

UEL QUALITY MANUAL

PART 11

COLLABORATION WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS

1. Introduction

1.1. UEL is involved in a range of collaborative academic partnership relationships, each relationship is categorised as one of the following models of collaboration:

- 1.1.1. **Franchise:** UEL may license whole courses, or stages of courses, designed by UEL and delivered on campus at UEL, to be delivered by a partner institution at their premises. Core modules will be as set out in the UEL course specification for the course, differences in curriculum content in core modules may be permitted to reflect cultural and regional differences as long as learning outcomes remain consistent. The partner institution may be permitted to develop a different set of optional modules, as long as they enable the course learning outcomes to be met. Additional optional modules would need to be approved through the UEL approval procedures. Where there is justification for doing so, and in-country regulations do not prohibit, it is possible for franchise courses to have a different course title to the on-campus UEL course. UEL retains ultimate responsibility for updating course content and course content will be reviewed as part of the Departmental academic review;
- 1.1.2. **Validation:** UEL may accredit a course developed by another institution as equivalent to a UEL award or leading to the award of a specific number of credits. The partner institution has responsibility for updating course content and course content will be reviewed as part of the partner institution's course review;
- 1.1.3. **Joint:** A course delivered jointly by UEL and at least one other institution. Delivery of the course may take place at UEL, the partner institution's premises, both at UEL and the partner institution's premises or by distance learning. Responsibility for updating course content is shared and course content will be reviewed as part of the Departmental academic review;
- 1.1.4. **Distributed Delivery:** (*also known as 'flying faculty'*) A course of study whereby course delivery and assessment is undertaken by UEL staff at the partner institution site. The partner institution may provide certain specialist resources, as approved by the University. UEL retains ultimate responsibility for updating course content and course content will be reviewed as part of the Departmental academic review.

- 1.2. Partnerships categorised as either franchise, validation or joint will adhere to one of the following methods of course delivery:
 - 1.2.1. **Partner On Campus:** The course is delivered on site at the partner institution, or through blended/dual delivery, the partner institution is responsible for the management of teaching and assessment;
 - 1.2.2. **Joint:** Course delivery is split between UEL and the site of the partner institution. Responsibility for teaching and assessment is split between UEL and the partner institution, normally each institution takes responsibility for elements of the course which are delivered at its teaching site. The split in responsibility for delivery of the course will be agreed at validation;
 - 1.2.3. **Distance learning:** A course of study whereby a student would not normally attend a UEL campus or that of a partner institution. Attendance may be required for residential sessions, for study support or for assessment purposes. The partner institution may manage elements of delivery, support and/or assessment, as agreed at validation.
- 1.3. Each course delivered in collaboration with a partner institution will lead to one of the following award types:
 - 1.3.1. **Single award:** A course of study leading to the award of a UEL qualification. UEL have sole responsibility for the issuing of the award certificate;
 - 1.3.2. **Double award:** A course of study leading to the award of both a UEL qualification and that of a partner institution. Each institution shall be responsible for the issuing of the award certificate of that institution;
 - 1.3.3. **Joint award:** A course of study leading to the award of a single certificate awarded jointly by UEL and another partner institution. Responsibility for the issuing of the award certificate shall be agreed between the two institutions prior to the commencement of the course.
- 1.4. The academic framework, assessment and feedback policy apply to the various models as follows:
 - 1.4.1. For **franchise and distributed delivery** agreements, all will apply;
 - 1.4.2. For **joint and validation** agreements, the assessment and feedback policy apply. The academic framework would normally be expected to apply with scope for negotiation. Deviations from the academic framework and/or the assessment and feedback policy must be approved by UEL's Education and Experience Committee (EEC)
- 1.5. UEL's academic framework requires that course teams incorporate our principles of Mental Wealth (<https://www.uel.ac.uk/about/about-uel/mental-wealth>). All undergraduate courses delivered in collaboration with a partner institution are, unless granted an exemption, required to incorporate the principles of Mental

Wealth within their curriculum. Mental Wealth is not a requirement of postgraduate courses delivered in collaboration with a partner institution and the partner institution will be given the option of whether or not they wish to adopt UEL's Mental Wealth principles.

- 1.6. UEL has ultimate responsibility for the quality of all courses leading to a UEL award. Where a course leads to a double or joint award responsibility for quality may be shared with each institution having ultimate responsibility for the quality of its own award.
- 1.7. In some circumstances UEL staff are contracted to teach on courses designed, validated and delivered at another institution. In this context it is usually the partner institution that takes responsibility for the quality of the course offered and UEL's quality assurance procedures do not apply.
- 1.8. 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 course from it.

