaluated, and any special requirements of the associated processes, are set out in 5.8 of this part of the manual.

5.3 The panel will be constituted to include a range of expertise enabling it to evaluate institutional issues as well as those that are programme specific. It will be responsible for reviewing:

- academic infrastructures;
- academic and professional achievements and aspirations;
- quality of teaching staff;
- learning experience of students;
- availability and use of resources (including teaching accommodation, computing, laboratory, library and media facilities);
- procedures for assuring quality and arrangements for collaboration.

5.4 Where a proposal involves a new programme(s) with more than one UEL School in the same academic year, a joint event, to be held at the collaborating

institution's premises, will be considered. Advice will be sought from the Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement regarding the maximum number of programmes to be considered at a single event and in one day.

5.5 Where the provision to be approved is offered at multiple locations, the Chair and officer will take advice from the Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement on the process to be followed. Site visits to all sites will be required prior to the panel approval event, and a report of these visits presented to the approval panel. The approval panel will need to see the CVs of all staff involved in delivery at all locations.

5.6 Where a programme that has, or requires, recognition by a professional, statutory or regulatory body, is the subject of the approval, the professional, statutory or regulatory body will be informed of the proposals at the earliest opportunity and the validation panel will set a condition that the programme team obtain approval from the professional, statutory or regulatory body to deliver such programme. Where appropriate, depending on the approval requirements of that body, a representative will be invited to attend the panel event.

5.7 Documentation Requirements

5.7.1 The following documentation is required for both the planning meeting and the approval event for a collaborative programme. The Programme Proposer is responsible for ensuring that sufficient copies of all the documentation are provided. It is recommended that the following documentation is provided in 3 volumes as follows:

5.7.1.1 Programme Specification (using the standard UEL template, available at <https://uelac.sharepoint.com/LearningandTeaching/Pages/forms-and-guidance-notes.aspx> and from Quality Assurance and Enhancement); for a franchised programme the most up-to-date version of the programme specification is required;

5.7.1.2 Validation document, to include:

- The context of the proposed programme: the way in which the proposal meets the objectives of UEL's strategic plan and the School plan; the academic profile of the School and an assessment of the impact of the proposal on that profile; and any relationship of the proposal to programmes run by other Schools within UEL;
- Information about the collaborating institution, including their previous experience in the programme area, their areas of experience/expertise and the way in which the collaboration with UEL will further their strategic objectives;
- The rationale for the proposal: to include evidence of the regional demand for the proposal; details of consultation with relevant

employers and relevant professional bodies; the relationship of the proposal to similar provision offered elsewhere; the target student group/expected student profile;

- A curriculum vitae for each member of staff; key management staff and staff teaching on the proposed programme(s);
- Statement of Resources: the physical resources that are available to support the programme (e.g. library, computer hardware and software, specialist accommodation, other specialist equipment, programme management and administrative resources) and , where applicable, how distance learning students will access the resources;
- The academic and administrative staff support infrastructure for distance learning students;
- For validated programmes only, a statement detailing the programme team's evaluation of their proposal with regard to the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, relevant QAA Subject Benchmark Statement(s) (where applicable), the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, and any professional accreditation requirements (i.e. how have they been used in the development of the programme).

5.7.1.3 For collaborative distance learning provision, learning materials for one module on the programme;

5.7.1.4 For collaborative distance learning provision, a detailed schedule for completion of all distance or blended learning materials for the programme;

5.7.1.5 A draft Student Handbook which at a minimum must include the following information:

- Programme structure diagram;
- Module Specifications (using the standard UEL template);
- Arrangements for the supervision and assessment of any placement element;
- Local academic and other counselling/ support arrangements for students.

5.7.2 In addition to the documentation provided by the Programme Proposer, the Approval Panel will be provided with a copy of the following information to assist with their deliberations:

- The UEL Quality Criteria;
- The relevant QAA Subject Benchmark Statement(s);
- An extract from Part 1 of the Manual of General Regulations, providing the full description of the award to which the proposed programme will lead;
- A copy of relevant sections of the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education (i.e.: Section B10: Managing HE Provision with others);
- Relevant documentation articulating professional body accreditation requirements;
- Any other information relevant to the proposal.

5.8 Criteria for Validation of Franchise, Joint and Validated Programmes

5.8.1 The purpose of the approval process for franchise, joint and validated programmes is to ensure that the quality of the student experience will be comparable to that offered by UEL for the same or similar programme. The approval panel must ensure that:

5.8.1.1 there are adequate physical resources available to support the programme;

5.8.1.2 there are adequate human resources available to support the programme;

5.8.1.3 the proposed programme team has a clear understanding of, and commitment to, the aims and objectives of the programme to be franchised and an implementation plan for delivery;

5.8.1.4 there are adequate arrangements for student support and pastoral care;

5.8.1.5 there are adequate programme management and administrative arrangements in place to support the programme;

5.8.1.6 there is a clearly defined Memorandum of Co-operation between UEL and the collaborating institution.

