

**QUALITY ASSURANCE OF
COLLABORATIVE PROVISION POLICY
2017 - 18**



Document Title:	Quality Assurance of Collaborative Provision Policy
Document Author:	Dr Angus Paddison, Director of Academic Quality and Development
Responsible Person and Department:	Dr Angus Paddison, Director of Academic Quality and Development
Approving Body:	Senate
Date of Approval:	17 June 2015
Date Effective From:	17 June 2015
Review Date:	June 2018 (triennially)
Indicate whether the document is for public access or internal access only Indicate whether the document applies to collaborative provision? <i>(Strikethrough text, as appropriate)</i>	Public Access Internal Access Only Applies to Collaborative Provision
Summary: <p>This policy sets out the processes for the approval of partners with whom the University delivers its awards. It principally covers partner delivered awards and articulation arrangements. It is informed by B10 of the UK Quality Code. It was substantially revised in May 2014 in the light of this Chapter. Key changes include more detail on: the criteria for the approval of partners; the monitoring of arrangements; and a stronger emphasis on risk management.</p> <p>The policy was further revised in Spring 2015. Along with minor adjustments separate arrangements that pertain to School Centred Initial Teacher Training collaborations were inserted.</p>	

QUALITY ASSURANCE OF COLLABORATIVE PROVISION POLICY

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION:	WORKING WITH OTHERS AND COLLABORATIVE PROVISION	1
SECTION 1:	KEY PRINCIPLES RELATING TO THE QUALITY ASSURANCE OF COLLABORATIVE PROVISION	1
SECTION 2:	QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT	2
SECTION 3:	PROCEDURES AND REQUIREMENTS FOR THE INSTITUTIONAL APPROVAL OF COLLABORATIVE PARTNERS	3
3.1	Initial stages in the proposal	3
3.2	Documentation	3
3.3	Approval Panel Event	4
3.4	Approval of the Proposed Collaboration and Partner Organisation	5
3.5	Institutional Agreement/Articulation Agreements	6
3.6	The Register of Collaborative Provision	7
SECTION 4:	PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW, REVALIDATION AND RE-APPROVAL	7
4.1	Annual Review by Senate Academic Development Executive Committee	7
4.2	Institutional Review of the Partner Organisation	8
4.3	Periodic Re-Validation of Partner delivered awards	9
4.4	Periodic Re-approval of Articulations	9
SECTION 5:	ARRANGEMENTS FOR ANNUAL MONITORING OF PARTNER DELIVERED AWARDS	9
SECTION 6:	PROCEDURES FOR WITHDRAWAL	9
APPENDIX 1	TYPOLOGY OF COLLABORATIVE PROVISION	10
APPENDIX 2	TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONAL CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF A PROPOSED COLLABORATION AND PARTNER ORGANISATION	13
APPENDIX 3	TEMPLATE FOR RISK ASSESSMENT	17
APPENDIX 4	INDICATIVE AREAS FOR AGREEMENT WITH PROSPECTIVE PARTNERS	19
APPENDIX 5	SCITT ARRANGEMENTS	25

INTRODUCTION: WORKING WITH OTHERS AND COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

Working with others in the provision of Higher Education is integral to a vibrant University culture and to the University of Winchester's strategic direction, but brings with it due diligence responsibilities and risks, both of which have to be managed.

Chapter B10 of the UK Quality Code defines working with others in the provision of higher education as 'learning opportunities leading or contributing to the award of academic credit or a qualification that are delivered, assessed or supported through an arrangement with one or more organisations other than the degree-awarding body'¹. This definition therefore covers any activity where the achievement of the learning outcomes for a module or programme is dependent on the arrangement made with a partner organisation(s).

This policy sets out the procedures and requirements which enables the University to fulfil its quality assurance responsibilities for the standards of its collaborative provision, which falls within this umbrella term of 'working with others'. The University of Winchester's definition of collaborative provision is informed by Chapter B10 of the UK Quality Code. 'Collaborative Provision' is defined by the University as:

an arrangement, secured by a legal agreement, with home or international partners, whereby those partners deliver or provide physical resources for part or whole of a programme to either enable students to qualify for a University of Winchester award or to articulate with advanced standing onto a defined University of Winchester programme.

This definition does not include student/staff exchange agreements, or progression agreements with institutions which allow applicants with specified qualifications to be considered for admission on an individual basis; these are dealt with under separate procedures. Similarly there are separate approved procedures relating to placements and work-based learning, although some partnerships with employers involving collaborative arrangements may fall under this definition. A key aspect of the definition above is whether the delivery of the programme is dependent on the collaborative arrangement.