2. Summary of the Approval Process

- 2.1. Before UEL can offer courses in collaboration with a partner institution, course approval process must be completed. The criteria for approval are as follows:
 - 2.1.1. The arrangement is consistent with the UEL vision and strategy and policy on collaboration;
 - 2.1.2. There is evidence to suggest that there will be adequate resources available to support the collaborative arrangements proposed;
 - 2.1.3. The proposal has academic benefit for UEL and is financially viable;
 - 2.1.4. The partner institution is of appropriate standing and is capable of providing a suitable learning environment for the delivery of courses of study leading to UEL awards;
 - 2.1.5. There is confirmation from official sources that official recognition will be granted, or of the limitation or conditions applying in respect of recognition (overseas courses only);
 - 2.1.6. There is no evidence to suggest that the partner institution will be prepared to place quality and standards at risk for financial gain.
- 2.2. For institutions with which UEL has not worked before, **institutional approval** is required. This includes proposals where partner institutions assist in or facilitate the delivery of a UEL course by distance learning.

- 2.3. Discussions will also take place with the partner institution with regard to the **memorandum of co-operation**, to agree the commercial and financial terms, the operation of an academic calendar, the allocation of responsibilities between UEL and the partner institution and the implementation of UEL policies and procedures. No course can run without a signed memorandum of co-operation being in effect.
- 2.4. The **course approval** process for new academic partners 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. Following the event, the proposal will be approved, approved subject to conditions, or not approved. Where conditions are set a deadline will be imposed. Peer Review, acting on behalf of Academic Board, will formally validate the proposal, having considered the report of the approval panel. The course may not run until all conditions are met and validation has been completed.
- 2.5. Any deviation from the usual process flow for collaborative approvals detailed at Appendix A must be approved by the Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement and by the Academic Partnerships Oversight Committee.
3. **Institutional Approval the Institutional Approval Process has been revised.** . Please contact the APO (D.Glautier@uel.ac.uk) or QAE (QAE@uel.ac.uk) for further information

4. **Course Approval for Existing Approved Partners**

- 4.1. For existing partners for whom institutional approval has been granted, a new course proposal may proceed to course approval. All collaborative courses will be evaluated through a process that will normally include an approval event, before they are offered to students. The purpose of the approval event is to confirm that:
 - 4.1.1. The partner institution is able to provide a suitable learning environment for the delivery of courses of study leading to UEL awards:
 - 4.1.2. Adequate resources are available to meet both the academic and support needs of the students;
 - 4.1.3. The arrangements for collaboration set down in the memorandum of co-operation are appropriate, understood and accepted by all parties.
- 4.2. The following timelines should be adhered to when undertaking course approval:
 - 4.2.1. For courses where it is proposed that delivery **will begin in September**, the course approval event should have taken place no later than May;
 - 4.2.2. For courses where it is proposed that **delivery will begin in February**, the course approval event should have taken place no later than October.

4.2.3. Any proposal that sits outside the timelines above 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 cannot be progressed without the approval of both the Head of Quality Assurance Enhancement and the Academic Partnerships Oversight Committee.

Where a new course is proposed for an existing partner institution it is normally necessary for the approval event to take place at the site of delivery.

- 4.3. The approval (validation) panel will be constituted to include a range of expertise enabling it to evaluate institutional issues as well as those that are course-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.
- 4.4. Where a proposal involves new courses with more than one UEL School in the same academic year, a joint event will be considered. Advice will be sought from the Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement regarding the maximum number of courses to be considered at a single event and in one day.
- 4.5. Where the provision to be approved is offered at multiple locations, the Chair and servicing officer will take advice from the Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement on the process to be followed. Confirmation from the Academic Partnerships Account Manager for the partnership and the Collaborating School that the required teaching resources are in place will be presented to the Approval Panel. The approval panel will need to see the CVs of all staff involved in delivery at all locations and will review the likely consistency of the student experience at different locations as part of its remit.
- 4.6. Where a course 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 course team obtain approval from the professional, statutory or regulatory body to deliver such courses. Where appropriate, depending on the approval requirements of that body, a representative will be invited to attend the panel event.