5.8.1.7 in the case of franchise programmes, the aims and objectives, structure, content and assessment of the programme will have already been validated, and thus these will not normally be an issue during the approval of the franchise arrangement.

- 5.8.2 In the case of joint programmes, where it is determined that UEL will have ultimate responsibility for the quality of a joint programme, the approval event will also be responsible for the approval of the programme. The programme will be evaluated against the Quality Criteria to ensure that the academic standard is commensurate with the proposed award and that the quality of the student experience is likely to be appropriate. The membership of the approval panel will normally include representation from the institution collaborating with UEL.
- 5.8.3 If the collaborating institution has authority to award its own degrees, the two institutions may decide to take joint responsibility for the quality of the programme. In these circumstances a joint validation process may be negotiated provided that the principles underlying the UEL's quality assurance procedures are observed and the process ensures that the UEL's Quality Criteria for programmes are met. A Memorandum of Co-operation between the two institutions will be required.
- 5.8.4 Where an approval event incorporates the approval of programmes designed by other institutions for delivery by them the approval event will also be responsible for the approval of the programme. The programme will be evaluated against the Quality Criteria to ensure that the academic standard is commensurate with the proposed award and that the quality of the student experience is likely to be appropriate.

5.9 **Approval processes for distance and blended learning provision offered in collaboration with collaborating institutions**

- 5.9.1 An approval event by panel will take place where the collaborating institution undertakes elements of the following:
- Programme and module design;
 - Learning materials design and production;
 - Content delivery and delivery support;
 - Assessment.
- 5.9.2 The approval event will consider, in addition:
- the schedule of availability and readiness of any print or online learning materials;
 - the system of delivery of the programme;
 - support infrastructure, roles and responsibilities of academic and support staff;
 - student access to UEL systems, support and guidance services.

5.9.3 The approval panel will make recommendations relating to the timing of the review and updating of the academic content of programmes offered by distance learning, given the implications and costs of updating.

5.9.4 Where a collaborating institution is approved to deliver elements of programme support, which does not include any form of programme or module design, or academic content related teaching or assessment, a site visit type B will be undertaken. This event will be held at the collaborating institution site, and will apply where the collaborating institution undertakes elements of the following:

- Programme promotion and enquiry handling;
- Administrative functions including fees payment;
- Non-academic delivery support;
- Local study skills support and non-content related support.

5.9.5 The site visit will be conducted by a Chair, an external adviser and servicing officer appointed by QAE. Relevant colleagues from the responsible School and the collaborating institution will accompany the panel. The following will be required in advance of the event:

- Validation document including:
 - a description of the nature of the collaboration;
 - details of the services to be provided by the collaborating institution and the way in which this will link with the responsibilities undertaken by UEL and the mechanisms for monitoring;
 - responsibilities of each party;
 - CVs of staff involved in local and study skills support;
 - Where support takes place via a number of delivery centres: a list of the centres, criteria for the selection of centres, specification of the facilities and support provided by each centre;
 - Details of any relevant quality assurance processes of the collaborating institution.
- Student handbook with relevant additions identifying additional support available at the collaborating institution;
- Updated programme specification.

5.10 Panel Composition

- 5.10.1 Quality Assurance and Enhancement will assign a Chair to the approval event. The Chair will normally be a member of staff with significant experience in quality assurance, and who is independent of the School with proposing the programme (usually a member of Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee). Any exceptions will be agreed by the Chair of Validation and Review sub-Committee.
- 5.10.2 Prior to the planning meeting, the Programme Proposer will nominate appropriate external subject advisers to participate, normally by attendance, in the approval event. At least one external adviser is required but this number can be increased, as appropriate, at the discretion of the Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement. Where approval of collaborative distance learning programmes is included, at least one external adviser should have experience of distance learning provision.
- 5.10.3 The suitability of the external advisers will be determined by the Chair of the approval panel subject to the following criteria:
- 5.10.3.1 the depth and relevance of subject knowledge;
 - 5.10.3.2 experience in the management of collaborative activity;
 - 5.10.3.3 prior experience of teaching on programmes at the same level or above. At least one external panel member to have current experience of working in UK Higher Education;
 - 5.10.3.4 impartiality (the nominee should not have any formal links with the School offering the programme during the last five years as a former member of staff or the last three years as an external examiner);
 - 5.10.3.5 professional expertise (for vocational programmes, at least one of the advisers should be a 'practitioner' drawn from a relevant business or professional background).
- 5.10.4 In making judgments about the suitability of the proposed external subject advisers, the Chair will need to take into account the overall balance of expertise presented by the external advisers. The Chair may reject a nominee or require the Programme Proposer to nominate additional external subject advisers in order to ensure a balance of expert advice.
- 5.10.5 Where more than one programme is being considered for approval, the membership of the approval panel will be constituted to ensure that the full range of issues can be adequately appraised.
- 5.10.6 For the approval of professional doctorate programmes a representative of the Graduate School will also be invited to attend.