A typology of collaborative provision covered by this Policy can be found in Appendix 1. The University normally involves itself in two types of collaborative provision: partner delivered awards and articulation agreements.

SECTION 1: KEY PRINCIPLES RELATING TO THE QUALITY ASSURANCE OF COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

There are different versions of collaborative provision, including articulation and variants of partner delivered awards. Each of these arrangements have different implications for the respective responsibilities of the University and the partner. These responsibilities are detailed in a legal agreement between the University and the partner.

The key principles governing the quality assurance of all types of collaborative provision are determined by the University's responsibility for assuring that:

- a) the processes and infrastructure are in place to execute its responsibility for assuring the standards of all academic awards and credit granted in its name;
- b) the academic standards of all University of Winchester awards meet the expectations of the UK Quality Code, including the Framework of Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) and any UK subject benchmark statements;
- c) the quality of student learning opportunities and experiences on off-campus University of Winchester programmes are comparable to on-campus programmes and adequate to enable

¹ The UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Part B: Assuring and Enhancing Academic Quality, Chapter B10: Managing higher education provision with others, December 2012, p. 3.

- students to achieve the appropriate academic standards;
- d) arrangements are monitored and supported;
- e) when it aligns itself with partners it deems appropriate the University's strategic objective, 'To Educate' is advanced.

In pursuit of these principles, the University will:

- i) only consider working with partners who have the academic standing to deliver programmes to appropriate academic standards, the financial standing to sustain them, adequate infrastructure facilities and the resources to support them and the legal standing to contract to their delivery;
- ii) only work with a partner if it is consistent with the University's and the Faculty's strategic plans;
- iii) ensure that the risks of all partnerships are proportionately anticipated and managed;
- iv) consider how the geographical location of the partner, or any language barriers, might affect regular and/or effective contact for monitoring academic standards, review, and sharing of good practice;
- v) only consider working with a partner where the University has appropriate and sustainable academic expertise to enable it to assure itself of the comparability of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities at the partner;
- vi) require that the arrangements are set out in the form of a legally binding agreement or contract;
- vii) during the agreed period, monitor the arrangement and, if it perceives that standards are at risk, reserve the right to suspend or terminate the Institutional Agreement (Also known as Memorandum of Agreement) subject to safeguards for students;
- viii) at the expiry of the Institutional Agreement, conduct a full review of the standards and quality of the partner delivered award/the experience of students entering via articulation agreements, leading to a decision as to whether it should be re-approved and continued or terminated and discontinued subject to safeguards for students.

SECTION 2: QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT

Partner delivered awards

The University's Quality and Standards Handbook is applied to partner delivered awards with modifications and additions, where appropriate. Specified committees and individuals are responsible for the creation, implementation, monitoring, review and enhancement of the quality assurance of partner delivered awards which is designed to enable the University to discharge its responsibilities for the quality and standards of all its awards. For partner delivered awards an Academic Liaison Officer is normally nominated, based in the host Department. The role of the Academic Liaison Officer is to work collaboratively with the partner in assuring and enhancing standards. Details of the role of the Academic Liaison Officer, and their relationship within the collaborative arrangement are detailed in the relevant Operational Handbook. Details of the responsibilities of the partner and of the University are also clarified in the Institutional Agreement.

The University's academic regulations govern the eligibility of all candidates for University awards. Any exemptions from academic regulations are approved by Academic Regulations, Policies and Procedures Committee.

Articulation agreements

The standards of the delivery organisation are assured and tested via the University's approval processes (at the level of the institution and the programme onto which articulation is proposed). Students who thereafter enter into on campus programmes fall within the University's quality assurance and enhancement framework.

SECTION 3: PROCEDURES AND REQUIREMENTS FOR THE INSTITUTIONAL APPROVAL OF COLLABORATIVE PARTNERS

This section covers

- 3.1 Initial stages in the proposal
- 3.2 Documentation
- 3.3 Panel Event
- 3.4 Approval of the Proposed Collaboration and Partner Organisation
- 3.5 Institutional Agreements/Articulation Agreements
- 3.6 Register of Collaborative Provision

3.1 Initial stages in the proposal

A proposal for collaboration may be initiated by a prospective partner or interested parties within the University or jointly. Approaches from outside the University must be made directly to the Dean of Faculty or Director of Internationalisation for consideration. For articulation agreements the Programme Leader and the Dean of Admissions must also be consulted.

If the relevant Dean or Director wishes to support the collaboration a member of University staff will be appointed as University Proposer. This policy, and its procedures, will be shared by the Proposer with the prospective partner.

3.2 Documentation

For consideration by the Approval Panel the University Proposer should complete the Template for Institutional Consideration and Approval of the Proposed Collaboration and Partner (Appendix 2). The Risk Assessment should also be completed (Appendix 3). Normally, a site visit should be completed before the Approval Panel is held and the site visit report should form part of the documentation. A template for the site visit is available from the Quality Office.

