

Part 12

Admission with Advanced Standing and Similar Arrangements with Partner Institutions

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This part of the manual details the quality procedures for entry with advanced standing, or articulation, relationships:

Articulation: an arrangement whereby programmes and modules delivered by a partner institution are formally recognised for the purposes of advanced standing towards a UEL award.

- 1.2 A number of such types of relationships may be incorporated within this definition:

1.1.1 direct entry, or entry with advanced standing, of groups of students to UEL by virtue of their satisfactory progress in approved programmes in a partner institution;

1.1.2 any other association which allows a partner institution to use the name of UEL, or to refer to an award of that institution in any context apart from those described in Part 11 of this manual.

In these circumstances UEL is not responsible for the quality of a programme offered by a partner because it does not lead to a UEL award. Nevertheless UEL is responsible for:

1.1.3 ensuring that the academic achievements of students completing these programmes are appropriate for entry to specified University programmes;

1.1.4 ensuring that students taking these programmes are not misled in any way about the character of the programmes, or their prospects for future admission to a UEL programme, by virtue of inappropriate information distributed by the collaborating institution;

- 1.1.5 assuring itself that the collaborating institution provides an appropriate educational experience for students;
 - 1.1.6 maintaining regular communications with the collaborating institution to encourage the success of the partnership.
- 1.2 In the context of this section of the manual, the term 'institution' is used to describe any educational establishment (e.g. college of further education, college of higher education, university), or public or private agency providing education.

2 Articulation Approval Form

- 2.1 The Articulation Approval Form is designed to ensure that each proposal is considered on the basis of the risk that it poses to UEL. Each proposal will be categorised as either low risk or high risk:
- 2.1.1 Low Risk: Proposals that are low risk for indicators A and B. For low risk proposals it is necessary to complete Appendix A of the Articulation Approval Form.
 - 2.1.2 High Risk: Proposals that are high risk for one or more of indicators A and B. For high risk proposals it is necessary to complete Appendix B of the Articulations Approval Form.
- 2.2 Whether the proposal is low risk or high risk the Proposer will ensure that the appropriate Appendix has been completed by a member of staff suitably qualified to make judgements as to the equivalent levels of the programmes.
- 2.3 For low risk proposals Schools are required to complete the Low Risk Mapping table in Appendix A of the Articulation Proposal Form, indicating which modules on the UEL programme potential applicants would be exempt from undertaking and the equivalent modules at the partner institution which map against those on the UEL programme. The completed form should indicate the equivalent credit of the modules at the partner institution in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/Framework-Higher-Education-Qualifications-08.pdf>). A new Low Risk Mapping table should be completed for each pair of programmes being mapped.
- 2.4 For high risk proposals Schools are required to complete the High Risk Mapping in Appendix B of the Articulation Proposal Form. In order to complete the High Risk Mapping the School are required to complete a table for each module on the UEL programme indicating how either the Learning Outcomes or Content of the module are met by the modules at the partner institution. It is likely that no one module at the partner institution will map directly against the UEL module, if this is the case the School should clearly indicate all of the modules at the partner institution that have been considered for the purposes of mapping the Learning Outcomes or Content.

2.5 For high risk proposals it is a requirement a representative from the School with relevant subject expertise undertake a site visit of the partner institution. In situations where a non-subject specialist undertakes a site visit, subject specialist advice should be sought prior to the visit and the outcomes of the visit should be discussed and agreed with the subject specialist. The purpose of this visit will be to ensure:

- that the resources, facilities, staff, traditions, ethos and academic and non-academic capability and achievements of the collaborating institution are appropriate for the type of arrangement proposed;
- there are suitable arrangements for the operational management of the arrangement;
- there are adequate procedures to verify the integrity of the assessment process, and the output standards, of any course leading to entry to a UEL programme;
- that confirmation is available from official sources concerning appropriate recognition of the course, or of the limitation or conditions applying in respect of recognition;
- there is understanding of, and commitment to, the proposed Memorandum of Co-operation.

The School is required to complete the Site Visit Report section of the Articulation Proposal Form prior to submission to the School quality committee.

3 Articulation Approval Process

- 3.1 Each new articulation arrangement will have a Proposer who is based within the School to which the articulation arrangement will apply. The Proposer will be responsible for ensuring that the Articulation Approval Form is completed and considered at the appropriate committees.
- 3.2 The Articulation Approval Form would be submitted to the Education and Student Success Committee in the first instance. It is a minimum requirement that all Green sections of the form are completed prior to submission to Education and Student Success Committee.
- 3.3 Education and Student Success Committee would consider the proposed articulation from an institutional perspective and a decision by Education and Student Success Committee to approve the proposal is confirmation that, at an institutional level, it is considered that the proposal accords with UEL's strategic plan and that the proposal may be developed further towards final approval.
- 3.4 Education and Student Success Committee will either unconditionally approve the proposal or reject the proposal with feedback.