Documentation Requirements

4.7. The following documentation (using standard UEL templates, available at: <https://uelac.sharepoint.com/sites/QualityAssuranceandEnhancement/SitePages/Forms-and-Guidance.aspx> and the [Academic Partner Course Validation Template](#) are required for both the planning meeting and the approval event for a collaborative course:

4.7.1 Validation Document, which includes:

- The context of the proposed course.
- The rationale for the proposal.
- The professional context of the proposal.
- The course structure.
- Arrangements for the supervision and assessment of any placement element.
- Academic and other counselling/student support arrangements.
- A statement detailing the course team's evaluation of their proposal with regard to the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, relevant QAA Subject Benchmark Statement(s) (where applicable), the QAA Quality Code, and any professional accreditation requirements (i.e. how have they been used in the development of the Course).
- A curriculum vitae for each member of staff associated with teaching on the course.
- The resources available.
- Details of student and employer consultations.
- Transitional Arrangements (if relevant)

4.7.2 Course Specification, using the standard UEL template

4.7.3 Module Specifications, using the standard UEL template

4.7.4 Course technical details and Module information, using the standard UEL template

4.7.5 Apprenticeship Mapping Document (for apprenticeship courses only)

4.7.6 For distance learning proposals and proposals that involve a blend of both distance/online and on-campus learning, the proposal must also include a learning strategy, using the standard UEL template.

4.8. Apprenticeship courses may share module specifications with a non-apprenticeship counterpart; however, the module specifications should be addressed to ensure the terminology is still applicable for those on an apprenticeship.

- 4.8.1. For collaborative distance learning provision, a detailed schedule for completion of all distance or blended learning materials for the course;
- 4.8.2. A draft student handbook, using the latest UEL template, which at a minimum must include the following information:
- Course structure diagram;
 - Module specifications (using the standard UEL template);
 - Arrangements for the supervision and assessment of any placement element;
 - Local academic and other counselling and support arrangements for students.
- 4.8.3. For approval events that are not taking place at the site of delivery, the approval panel will be provided with a comprehensive report of physical resources available at the partner institution. Additional photographic or video evidence of resources may also be required.
- 4.9. In addition, 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 course will lead;
 - A copy of relevant sections of the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education (i.e. Partnerships Section);
 - Relevant documentation articulating professional body accreditation requirements;
 - Any other information relevant to the proposal.

Criteria for Approval of Validated and Joint Courses

- 4.10. The purpose of the approval process for validated and joint courses is to ensure that the quality of the student experience will be comparable to that offered by UEL for the same or similar course. The approval panel must ensure that:
- 4.10.1 There are adequate physical resources available to support the course;
- 4.10.2. There are adequate human resources available to support the course;
- 4.10.3. The proposed course team has a clear understanding of, and commitment to, the aims and objectives of the course and an implementation plan for delivery;
- 4.10.4. There are adequate arrangements for student support and pastoral care;
- 4.10.5. There are adequate course management and administrative arrangements in place to support the course;

- 4.11. In the case of joint courses, where it is determined that UEL will have ultimate responsibility for the quality of the course, the approval event will also be responsible for the approval of the course. The course 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.
- 4.12. If the partner institution has authority to award its own degrees, the two institutions may decide to take joint responsibility for the quality of the course. 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 courses are met. A memorandum of co-operation between the two institutions will be required.
- 4.13. Where an approval event incorporates the approval of new courses, they 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.

Requirements for the Approval of Distance Learning Provision

- 4.14. An approval event by panel will take place where a partner institution undertakes elements of the following:
- Course and module design;
 - Learning materials design and production;
 - Content delivery and delivery support;
 - Assessment.
- 4.15. 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 course;
 - Support infrastructure, roles and responsibilities of academic and support staff;
 - Student access to UEL systems, support and guidance services.
- 4.16. The approval panel will make recommendations relating to the timing of the review and updating of the academic content of courses offered by distance learning, given the implications and costs of updating.

Panel Composition

- 4.17. 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, who has undertaken Chair's training and who is independent of the School(s) proposing the course. Any exceptions will be agreed by the Head of Quality Assurance and Enhancement.
- 4.18. The course proposer will nominate appropriate external subject advisers to participate, normally by attendance for new partners and via correspondence for existing partners, in the approval event. Usually at least two external adviser are 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 courses is included, at least one external adviser should have experience of distance learning provision.
- 4.19. The suitability of the external advisers will be determined by the Chair of the approval panel and the relevant School quality leader, subject to the following criteria:
- 4.19.1. The depth and relevance of subject knowledge;
- 4.19.2. Experience in the management of collaborative activity;
- 4.19.3. Prior experience of teaching on courses at the same level or above. At least one external panel member must have current experience of working in UK Higher Education;
- 4.19.4. Impartiality (the nominee should not have any formal links with UEL or the partner institution during the last five years as a former member of staff or student and the last three years as an external examiner);
- 4.19.5. Professional expertise (for vocational courses, at least one of the advisers should be a 'practitioner' drawn from a relevant business or professional background).
- 4.20. 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 course proposer to nominate additional external subject advisers in order to ensure a balance of expert advice.
- 4.21. Where more than one course 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. A maximum of five courses can be considered at any one panel event.
- 4.22. For the approval of professional doctorate and Doctor of Philosophy PhD courses, a Research Degree Leader from another School will also be invited to attend the approval event.