The proposal should also include the following documentation (where relevant):

- a. Mission Statement of the proposed partner
- b. Strategic Plan of the proposed partner
- c. Organisational Structure of the proposed partner
- d. Staff CVs of core teaching team
- e. Certification of the legal identity of the proposed partner
- f. Reports from Funding or External Quality Bodies
- g. The two most recent sets of audited accounts of the partner, for approval by the Director of Finance
- h. Business Plans (this sets out all costs to the University, eg travel, academic liaison, external examiners etc)
- i. Draft Institutional Agreement/Articulation Agreement
- j. Statement setting out HE experience
- k. Arrangements for Quality and Standards (current), and for student support
- l. External Examiner reports for the last 3 years (if relevant)
- m. Annual monitoring reports for the last 3 years (if relevant)
- n. Statement from the present degree awarding institution with whom the partner has a collaborative arrangement as to the standing and effectiveness of the prospective partner (if relevant)

If the Proposal is an Overseas Prospective Partner Organisation additional evidence may be required including:

- o. Detail on the legal, financial and cultural environment (particularly in relation to quality and standards

and language issues) from relevant national government offices and agencies, UK bodies with a presence in the country such as the British Council, UK NARIC, UK government offices.

For all types of collaborative provision, the Approval Panel has to be satisfied that there is a sound business case for the proposal based upon realistic projections of revenues and full and accurate costing of activities. Particularly in the case of overseas provision, costs should include the travel and subsistence of staff involved in liaison, where appropriate in teaching, and in quality assurance and enhancement. For partner delivered awards, costs should also include those incurred in setting up the programme.

The Proposal and supporting documents (as required) are to be sent to the Quality Officer (Collaborative Provision) who will ensure the documentation is complete before the Approval Panel meets.

3.3 Approval Panel Event

Once all the documentation has been received, it will be forwarded to the Panel members. The Panel may also have access to the report on the visit to the partner organisation, if already undertaken.

The First Deputy Vice-Chancellor will chair a Approval Panel, meeting as an Executive committee of Senate Academic Development Committee, which will normally include:

- Dean of the relevant Faculty;
- Director of Finance;
- Director of Academic Quality and Development.

The University Proposer and relevant Director will attend part or all of the event in order to answer any questions.

Central to the decision making of the Panel are the following four overarching criteria:

1. That there is a strategic 'fit' between the University's Strategy and the particular proposal;
2. That the benefits to the Faculty/institution are clearly and convincingly articulated;
3. That appropriate and proportionate due diligence processes have been carried out;
4. That the risks associated with the proposed partnership have been anticipated and proportionately managed.

In the light of these criteria the Approval Panel will make judgments about:

- a. whether there is a sound rationale for the proposed collaboration;
- b. whether the proposed collaboration is consistent with the University's Strategic Plan, Foundation Strategy and/or the University's Internationalisation Strategy;
- c. whether it would be appropriate to undertake the proposed collaboration in view of the University's existing collaborative arrangements and other commitments;
- d. whether the University and the Faculty has the appropriate resources in place to support the proposed collaboration;
- e. whether the proposed collaboration will command the commitment and support of the Faculty and senior management of the University and of the prospective partner;
- f. in the case of partner delivered awards, whether the proposing Faculty has knowledge, experience, and intellectual capital to underwrite the awards.
- g. whether the outline business plan is sound, in the light of expected student numbers;
- h. whether the risks to the University have been appropriately anticipated and mitigated;
- i. whether the prospective partner organisation is financially stable and the prospective partner organisation can contract legally with it.

If the Panel is satisfied that the above matters have been met they will go on to consider the following:

- j. the overall academic standing of the prospective partner organisation;
- k. the organisational structure of the partner, in particular that academic and business decision-making are separate;
- l. the robustness of its overall quality control and assurance procedures at the organisational level (drawing from previous experience of working with HEIs, if appropriate);
- m. the adequacy of its overall administrative support for quality assurance at the organisational level;
- n. the adequacy of its overall provision for academic and pastoral support and guidance;
- o. the adequacy of overall staffing in relation to the ability to meet requirements for awards;
- p. that it has experience of delivering comparable programmes at a similar level, or is capable of delivering programmes at that level;

and, in the case of proposed overseas partner delivered awards:

- q. that the prospective partner has a relevant understanding of the current practices of UK HE, e.g. in connection with external examining, assessment arrangements, and quality assurance arrangements and there is nothing that will inhibit fulfilment of the Expectations of the UK Quality Code;
- r. that both the University and the prospective partners have the capacity to address differences in cultures and expectations between HE systems in such a way as to ensure that the requirements of the arrangement can be met;
- s. that any language requirements have been appropriately anticipated;
- t. that, if instruction and assessment is to be in a language other than English, it has the capacity to provide any required translation facilities to an appropriate standard;
- u. that in-country recognition requirements have been investigated, and that one of the following has been demonstrated by the proposing Faculty:
 - i. there are no in-country recognition requirements;
 - ii. there is no requirement to seek in-country recognition in order to deliver the proposed programme, but in order for the programme to be recognised as a valid qualification in the country in which it is delivered national recognition is needed (in these cases, the proposers must demonstrate how this recognition will be achieved or alternatively why they are not seeking it and how students will be informed that the programme does not carry this recognition);
 - iii. approval from a national body is required to deliver the programme, and this has been obtained.

The Approval Panel will produce a written report on these matters and decide whether the proposal has received Institutional Approval, or not.

The Panel may request an additional site visit to be completed. This site visit will normally be undertaken by members of staff nominated by the First Deputy Vice-Chancellor. The University may also appoint an external advisor (a subject expert with experience of collaborative provision to assist them). The First Deputy Vice-Chancellor together with the Director of Academic Quality and Development will consider the site report and approve the proposal and prospective partner organisation on behalf of the Panel.

3.4 Approval of the Proposed Collaboration and Partner Organisation

Once Institutional Approval for the collaboration is obtained the proposal should proceed to the validation stage (for partner delivered awards) or through the articulation approval procedures (for articulation arrangements).

Institutional Approval is therefore a separate process from programme or articulation approval. It does not pre-judge the outcome of these processes. When planning collaborative proposals Faculties and proposers should therefore bear in mind that sufficient time must be built in. For articulation arrangements, programmes may begin the curriculum mapping exercise, on the understanding that the mapping cannot

be processed until after Institutional Approval is secured.

3.5 Institutional Agreement/Articulation Agreements

Once the Institutional Approval is obtained for a partner delivered award, the final Institutional Agreement should be finalised. The following is an indicative list of issues that should normally be covered as a minimum (where appropriate):

- a. responsibilities for publicity and marketing and where appropriate, agreed procedures for University approval;
- b. responsibilities for admissions and, where appropriate, agreed procedures for monitoring entry standards;
- c. responsibilities for enrolment and registration;
- d. maximum or minimum student numbers;
- e. responsibilities for student support and guidance;
- f. responsibilities for student progress, including the maintenance of student and other designated records during the course of the Agreement, after its termination, and in the event of the partner organisation ceasing to exist;
- g. responsibilities for student discipline, complaints, and appeals;
- h. arrangements for the conduct of examination and assessment;
- i. the appointment and role of External Examiners;
- j. quality assurance arrangements;
- k. the duration of the Agreement and arrangements to review it;
- l. provision to enable the University to seek arbitration or suspend or terminate the Agreement in the event of the partner organisation failing to fulfil its obligations;
- m. residual obligations to students on the termination of the Agreement;
- n. responsibilities for managing and issuing certificates, transcripts and records of achievement;
- o. mechanisms for administering the collaboration;
- p. the languages of instruction and assessment and, in the event that this is not English, any relevant details of how this language difference will be managed;
- q. financial arrangements, schedule for payments, confirmation of who is to pay travel, accommodation, external examiner and subsistence expenses;
- r. legal arrangements, including the legal jurisdiction under which disputes will be resolved;
- s. intellectual property details;
- t. details of the programme(s) covered by the Agreement.

The Approval Panel, must agree the contents of the Agreement, before sending the document to the Quality Office, for signing by the Vice-Chancellor.

Once Institutional Approval for an articulation is obtained, the final Articulation Agreement should be finalised by the Approval Panel.

Articulation Agreements will normally cover as a minimum:

- a. The precise programmes which are covered by the agreement, both at the partner and at the University of Winchester;
- b. The conditions which will apply concerning the acceptance of applications;
- c. The duties of the partner with respect to programme and curriculum changes that may affect the articulation;
- d. Arrangements and mutual responsibilities with respect to public information and publicity;
- e. The time limit of the agreement;
- f. Fees payable by the students, and any financial support available;
- g. Arrangements for the monitoring, review, and termination of the agreement.