5.11 Planning meeting

5.11.1 Prior to the approval event, a preliminary planning meeting will take place between the Chair of the panel, a member of Quality Assurance and Enhancement staff (acting as the servicing officer), and key members of the School proposing the collaborative programme (the programme leader and the Dean of School). The School Leader for Quality Assurance and a representative from the Academic Partnerships Office shall be invited to attend the meeting, and in the case of professional doctorate validations, a representative of the Graduate School also. The purpose of the preliminary planning meeting is to:

- identify and consider any outstanding issues relating to institutional approval;
- identify any outstanding resourcing issues that may need to be resolved before the approval event proceeds;
- identify major issues for consideration during the event;
- consider the adequacy of the documentation;
- discuss the programme for the approval event;
- ensure that there is agreement to the financial and commercial terms of the Memorandum of Co-operation;
- discuss the membership of the approval panel.

5.11.2 A programme proposal will not proceed to validation until the Chair is satisfied that the documentation is adequate. If the documentation presented to the planning meeting is inadequate, or there are outstanding resourcing issues that need to be resolved prior to validation, the Chair of the panel may convene subsequent planning meetings before the approval event.

5.11.3 A short report providing the outcomes of the planning meeting and the proposed programme for the approval event shall be prepared and circulated to panel members and other relevant staff by Quality Assurance and Enhancement.

5.12 Approval event

5.12.1 Quality Assurance and Enhancement will be responsible for convening the approval panel, sending out documentation to panel members and servicing the approval event (including the provision of regulatory advice etc.). In addition, the servicing officer will arrange for overnight accommodation for

external members (where applicable), room bookings and catering arrangements.

5.12.2 The programme proposer is responsible for:

- providing the agreed documentation by the deadline;
- arranging for the attendance of staff at relevant parts of the event;
- arranging for the attendance of any agreed external people, such as potential students and potential employers;
- ensuring that everyone involved is well briefed about the proposal.

5.12.3 The programme for the approval event will depend on the outcomes of the preliminary planning meeting but would typically include, where appropriate:

- rationale for the proposal;
- aims and objectives of the programme;
- admissions policy;
- programme content and structure;
- teaching and learning;
- assessment;
- student support and guidance;
- administrative arrangements for the registration and assessment of students;
- management of the collaborative partnership including the consideration of written agreements (e.g. Memorandum of Co-operation).

5.12.4 There will normally be a period at the beginning to enable members of the panel to raise issues that they would like to cover during the event and to enable the Chair to plan how and when various issues will be raised. There will also be a meeting of the panel at the end at which the outcome of the event will be determined. These will be private meetings of the panel unless the panel members agree otherwise.

5.12.5 It is likely that the panel will wish to hold meetings with staff involved in the programme (staff from both UEL and the collaborating institution) and

potential students, where applicable. A tour of resources available to support the programme is also likely.

5.12.6 In exceptional circumstances (for example, when the collaborating institution has recently been visited to validate a similar programme in the same subject area) a visit may not be required. It will be for the Chair, in consultation with the Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement, to determine how the academic environment is to be assessed.

5.13 Outcomes of the Approval Event

5.13.1 At the end of the approval event the panel will reach a decision about the programme. The panel may reject the programme, approve the programme for a fixed period or indefinitely, or set conditions of approval. Approval is valid for a period of five years, but if the programme has not commenced within three years of the date of approval, re-approval will be required before the programme can commence.

5.13.2 Where conditions of approval are set, the deadline for submission of responses to approval conditions shall be determined by the panel. Programmes may not be offered until all conditions of validation have been satisfied. The Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee has agreed the following standard conditions for panels:

- **External Examiner Nominations** - that the programme team should take action to ensure that a nomination is presented to the External Examiner Sub-Committee to cover delivery of the approved programme(s);
- **Memorandum of Co-operation** - that the final Memorandum of Co-operation is agreed and signed by the parties;
- **Establishment of Partnership Monitoring Committee** for the partnership, comprising representation from all UEL Schools/programme teams and collaborating institution representatives. This is essential where more than one School is involved with the collaborating institution. Where a committee already exists, the requirement will be to update the constitution to incorporate the additional programme/School;
- **Staff Development** –that a programme of staff development to be offered to collaborating institution staff in the first year of delivery is presented by the School;
- **Local laws and regulations** – that the collaborating institution presents verifiable evidence to confirm that government approval to deliver the programme(s) has been obtained.