Planning Meeting

- 4.23. 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), key members of the partner institution (this normally includes the proposed course leader, the partner institution's Head of Quality and other key stakeholders) and key staff members from the School proposing the collaborative course (this normally includes the Department Head, Collaborative Leader and other key stakeholders). The School Collaborative Leader and a representative from Academic Partnerships shall be invited to attend the meeting, and in the case of professional doctorate and Doctor of Philosophy PhD validations, the School Research Degree Leader also. The purpose of the preliminary planning meeting is to:
- Identify any outstanding resourcing issues that may need to be resolved before the approval event proceeds;
 - Identify major issues for consideration during the approval event;
 - Consider the adequacy of the documentation;
 - Discuss the course for the approval event;
 - Discuss the membership of the approval panel.
- 4.24. A course proposal will not proceed to validation until the Chair is satisfied that the documentation is adequate. If the documentation presented at 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.
- 4.25. A short report providing the outcomes of the planning meeting and the proposed course for the approval event shall be prepared and circulated to panel members and other relevant staff by Quality Assurance and Enhancement.

Approval Event

- 4.26. 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.)..
- 4.27. The course 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.
- 4.28. 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 course;
- Admissions criteria
- Course content and structure;
- Teaching and learning;
- Assessment;
- Student support and guidance;
- Administrative arrangements for the registration and assessment of students;

4.29. There will normally be a private meeting of the panel at the beginning of the approval event 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 private meeting of the panel at the end of the approval event at which the outcome of the event will be determined.

4.30. It is likely that the panel will wish to hold meetings with staff involved in the course (staff from both UEL and the partner institution) and potential students, where applicable. A tour of resources available to support the course is also likely.

Outcomes of the Approval Event

4.31. At the end of the approval event the panel will reach a decision about the course. The panel may reject the course, approve the course without conditions, or set conditions of approval. Approval is valid for a period of five years, but if the course has not commenced within three years of the date of approval, re-approval will be required before the course can commence.

4.32. Where conditions of approval are set, the deadline for submission of responses to approval conditions shall be determined by the panel. Courses may not be offered until all conditions of validation have been satisfied.

4.33. Once conditions have been satisfied the Academic Partnerships Office will be responsible for ensuring that the MoC and/or Course Schedule is updated and signed by both parties.

4.34. If conditions are imposed, it is the responsibility of the course proposer to ensure that the conditions are satisfied within the time scale specified.

4.35. The response to conditions of approval should be submitted to Quality Assurance and Enhancement who will arrange for it to be considered.

4.36. The Chair of the event will be responsible for formally determining that the conditions of approval event have been satisfied.

4.37. Following the approval event, the Chair will receive a draft report for comment and to check factual accuracy. The report is also circulated to members of the approval panel for comment. The unconfirmed report will then be produced and circulated to the Course Proposer and the partner institution to confirm.

4.38. Once confirmed the report and course specification will be submitted to Peer Review so that the decision can be endorsed and the course can be offered.

5. Delivery Approval – the Approval of the Delivery of a Franchised Course, a Course at an Alternative or Additional Location or the Approval of an Additional Location of Delivery -. Please contact the APO (D.Glautier@uel.ac.uk) or QAE (QAE@uel.ac.uk) for further information

6. Approval of Revalidated Franchised Courses

6.1. Where a partner institution has approval to deliver a franchised course and the School subsequently revalidate the on-campus version of the course it is necessary that the School ensure that the partner institution is capable of delivering the revalidated version of the course. Partner institutions have up to one year from the date of the first delivery of the revalidated on-campus course to implement the new course and if approval is not obtained within this timeframe, then recruitment to the franchised course will be placed on hold until this approval has been obtained.

6.2. In order to approve the partner institution to deliver the revalidated course the following documentation should be presented to the School Quality Committee for approval:

6.2.1. A statement or report on proposed arrangements to support delivery of the revalidated course, this statement should include:

- Confirmation that existing physical resources (previously approved) adequately support delivery of the new course;
- Evidence of staff expertise to deliver the new course – staff CVs should be appended to the statement or report;
- A brief statement relating to the assessment strategy, particularly around the use of formative assessment;
- Proposals for dealing with ethical approval for dissertation, where relevant;
- details of assessment board arrangements (linked to the number of intakes) and how they will align to the UEL calendar of assessment boards;
- Details of transitional arrangements, where relevant;
- A schedule of staff development to be offered to the partner institution in relation to delivery of the new course.