*Both agreements are approved and signed only **after** programme validation or articulation approval. No programme or articulation will be approved without a draft Institutional Agreement in motion.*

3.6 The Register of Collaborative Provision

Once the Institutional Agreement has been approved and signed, the Quality Office will arrange for the collaboration to be entered onto the University's Register of Collaborative Provision. The information pertaining to partner delivered awards held on the Register includes:

- a. the name, address and nature of the partner organisation;
- b. the date of the formal Agreement, the dates on which it is to be reviewed, and the dates on which it will end;
- c. the nature of the collaboration, the programmes and awards involved, and the numbers of students;
- d. details of individuals in the University and the partner organisation with responsibility for overseeing the arrangement;
- e. the language of assessment used in the programme.

Separate details are entered for Articulation Agreements.

The Register is a publicly available document and is uploaded on the University's public facing webpages.

SECTION 4: PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW, REVALIDATION AND RE-APPROVAL

Procedures for Institutional Review and Re-approval cover:

- 4.1 Annual Review by Senate Academic Development Executive Committee
- 4.2 Institutional Re-approval of Partners
- 4.3 Periodic Reapproval of Partner delivered awards
- 4.4 Periodic Reapproval of Articulations

4.1 Annual Review by Senate Academic Development Executive Committee

All partner delivered awards that are the subject of a formal Agreement will be reviewed on an annual basis, at a meeting of a Senate Academic Development Executive Committee, comprised of:

- The First Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Chair)
- The Director of Academic Quality and Development (or nominee)
- Quality Officer (Collaborative Provision)
- Relevant Academic Liaison Officers, or relevant members of staff responsible for managing the Agreement and its schedules.
- The Director of Finance (or nominee)
- Relevant Chair of FADC
- Relevant Dean of Faculty

The meeting, one held for each Faculty, will focus around determination of the following issues:

- a. That the partner and the Faculty continue to have the resources to support the implementation of the Institutional Agreement and the Operational Handbook;
- b. That the University continues to have confidence in the academic standards of the programme(s), and the support offered to students;
- c. That the partner is engaging effectively with the University's quality assurance and enhancement framework (including expectations surrounding admissions and the support of any students on placements);

- d. That the risks identified in the initial proposal continue to be adequately managed by the Faculty, and the contingency planning is current;
- e. That levels of enrolment are in line with the Institutional Agreement.

A template will be completed before the meeting is convened. This, along with the most recent Annual Programme Evaluation from the programmes, will be considered by the Committee. Feedback from the Executive Committee will be provided to the partners.

The Executive Committee will also review the articulation agreements in place. For articulation agreements, the meeting will focus on determining the following issues:

- a. That the programmes remain aligned and that curriculum changes by the partner or by the University have not affected the currency of the articulation agreement;
- b. That the University continues to have confidence in the accuracy of the publicity prepared by the partner;
- c. That the student experience and attainment of those who have articulated gives no ground for concern.

A template will be completed before the meeting is convened. Feedback from the Executive Committee will be provided to the partners.

4.2 Institutional Review of the Partner Organisation

In the final year of the agreed period covered by the Institutional Agreement/Articulation Agreement, and in the year preceding the re-approval of the programme/articulation the partner will be subject to formal review by the University. The review will seek to establish:

- a. whether the rationale for the collaboration remains valid;
- b. whether the collaboration remains aligned with the University's strategy and mission;
- c. whether the collaboration remains appropriate in the context of the University's commitments;
- d. whether it continues to command the support of senior managers in the University and the partner organisation;
- e. whether the partner organisation retains appropriate academic, financial, and legal status;
- f. whether the programmes continues to meet the appropriate academic standards and offer students the learning opportunities and experiences necessary to achieve them;
- g. whether the Faculty continues to possess the knowledge, experience and intellectual capital to underwrite any partner delivered awards;
- h. whether the arrangements for collaboration will continue to enable the University and the partner to effectively discharge their mutual responsibilities;
- i. where there are requirements in relation to in-country recognition, these will continue to be met;
- j. whether the business case remains valid;
- k. whether the risks of the collaboration remain proportionately anticipated and mitigated against.

The criteria may be amended, as appropriate, for articulation arrangements.

The Panel will be constituted in the same way as for the approval of new collaborative provision (see section 4 above). The Panel will collect relevant documentary evidence relating to these matters and, where possible and appropriate, direct evidence through a visit to the partner organisation to review resources.

The Panel will review the evidence against the criteria above and, if it is satisfied that they are met, re-approve the collaboration. If the Panel is not satisfied but considers that the criteria could be met after improvements are made, it may recommend that the collaboration continue for a defined period, following which it is subject to further review. If, either initially or after further review, the Panel is not satisfied that

the criteria have been met, it may recommend that the agreement be terminated subject to safeguards for students.

Following re-approval, an updated Institutional Agreement/Articulation Agreement will be finalised.

4.3 Periodic Re-Validation of Partner delivered awards

The University's procedures for the Re-Validation of an existing programme should be followed for all partner delivered awards.