Such standard conditions will be set along with any other outstanding matters that programme teams need to address prior to commencement of the programme(s).

- 5.13.3 If conditions are imposed, it is the responsibility of the programme proposer to ensure that the conditions are satisfied within the time scale specified.
- 5.13.4 The response to conditions of approval should be submitted to Quality Assurance and Enhancement which will arrange for it to be considered.
- 5.13.5 The Chair of the event will be responsible for formally determining that the conditions of approval have been satisfied.
- 5.13.6 Following the event the programme proposer, Dean of School and a representative of the collaborating institution will receive a draft report for comment to check factual accuracy. The report is also circulated to members of the approval panel for comment. The confirmed report will then be produced and circulated.
- 5.13.7 The report will be submitted to the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee so that the decision can be endorsed and the programme can be offered
- 5.13.8 For new collaborating institutions, or collaborating institutions where significant new development has taken place, a review will take place after one year of operation to ensure that that systems are operating effectively and to address any misunderstandings or concerns developing with the collaborating institution in the first year. This review will be led by a member of the Quality Assurance and Enhancement team and involve staff in relevant Schools and the collaborating institution.

6 Validation of the Delivery of a Programme at an Alternative or Additional Location

- 6.1 The purpose of the validation process will be to ensure:
 - 6.1.1 that the physical resources/accommodation at the alternative institutional location are satisfactory;
 - 6.1.2 that the arrangements for the pastoral care and support services available to students are satisfactory;
 - 6.1.3 that the arrangements for co-operation between all institutions involved, including UEL, are clearly articulated in a Memorandum of Co-operation.
- 6.2 **Site Visit Type A** – A site visit type A will be conducted under the following circumstances:

- approval of delivery of a UEL programme by UEL staff at new premises where UEL staff are responsible for **all** the academic elements of delivery (including admission, teaching and assessment);
 - approval of a change of premises for delivery of an approved programme by a collaborating institution;
 - approval of a new premises for the delivery of an element of an approved programme by a collaborating institution.
- 6.3 The site visit will be conducted by a servicing officer appointed by QAE and a representative of the responsible School. The purpose of the site visit will be to ensure the suitability of the academic environment in which the programme will be offered. Approval of any changes in staffing will be the responsibility of the UEL academic School, in line with the process for approving changes in staffing at collaborating institutions. A report will be presented to the Validation and Review sub-Committee. Where required, an external adviser will be invited to join the visiting panel.
- 6.4 **Site visit type B** – A site visit type B will be conducted under the following circumstances:
- a new distance learning collaborating institution, where the collaborating institution is approved to deliver elements of programme support, which does not include any form of programme or module design, or academic content related teaching or assessment;
 - delivery of a programme of study, or part of a programme of study whereby programme delivery and assessment is undertaken by UEL staff at a collaborating institution site;
 - delivery of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) and/or Master of Philosophy (MPhil) provision by a collaborating institution.
- 6.5 The process will require Initial Approval, followed by a planning meeting and a site visit. Documentation will comprise a validation document, a programme specification (where relevant) and a draft student handbook.
- 6.6 The site visit will be conducted by a Chair, external adviser, and servicing officer appointed by QAE. The number of external panel members can be adjusted, as appropriate, at the discretion of the Chair of the approval panel. Representatives of the responsible School will be in attendance. The purpose of the site visit will be to ensure the suitability of the academic environment in which the programme will be offered, including the staff team, academic resources, pastoral care and support services. A site visit report will be presented to the Validation and Review sub-Committee.

7 Repeat Due Diligence

- 7.1 All collaborative arrangements are subject to a financial review by the Assistant Director of Financial Management (a financial review of new collaborative arrangements would normally be undertaken as part of Institutional Approval, see 4.6 above). The financial review allocates a risk rating to each collaborating institution of Low, Medium or High and due diligence checks will be repeated for the ratings as follows:
- Low – further periodic monitoring every two years;
 - Medium – further periodic review every year;
 - High – further detailed investigation potentially involving discussions with collaborating institution as this could lead to a decision to terminate or not proceed with the proposed collaboration.

Exceptions (extensions) to the above schedule may be considered but only with the advice of Assistant Director of Financial Management.