6.2.2. A draft student handbook - to include at a minimum the new module structure, module specifications (clearly listing Module Leaders/Tutors) and the academic calendar;

6.2.3. A revised course specification - listing the partner information;

- 6.2.4. For courses delivered in a language other than English, the module specifications presented for approval should be in the language of delivery and include the updated reading list. Evidence of external examiner approval of the updated reading list should also be included.
- 6.3. Should the School Quality Committee approve the partner institution to deliver the revalidated version of the course the following documentation should be presented to Peer Review for consideration:
- 6.3.1. Minutes of the School Quality Committee where the proposal was considered;
- 6.3.2. The revised course specification;
- 6.3.3. External examiner comments regarding reading lists (if applicable).
- 6.4. Approval by Peer Review is confirmation that the partner institution may deliver the revalidated version of the course.

7. Language of Instruction

- 7.1. 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.
- 7.2. In these circumstances, both teaching and assessment must take place in the same language.
- 7.3. The course approval panel will review the proposal to teach and assess in a language other than English. The panel should include a minimum of one external fluent in the proposed language of delivery and assessment. The course 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 course 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. CAM reports, course 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 partner institution will not be used as translators of examination scripts or coursework.

7.4. For the guidance of course 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 courses in a language other than English'.

8. Modifications to Collaborative Courses

8.1. The School Quality Committee is responsible for approving modifications to collaborative courses involving change to 25% or less of the course, using the procedures set out in Part 6 'Course Modifications' of this Quality Manual.

8.2. Arrangements for the process of modifications that constitute more than 25% of a collaborative course will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

9. Withdrawal of Franchised Courses On-Campus

9.1. There may be occasions where Schools have established relationships with partner institutions for the delivery of franchised courses but wish to withdraw the on-campus version of the course. Such scenarios can result in the following issues:

9.1.1. The in-country regulatory requirements of the provider may not allow for the partner institution to deliver a franchised course that is not delivered at the home institution;

9.1.2. Over a period of time the course content may become outdated;

9.1.3. Course content would not automatically be considered under the remit of collaborative review but would also not be considered as part of the Departmental academic review.

9.2. Where the on-campus version of the course is being revalidated it would be appropriate for the School to liaise with the partner institution to consider whether they might adopt the revised version of the course.

9.3. When completing the course withdrawal form, the School will be required to comment on the implications that the withdrawal of the on-campus version of the course will have on each partner 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.

- 9.4. When withdrawing on-campus versions of franchised courses Schools must make one of the following proposals for how to proceed with each franchised version of the course delivered by a partner institution:
- 9.4.1. The partner institution will take over responsibility for ensuring currency of course content and the course will be redefined as validated on the collaborative register;
 - 9.4.2. The course will be withdrawn at the partner institution.
- 9.5. Where the School wishes to transfer responsibility for the course content to the partner institution it must, through the School Quality Committee, assure itself of the suitability of the course team at the partner institution to maintain the currency of the course. In order to approve the course team at the partner institution to undertake this role the School Quality Committee should receive the following:
- 9.5.1. The CVs of the course team at the partner institution;
 - 9.5.2. Written confirmation from the partner institution that they have agreed to the proposed change to the course status;
 - 9.5.3. A statement from the UEL Department Head confirming the suitability of the course team at the partner institution to undertake this role.
- 9.6. Following confirmation of the suitability of the course leader at the partner institution, Quality Assurance and Enhancement will update the collaborative register to redefine the course delivered by the partner institution as validated.
- 9.7. Arrangements for withdrawal or suspension of courses offered in collaboration are as detailed in Part 6 'Course Modifications' of this Quality Manual.
- 10. Termination of Collaborative Partnerships** - Please contact the APO (D.Glautier@uel.ac.uk) or QAE (QAE@uel.ac.uk) for further information
- 11. Collaborative Partnership Review** - Please contact the APO (D.Glautier@uel.ac.uk) or QAE (QAE@uel.ac.uk) for further information

Manuals, Forms and Guidance notes relevant to Part 11

<https://uelac.sharepoint.com/sites/QualityAssuranceandEnhancement/SitePages/Forms-and-Guidance.aspx>

- Code of Practice for delivery in languages other than English
- Collaborative Student Handbook
- Collaborative Validation Document
- Guidance Notes on Course Specification
- Module Specification Template
- Nomination of an External Adviser for a validation/review event
- Professional Doctorate Course Specification Template
- Undergraduate/Postgraduate Course Specification Template