As a condition of approval a new Institutional Agreement will be signed. The Register of Collaborative Provision will be updated.

4.4 Periodic Re-approval of Articulations

Following Institutional re-approval the articulation re-approval process will proceed. As a condition of approval a new Articulation Agreement will be signed. The Register of Collaborative Provision will be updated.

SECTION 5: ARRANGEMENTS FOR ANNUAL MONITORING OF PARTNER DELIVERED AWARDS

As with all its programmes, the University requires partner delivered awards to lodge for approval annual monitoring reports (APE) to the Faculty responsible for monitoring the quality and standards of provision. The APE includes the response to the external examiner's report.

If, in their consideration of internal or external reports on the quality and standards of provision, the Faculty perceives that quality and/or standards of the award are threatened and the partner organisation is unable or unwilling to take remedial action, it should immediately notify the First Deputy Vice-Chancellor. The latter should conduct a full investigation of the matter. If the threat is confirmed, and subject to safeguards for students, the First Deputy Vice-Chancellor will seek remedial action, in line with the Institutional Agreement.

SECTION 6: PROCEDURES FOR WITHDRAWAL

The wish to withdraw from a collaborative agreement must be communicated as soon as possible to the other parties concerned. Subject to the provisions of the Institutional Agreement the University may terminate the partnership. . As appropriate, partner details or the programme will be removed from the Register.

APPENDIX 1 TYPOLOGY OF COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

The University defines the following arrangements as falling within its definition of collaborative provision.

1. Articulation

For the purpose of this Policy the University adopts the following definition as contained in B10 of the UK Quality Code: “A process whereby all students who satisfy academic criteria on one programme are automatically entitled (on academic grounds) to be admitted with advanced standing to a subsequent stage of a programme of a degree-awarding body. These arrangements, which are subject to formal agreements between the parties, normally involve credit accumulation and transfer, so that credit achieved for the approved study at the first provider is transferred to contribute to the programme and award completed at the second (the degree-awarding body). The two separate components are the responsibility of the respective organisations delivering them but, together, contribute to a single award (of the degree-awarding body). Students normally have a contractual relationship with the organisation which delivers the first component and subsequently with the degree-awarding body.”

Such arrangements are governed by an Articulation Agreement. The partner and the University have separate responsibilities, normally as set out below.

The partner is responsible for the recruitment and selection of students; for the registration and regulation of students (including complaints and appeals procedures); for the design of the programme; for its delivery; for the quality of the student learning experience; for the standards of the credit/award; and for financial matters.

The University is responsible for ensuring that the output standards set and achieved by students are equivalent to those set and achieved by Winchester students taking the programme and entering the same stage of their studies. Programmes must be carefully mapped against one another.

2. Partner delivered awards

Partner delivered awards are programmes, or sets of programmes, delivered by a partner. They are programmes whose delivery is dependent on a contracted relationship with a partner. The award is that of the University of Winchester. They take one of the following forms (or combination thereof):

2.1 Franchised Award

As defined by B10 of the UK Quality Code franchising is ‘[a] process by which a degree-awarding body agrees to authorise a delivery organisation to deliver (and sometimes assess) part or all of one (or more) of its own approved programmes.’

The University is ultimately responsible for the recruitment and selection of students. Students are registered with the University and are subject to its regulations, including those relating to complaints and appeals. The University is responsible for the maintenance of the student academic record and the administration of statutory returns.

The partner institution is responsible for the delivery of the programme, learning resources and student support, subject to the University’s overall responsibility for the quality of the student learning experience and the standards of the award. Exam Boards are normally held at the University.

2.2 Dual/double or Multiple Awards

As defined by B10 of the UK Quality Code dual/double or multiple awards are ‘[a] rrangements where two or more awarding bodies together provide a single jointly delivered programme (or programmes) leading to separate awards (and separate certification) being granted by both, or all, of them’..’

In terms of the division of responsibilities, these cases are subject to individual negotiation, but there has to be clarity in terms of responsibilities for recruitment and selection, the registration of the student, the regulations governing the student including complaints and appeals procedures, the approval of programme design and arrangements for delivery, responsibility for the quality of the student learning experience, and financial matters.

2.3 Joint Awards

As defined by B10 of the UK Quality Code a joint award is '[a]n arrangement under which two or more awarding bodies together provide a programme leading to a single award made jointly by both, or all, participants. A single certificate or document (signed by the competent authorities) attests to the successful completion of this jointly delivered programme, replacing the separate institutional or national qualifications'.

In terms of the division of responsibilities, these cases are subject to individual negotiation, but there has to be clarity in terms of responsibilities for recruitment and selection, the registration of the student, the regulations governing the student including complaints and appeals procedures, the approval of programme design and arrangements for delivery, responsibility for the quality of the student learning experience, and financial matters.