- 7.2 Where possible, the University Management Accounts team will undertake an investigation by obtaining information direct from a Credit Reference Agency e.g. Dun and Bradstreet. Quality Assurance and Enhancement will contact collaborating institutions as necessary to obtain a latest set of audited accounts.
- 7.3 Where a collaborating institution has been identified as High risk, Quality Assurance and Enhancement will arrange a meeting to include Dean(s) of managing School(s), Collaborative Leader(s) for managing School(s) and the Assistant Director of Financial Management. The purpose of the meeting will be to consider the strategic direction of UEL's relationship with the collaborating institution. Following the meeting Quality Assurance and Enhancement will produce a report outlining the discussions.
- 7.4 Where a collaborating institution does not provide their audited accounts to UEL on request they will automatically be rated as High risk and Quality Assurance and Enhancement will arrange a meeting as outlined in 7.3.

8 Memorandum of Understanding

- 8.1 A Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) notifies a non-committal intention to collaborate, and it will normally be prepared using the standard UEL MoU template. Quality Assurance and Enhancement will work with the relevant parties to obtain information required to draft the MoU. For prospective overseas collaborating institutions a Memorandum of Understanding will normally be signed during the early discussions with the prospective collaborating institution and is particularly useful in setting out the timeframes and proposal for collaboration. Detail may vary but can include the particular fields of study and methods of delivery e.g. distance learning, which might be the subject of the collaboration. It is signed by the Vice-Chancellor or a named representative. The formal written agreement, following validation, will be the signed Memorandum of Co-operation.

9 Memorandum of Cooperation

9.1 All forms of collaboration require a written agreement (usually known as Memorandum of Co-operation) setting down the responsibilities of each contributing institution. Normally, a single Memorandum of Co-operation exists for one collaborating institution, covering a number of programmes although there may be circumstances where different written agreements between the same collaborating institutions are required to reflect the provision.

9.2 The purpose of the Memorandum of Cooperation is to:

9.2.1 define the means by which the quality of the student experience will be assured and the academic standards of the programme maintained;

9.2.2 ensure that collaborative arrangements are clearly set out and operate smoothly, and that clear channels of authority, accountability and executive action are identified.

9.3 The Memorandum of Cooperation will normally address the following issues:

- the names of the institutions or bodies which are parties to the agreed memorandum;
- the allocation of responsibility for the oversight and maintenance of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities, and procedures for resolving any differences which might arise in respect of the programme between the collaborating institutions;
- procedures and responsibilities for the initial validation, approval and subsequent periodic review of the programme, including provision for the implementation of changes to the programme required by validation, periodic review and annual monitoring in the collaborating institutions;
- procedures and responsibilities in respect of programme management and monitoring. If these are to be divided between institutions, the arrangements will need to be specified;
- learning, teaching, assessment and examination arrangements, and the responsibilities of parties involved;
- recruitment, selection and admissions;
- selection, appointment and development of staff;
- provision of an appropriate learning environment including all necessary physical resources;
- provision for student support and guidance;

- responsibilities in respect of all administrative arrangements, such as student registration, notification of decisions relating to student progression and assessment and the nomination, appointment and remuneration of external examiners;
 - provision for student appeals and complaints;
 - arrangements for marketing and publicity;
 - confidentiality, indemnity and liability;
 - details of the financial and payment arrangements;
 - duration and termination of the Memorandum of Co-operation.
- 9.4 The Quality Assurance and Enhancement team will draft the Memorandum of Co-operation in close association with all relevant parties. The financial details of the collaborations will be developed by the Assistant Director of Financial Management in negotiation with the Dean of School or his nominee.
- 9.5 The Head of Academic Partnerships Office in liaison with the UEL School will introduce the financial details to the collaborating institution, and lead on the discussions on the financial terms of the agreement. Discussions about the detailed allocation of responsibilities and other clauses that may be subject to negotiation happen via Quality Assurance and Enhancement in liaison with the UEL School. Quality Assurance and Enhancement will confirm the final version, incorporating the detail of allocation of responsibilities between parties, and prepare the final version. There must be written agreement between all parties on at least the financial and commercial terms within the Memorandum of Co-operation prior to any programme approval event and, following programme approval, the Memorandum of Co-operation must be signed before delivery of the programme(s) may commence.
- 9.6 Once the Memorandum of Co-operation has been finalised and the programme approval event has been undertaken, Quality Assurance and Enhancement will arrange for signatures by all contributing parties. The Memorandum of Co-operation will be signed by the Vice-Chancellor or Deputy Vice-Chancellors on behalf of UEL. **There are no other authorised signatories.**
- 9.7 Memoranda of Co-operation are reviewed a minimum of every three years by the Quality Assurance and Enhancement team in consultation with the relevant School. Programme Schedules may be reviewed more frequently i.e. every year.
- 9.8 The Dean of School has executive authority for the effective delivery of collaborative arrangements within the School. He/she must ensure that monitoring and quality assurance arrangements are operating effectively.