- 3.5 Upon approval by the Education and Student Success Committee the Proposer will submit the Articulation Approval Form to School quality committee. It is a minimum requirement that the relevant Appendix, as defined by the risk assessment outlined in paragraph 2.1, is completed.
- 3.6 The School quality committee will consider the proposal from a quality perspective and will ensure that all relevant sections of the form have been satisfactorily completed and that the mapping provides appropriate evidence that the relevant Learning Outcomes/Content of the UEL programme have been covered by the partner institution programme with the necessary credit at the relevant level. The following documentation should be included with the Articulation Approval Form:
- 3.6.1 For programmes with professional, statutory and regulatory body (PSRB) requirements, revisions to the programme specification clarifying the status of the PSRB accreditation in relation to students joining the programme via an advanced standing arrangement should be included in the submission to School quality committee.
- 3.7 A Quality Assurance Officer and member of staff from another School (normally a School Leader for Quality Assurance, but may be a Deputy Quality Leader, Dean/Associate Dean of School and School Leader in Learning and Teaching) must be present at the meeting.
- 3.8 The School quality committee will either unconditionally approve the proposal or reject the proposal with feedback. The School quality committee may not impose conditions of approval, with the exception of a condition relating to the signing of the Memorandum of Co-operation.
- 3.9 The Articulation Approval Form will be submitted to Validation & Review Sub-Committee for formal validation. The following documents should be included with the Articulation Approval Form:
- 3.9.1 The School quality committee minute recommending approval.
- 3.9.2 For programmes with professional, statutory and regulatory body (PSRB) requirements, a revised programme specification clarifying the status of the PSRB accreditation in relation to students joining the programme via an advanced standing arrangement.
- 3.10 The Validation & Review Sub-Committee will either unconditionally approve the proposal or reject the proposal with feedback. The School quality committee may not impose conditions of approval, with the exception of a condition relating to the signing of the Memorandum of Co-operation. Approval shall be time limited for a maximum of four years.

4 Memorandum of Co-operation

- 4.1 All collaborative partnerships require a written Memorandum of Co-operation outlining the agreement between the two institutions. Quality Assurance and

Enhancement will draft the Memorandum of Co-operation in association with the relevant parties following approval of the Articulation Approval Form by Validation & Review Sub-Committee.

4.2 The purpose of the Memorandum of Co-operation is to:

- define the means by which the integrity of the collaborative arrangement shall be assured;
- ensure that the collaborative arrangements are clearly set out and operate smoothly, and that clear channels of authority, accountability and executive action are identified;
- detail the requirements for entry onto the UEL programme(s) under the agreement.

4.3 The Memorandum of Co-operation will, inter alia, and as appropriate to the nature of the arrangement and standing of the partner, include details of the way in which the arrangement will be managed and students admitted to UEL programmes, proposed arrangements for monitoring, and arrangements governing information and publicity.

4.4 Once the advanced standing arrangement has been validated and the Memorandum of Co-operation finalised, Quality Assurance and Enhancement will arrange for signature by all contributing parties. The Memorandum of Co-operation will be signed by the Vice-Chancellor or Deputy Vice-Chancellor on behalf of UEL. **There are no other authorised signatories.**

4.5 Memoranda of Co-operation for articulation arrangements will have a duration of four years following approval of the articulation mapping by Validation and Review sub-Committee, else there is a risk that the mapping will be out of date and no longer valid. The Memorandum of Co-operation will outline the responsibility of each institution to inform the other of any changes to their programme at which point it will be necessary for the School to undertake a further mapping exercise. If further programmes are to be added to Memorandum of Co-operation at a later date the duration of the agreement will not change from the date of the original agreement.

4.6 Deans of School have executive authority for the effective delivery of collaborative arrangements and for ensuring that the terms of the Memorandum of Co-operation are observed.

5 Financial Arrangements

5.1 The Dean of School or his/her nominee and the Head of the Academic Partnership Office or his/her nominee are responsible for liaising with the Assistant Director of Financial Management concerning any financial arrangements.

- 5.2 Any financial agreement made with the collaborating institution shall provide safeguards against financial temptations to compromise academic standards; or to register more students than can properly be accommodated by the partner institution.

6 Monitoring and Review

- 6.1 Where collaborative links lead to entry with advanced standing to a particular programme, the performance of these students should be kept under constant review by the programme team concerned and action taken if their performance suggests that the link is not operating effectively.
- 6.2 At least once every four years, based on the expiry date of the Memorandum of Co-operation, the collaborative arrangement will be formally reviewed. This will be undertaken at School level; the review will be based on a review document prepared by the Academic Link Person and include a brief overview of the link, review of the output of students admitted under the advanced standing arrangements; any changes in the institution itself; and a re-mapping of the partner institution's qualification against the UEL award. A visit to the partner institution may be included.
- 6.3 The review document will be considered by School quality committee, the minutes of the meeting considering the review and the review document will be forwarded to Validation and Review Sub-Committee for formal validation.
- 6.4 Following approval from the Validation and Review Sub-Committee, Quality Assurance and Enhancement will draft a revised Memorandum of Co-operation in association with the relevant parties and arrange for signature by all contributing parties.

7 Termination of Articulation Arrangements

- 7.1 Proposals for termination of articulation arrangements will be considered by the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee. Schools should complete the termination form (downloadable from <https://uelac.sharepoint.com/LearningandTeaching/Pages/quality-assurance-handbook.aspx>) stating the final date at which students on the programme(s) granting advanced standing can transfer to the UEL programme(s). Advice on contractual matters relating to termination can be obtained from the Quality Assurance and Enhancement team, and termination letters should be signed by the Head of Governance and Legal Services.

Manuals, Forms and Guidance notes relevant to Part 12

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

- Articulation Approval Form
- Minutes template for SQSC minutes for articulation proposals
- Partnership Termination Form