2.4 Validated award

This is the most common collaborative arrangement at the University of Winchester.

The programme is normally designed, developed and owned by the partner (in collaboration with the University). It is delivered wholly or in part by the partner. The curriculum for the programme is expected to be designed in accordance with University policies and regulations. The University assures itself that the programme has sufficient academic standing, that quality assurance processes are robust, and that the partner has the learning resources in place to protect the student experience.

The arrangement is covered by a legal agreement which includes the financial arrangements. The University is also responsible for ensuring that the output standards of the award are equivalent to those for the same or a similar award for its own programmes. An Academic Liaison Officer is normally appointed from within the University academic staff. Validated awards are not normally entered into in subjects where the University does not have supporting expertise.

Students are registered with the University and are subject to its regulations, including those relating to complaints and appeals, but the programme is delivered wholly or in part by a partner organisation.

Normally, the partner organisation is responsible for the recruitment and selection of students and for the delivery of the programme, learning resources and student support, subject to the University's overall responsibility for the quality of the student learning experience and the standards of the award. The University will monitor, as appropriate, all such arrangements. Careful consideration must be given to the University resources that students are able to access and this must be detailed within the Institutional Agreement.

With this type of arrangement, responsibilities between the university and partner organisation may vary and will be agreed on an individual basis and detailed in the Institutional Agreement.

2.5 Serial arrangements

As defined by B10 of the UK Quality Code 'a serial arrangement occurs when the delivery organisation (through an arrangement of its own) offers whole programmes (franchised to it or validated by the degree-awarding body) elsewhere or assigns to another party powers delegated to it by the degree-awarding body.' . The University does not permit such arrangements.

3. Hybrids

Collaborative Provision is a fluid area and collaborative arrangements may involve combinations of the above. So, for example, there may be an articulation arrangement governing the first two years of a programme leading to a Diploma that is accepted for entry to the final year of study leading to an Honours degree. The final year may be delivered by the partner organisation under a franchise, or validation agreement. Teacher education is another area which raises hybrid arrangements. In such hybrids, the responsibilities of the partners would still correspond to those described above, and be different in relation to the types of collaborative provision. With the agreement of the Director of Academic Quality and Development/Senate Academic Development Committee (or its Executive Committees) the arrangements as detailed in this policy may be varied in response. In particular, arrangements for SCITTs (School Centred Initial Teacher Training) are different. These are detailed in Appendix 5 of this policy.

APPENDIX 2 TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONAL CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF A PROPOSED COLLABORATION AND PARTNER ORGANISATION

Section 1 - To be completed by the University Proposer
 (approved by the Dean of Faculty and the Director of Internationalisation in collaboration with the Partner)

University Proposer	
Contact telephone/email	
Lead Faculty	
Proposed Partner	
Contact telephone/email	
Date document submitted	

Title and FHEQ level of programme/s which would be the subject of the collaboration

1.	Proposal
1a	The type of collaboration (refer to Appendix 1)
1b	The name and address of the prospective partner
1c	The address of all programme delivery sites
1d	Detail the rationale for the collaboration. How does it fit with the University's Strategic Plan, the Faculty's strategy, other relevant University strategies? What will be the benefits to the Faculty of the proposed collaboration?
1e	Projected student numbers (indicating if they will be full-time or part-time) Year 1 Year 2 Year 3

	Year 4
1f	An outline of the business plan for the proposal
1g	Detail the risks associated with this partnership
1h	Detail how these risks will be mitigated.
1i	<p>Comment and approval of the Director of Internationalisation/Dean of Admissions (where appropriate)</p> <p>Signature: _____ Director of Internationalisation/Dean of Admissions</p>
2.	<p>Finances (two most recent sets of published accounts may be required by the Director of Finance)</p> <p>The Director of Finance must be satisfied with the financial health of the prospective Partner organisation.</p> <p>Signature: _____ Head of Finance</p>
3.	HE Experience (please provide details of the programme/s, UK validating institution and status of the relationship, if transferring from another awarding body indicate why)
4.	Other collaborations (please provide details of other collaborations either UK based or overseas)
5.	Accreditation (please provide details of current PSRB accrediting bodies and proposals for accreditation, if relevant)
6.	<p>Timescale</p> <p>Proposed start date of the proposal:</p> <p>Any deadlines? Please state.</p> <p>Will any students be transferring from the awarding body they are currently registered with?</p>
7.	Business Case (please provide details and supporting evidence)