10 Language of Instruction

- 10.1 In normal circumstances the language of instruction for a UEL award shall be English. Exceptionally, and only where there is good reason, an award offered in collaboration with another institution may be taught and assessed in a language other than English.
- 10.2 In these circumstances, both teaching and assessment must take place in the same language.
- 10.3 The programme approval panel should include a minimum of one external fluent in the proposed language of delivery and assessment. The programme approval panel will consider the following:
- how individuals with the necessary expertise in the appropriate language, subject knowledge and assessment methods will be identified and employed;
 - how suitable external examiners fluent in both English and the relevant language will be identified and involved in the assessment process;
 - how communication between the UEL and overseas programme team and academic staff will be facilitated;
 - how the quality and accuracy of student materials – e.g., assessment or teaching materials, policies and regulations - translated into the native language will be assured; and how updated versions of such will be made available;
 - how material required for UEL quality assurance and enhancement processes (e.g. REP reports, programme committee minutes, external examiner reports) will be made available to both local staff and students and UEL authorities and committees;
 - if translation is used, how the reliability and validity of the assessment judgments arising from the marking of translated assessments will be assured;
 - if translation is used, an assurance that students at the collaborating institution will not be used as translators of examination scripts or coursework.
- 10.4 For the guidance of programme teams developing provision and for validation panels, the additional detail of the arrangements that will apply is set out in the 'code of practice for the validation and delivery of taught programmes in a language other than English'.

11 Modifications to Collaborative Programmes

- 11.1 The relevant School quality committee is responsible for approving modifications to collaborative programmes involving change to 25% or less of the programme, using the procedures set out in Part 6 of this manual.

12 Withdrawal of Franchised Programmes On-Campus

- 12.1 There may be occasions where Schools have established relationships with collaborating institutions for the delivery of franchised programmes but wish to withdraw the on-campus version of the programme. Such scenarios can result in the following issues:
- 12.1.1 the in-country regulatory requirements of the provider may not allow for the collaborating institution to deliver a franchised programme that is not delivered at the home institution;
 - 12.1.2 over a period of time the programme content may become outdated.
- 12.2 Where the on-campus version of the programme is being revalidated it would be appropriate for the School to liaise with the collaborating institution to consider whether they might adopt the revised version of the programme.
- 12.3 When completing the Programme Withdrawal Form the School will be required to comment on the implications that the withdrawal of the on-campus version of the programme will have on each collaborating institution, including any in-country regulatory requirements. The School should contact Quality Assurance and Enhancement for guidance if they are unsure how to complete this section of the form.
- 12.4 When withdrawing on-campus versions of franchised programmes Schools must make one of the following proposals for how to proceed with each franchised version of the programme delivered by a collaborating institution:
- 12.4.1 the collaborating institution will take over responsibility for ensuring currency of programme content and the programme will be redefined as validated on the collaborative register;
 - 12.4.2 the programme will be withdrawn at the collaborating institution.
- 12.5 Where the School wishes to transfer responsibility for the programme content to the collaborating institution it must, through the relevant School quality committee, assure itself of the suitability of the programme leader at the collaborating institution to undertake this role. In order to approve the programme leader at the collaborating institution to undertake this role the relevant School committee should receive the following:
- 12.5.1 the CVs of the programme team at the collaborating institution;
 - 12.5.2 written confirmation from the collaborating institution that they have agreed to the proposed change to the programme status;

12.5.3 a statement from the UEL Subject Area Head confirming the suitability of the programme leader at the collaborating institution to undertake this role.

- 12.6 Following confirmation of the suitability of the programme leader at the collaborating institution, Quality Assurance and Enhancement will update the collaborative register to redefine the programme delivered by the collaborating institution as validated.

13 Partnership Monitoring Committees

- 13.1 A Partnership Monitoring Committee will be established where a partnership involves more than one UEL School. The purpose of the committee is to ensure a consistent approach to the academic and administrative support and management of the partnership and establish communication mechanisms across all parties and levels of the partnership. The role of the committee will include discussion of a common approach to partnership management activities, agreed approaches to assessment and moderation, the monitoring of external examiner reports and REP action plans, marketing materials, the application of policy updates, and a programme of staff development.

14 Termination of Collaborative Partnerships

- 14.1 In the event that either party wishes to terminate the collaborative partnership the following steps will be undertaken:

14.1.1 **Step 1:** Where a School wishes to terminate a collaborative partnership or have received communication from a collaborating institution advising of their intention to terminate the Quality Manager (Collaborations) should be advised of this as soon as possible. The Quality Manager (Collaborations) will liaise with Governance and Legal to ensure that the Memorandum of Co-operation is formally and correctly terminated.

14.1.2 **Step 2:** The Quality Manager (Collaborations) will arrange a Termination Meeting with key stakeholders from the managing School(s) and the collaborating institution to discuss arrangements for the termination. Following the initial meeting a Termination Meeting with key stakeholders will be arranged by Quality Assurance and Enhancement on an annual basis until all students have completed the programme(s). The minutes of the first Termination Meeting will act as an exit strategy for the phasing out of the collaborative programme(s). The exit strategy and subsequent minutes will be submitted to the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee for monitoring.

14.1.3 **Step 3:** Quality Assurance and Enhancement will coordinate a communication to be sent to existing students studying on UEL programme(s) at the collaborating institution informing them of the termination of the collaborative partnership.

14.1.4 **Step 4:** The managing School(s) complete a Partnership Termination Form for noting at the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee which will continue to receive updates on the numbers of students remaining on programme(s) at the collaborating institution. When all students at the collaborating institution have completed or run out of opportunities to complete their programme of study it will be noted at Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee and the partner institution will be removed from the Collaborative Register.

14.2 Arrangements for withdrawal or suspension of programmes offered in collaboration are as detailed in Part 6, section 5 of this manual.

15 Collaborative Review

15.1 Collaborative Review of the partnership and the programmes offered by the collaborating institution is undertaken every five years. However, in exceptional circumstances Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee may request a review of collaborative arrangements at an earlier date (exceptional review) should evidence come to light that quality and/or standards may be at risk in a collaborative arrangement or should a review panel indicate that they believe a follow up review is necessary. The review normally takes place at the location of delivery of programmes.

15.2 The purpose of the Collaborative Review is to:

- undertake an academic review of the programmes offered by the collaborating institution (franchised programmes are subject to academic review at UEL and therefore would not be subject to academic review as part of the Collaborative Review process);
- provide an opportunity to review the nature of the collaborative relationship, and resolve any problems that might exist;
- review the academic and administrative infrastructure of the collaborating institution to ensure that it continues to be able to offer a suitable learning environment for students;
- review student achievement to ensure that the quality of student experience continues to be adequate;
- encourage the further development of the collaborating institution's own quality assurance procedures.

15.3 The scope of the Collaborative Review will to some extent be determined by the nature of the collaboration; for franchise programmes the focus will be on achievement of academic standards and delivery of the approved programme, the quality of the student experience and activities to assure and enhance standards

and quality; for validated programmes a review of the programme specification and programme content will be included.

- 15.4 During the year prior to the collaborative review event, an informal preparatory meeting with the collaborating institution, link persons and other key stakeholders from the School, the Academic Partnership Office and the collaborating institution will take place. Discussion will be led by Quality Assurance and Enhancement and include the purposes of the review, requirements of the collaborating institution and Schools in the review, and identification of issues that may impact on the review.
- 15.5 As part of the event planning, a planning meeting will take place between the Chair of the review, a member of Quality Assurance and Enhancement (acting as the servicing officer), and the academic and administrative link persons at UEL and the collaborating institution. The School Leader for Quality Assurance will be invited to attend the meeting.

15.6 Documentation

15.6.1 The Critical Appraisal Commentary is the key document for the Collaborative Review process and will be the basis for the panel's enquiries. This document should be produced jointly by the relevant School(s) and the collaborating institution. The Critical Appraisal Commentary is essentially a self-study by both parties of the means used to assure quality and standards in that collaborative link, and the effectiveness of those means. It describes and reviews organisational changes since Institutional Approval and evaluates the operation of the programme(s) since the last approval/review and identifies the future direction of the partnership. The Critical Appraisal Commentary should:

- describe the collaborative link including a summary and explanation of the development of the link over the period under review;
- analyse the strengths and weaknesses of the link;
- summarise any issues raised about the quality and operation of the link during the period being reviewed and how these have been addressed;
- provide a view of the effectiveness of the means by which the UEL Schools assure themselves of the quality of the learning opportunities and student support offered through the link;
- provide a view of the effectiveness of the means by which the UEL Schools assure themselves of the standards of credits and/or awards gained through the link;
- identify any other issues which the programme team's own evaluation of the link has raised and how these are to be addressed;

- address any external developments which have affected, or will affect, the link;
- provide an index of the evidence that it cites and that will be available to the review team.

15.6.2 The supporting documentation listed below must be made available to the panel during the review:

- student handbook(s);
- programme specification;
- report from the previous validation/review event;
- Review and Enhancement Process reports and action plans for the three previous years;
- external examiner's reports for the three previous years;
- report on the observation of learning and teaching;
- a staff development statement (covering both subject development and pedagogical development);
- reports by professional bodies (where appropriate);
- student intake and progression data covering the last three intakes;
- a description of student support/welfare services, plus any recent analysis of student use, subject to normal constraints of confidentiality in respect of counselling and similar activities;
- examples of students' work to reflect the range of levels and attainment – including examination papers/scripts, coursework, project/lab reports scripts, project reports and dissertation;
- marking and feedback sheets and assessment criteria;
- relevant extracts from the Memorandum of Co-operation;
- any other documentation referenced in the Critical Appraisal Commentary.

15.7 Programme for the Collaborative Review

15.7.1 The Collaborative Review process is normally conducted over a period of one to two days, depending on scale of the provision that is to be considered as part of the review. The programme for the review is agreed

during the preliminary planning meeting and includes a meeting with existing students, a tour of the physical resources available to support the link and meetings with staff from both UEL and the collaborating institution to discuss the various aspects of the link.

15.8 Outcomes of the Collaborative Review

15.8.1 A review panel may either:

15.8.1.1 approve the continuing collaborative delivery of the programme(s) without conditions;

15.8.1.2 approve the continuing collaborative delivery of the programme(s) with conditions and/or recommendations;

15.8.1.3 withhold approval.

15.8.2 A review panel may decide that they would like to approve the continuing collaborative delivery of the programme(s) but have significant concerns which they do not feel can be entirely resolved through the setting of conditions. In such instances the review team may decide to approve the continuing delivery of the programme(s) for a shorter period of time (usually one year). Following such an outcome a further review will be arranged within the stipulated timeframe.

15.8.3 Following the review visit, a report will be produced which will be submitted to Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee, on behalf of Academic Board, so that the decision of the review panel can be endorsed. Collaborating institutions work with Schools to prepare an action plan based on the outcomes of the review process.

15.8.4 Following consideration of the Collaborative Review report the Quality Manager (Collaborations) will write to the collaborating institution, copied to the School, confirming the outcome of the Collaborative Review and to confirm the period for which the programmes will be reapproved (normally five years).

16 Financial Arrangements

16.1 The Assistant Director of Financial Management and the relevant Dean of School shall be responsible for ensuring that the financial arrangements are appropriate. Prospective collaborating institutions will normally bear all costs incurred for Institutional Approval Site Visits, Programme Approval and Collaborative Review events. This includes travel costs, accommodation costs and external adviser honorariums.

16.2 The financial agreement made with the collaborating institution will provide safeguards against financial temptations on the part of the overseas collaborating

institutions to compromise academic standards, or to register more students than can properly be accommodated.

- 16.3 Any fees paid by the collaborating institution must be sufficient to cover the full costs of assuring the quality and the standards of the programme(s).

17 Certification

- 17.1 Certification for all UEL programmes delivered overseas shall make clear the place of registration and the language of instruction where this is not English.
- 17.2 In all circumstances where a collaborating institution is active in the delivery of a UEL award certification will make reference to all active collaborating institutions.
- 17.3 If the record of achievement is the only document to provide details of the collaborating institution, the place of registration and/or the language of instruction and assessment, then the award certificate must make reference to the existence of the transcript.

Flowchart for approval of collaborative programmes

Initial Approval, for all programme proposals, to be considered at School level and Education and Student Success Committee (*School/QAE/Planning*)



Institutional Approval (for proposals with institutions with which UEL has not previously undertaken Institutional Approval) (*QAE/Finance/ESSC*)



Development of proposal, preparation of programme paperwork (*School in collaboration with partner*)



Preparation and agreement of Memorandum of Co-operation, including financial appendix (*QAE/School/Finance/partner*)



Planning meeting (*organised by QAE*) reviews approval documentation and draft Memorandum of Co-operation (commercial terms)



Approval event (*organised by QAE*)



Meeting report (*QAE*)



Signature of Memorandum of Co-operation (*UEL/Partner*)



Conditions met (*School/partner*)



Validation by Validation and Review sub-Committee



Programme delivery begins

Manuals, Forms and Guidance notes relevant to Part 11

<https://uelac.sharepoint.com/LearningandTeaching/Pages/forms-and-guidance-notes.aspx>

- Collaborative Initial Approval Form
- Nomination of an External Adviser for a validation/review event
- Collaborative Student Handbook
- Collaborative Validation Document
- Institutional Approval Visit Waiver Form
- Site Visit Site Visit Report Form
- Code of Practice for delivery in languages other than English
- Module Specification Template
- Guidance Notes on Programme Specifications
- Undergraduate Programme Specifications Template
- Postgraduate Programme Specifications Template
- Professional Doctorate Programmes Specifications Template
- Partnership Monitoring Committee Terms of Reference and outline agenda
- Programme Withdrawal Form
- Partnership Termination Form