7a	How is the proposal to be financially sustained?
7b	Which members of staff (include support staff where relevant) will be involved? State how they will be involved and if they have agreed to participate.
7c	How would the initiative be supported if the proposer were to leave the University?
7c	If the Department or Faculty had to resource the teaching out of the programme what would be the estimated cost (for partner delivered awards only)?
7d	What evidence is there that the activity is likely to be successful in achieving its aims? (<i>e.g. initial market survey / industry report etc</i>)
7e	Can the proposal be resourced from within existing staff time or does it need recruitment of additional staff?
8.	Impact on Services Please confirm that Director of the following Professional Services have been consulted: Library, ITS, Student Services, and Registry.
9.	Partner delivered awards
9a	Detail the contingency plans should the relationship be terminated, by either party.
9b	Detail how the proposed programme(s) is congruent with existing Faculty provision and expertise, and research plans.
9c	Detail the physical learning environment and the resources that will support student learning at the proposed partner.

Section 2 – Supporting Documents

1	<p>Partner Profile</p> <p>Mission Statement Yes/No</p> <p>Strategic Plan Yes/No</p> <p>Organisational Structure (detailing separation of academic and financial Decisions) Yes/No</p> <p>Certification of the legal identity of the proposed partner Yes/No</p> <p>Staff CVs of core teaching staff Yes/No</p> <p>Reports from Funding or External Quality Bodies Yes/No</p> <p>Business Plans Yes/No</p> <p>Draft Institutional/Articulation Agreement Yes/No</p> <p>If other supporting documents are included please list:</p>
2	<p>HE Experience</p> <p>Statement setting out all HE experience (please identify programmes which are UK, overseas, validated or non-validated provision) Yes/No</p> <p>Arrangements for Quality and Standards (current) Yes/No</p> <p>External Examiner reports for the last 3 years Yes/No</p> <p>Annual monitoring reports for the last 3 years Yes/No</p> <p>Statement from the existing HE partner Yes/No</p> <p>If other supporting documents are included please list:</p>
3	<p>Finances</p> <p>Please include all documents required by the Director of Finance Yes/No</p>
4	<p>Internationalisation</p> <p>Please include all documents required by the Director of Internationalisation Yes/No</p>

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE UNIVERSITY PROPOSER

Section A: Proposed partner

Partner's status

University, UG and PG	1
Publicly-funded FE college/School	2
Private college/organisation	3

Partner's strengths

Large well-resourced	1
Small well-resourced	2
Any size with limited resources	3

Partner's expertise in this field

Programmes at this level	1
Programmes at lower level	2
No experience in this field	3

Partner's previous collaboration with UK HEIs

At this level	1
At lower level	2
None	3

Section B: Proposed partnership

Role of partner

Administrative centre (for distance or e-learning)	1
Learner support centre (for distance or e-learning)	2
Teaching centre (franchised programme)	2
Teaching centre (validated programme)	3

Host faculty's experience of collaboration

Overseas and local	1
Local	2
None	3

Host faculty's track record on quality

Very secure	1
Secure	2
Less secure	3

Programme

Established collaborative programme	1
Established at university only	2
New programme	3

Credit level

Level 3	1
Level 4, 5	2
Level 6, 7, 8	3

Section C: Context of partnership

Language of instruction

UK or overseas; English first language	1
UK-based: English second language	2
Overseas: English second language	3

Cultural and educational context

UK	0
Commonwealth	1
EU (Socrates/Erasmus)	1
Other European	2
Other	3

'In country' approval/recognition

UK – HE provider, reviewed by QAA	0
UK – other	1
Overseas – programme recognition	
Requirements set at national level (e.g. approval is not required from a national body to deliver the programme, but in order for the programme to be recognised as a valid qualification in the country it is delivered national recognition of the programme is needed)	2
Overseas – approval to deliver required from national body	3

0/1= no/low risk;
 2= medium risk;
 3= high risk

Scores:

<19 potentially low risk;
 19-26 medium risk;
 >26 high risk

APPENDIX 4 INDICATIVE AREAS FOR AGREEMENT WITH PROSPECTIVE PARTNERS

It is vital that the following indicative areas are discussed and, where appropriate, agreed in the course of negotiations with prospective partners. Most apply to partner delivered awards only.

1 Regulatory requirements

In many countries, it is a requirement that collaborations and programmes are approved by local regulatory bodies. In such cases, the University requires that partner organisations secure the necessary approval(s) prior to the commencement of the collaboration and the programme(s).

2 Publicity and Marketing

Regardless of the type of collaborative provision, the University requires that it should maintain effective control of publicity and marketing materials, especially where these are published by a partner organisation. In particular the University seeks to ensure that publicity and marketing materials avoid:

- a) inappropriate or misleading comparisons with other providers;
- b) derogatory statements about other providers;
- c) misleading statements about recognition of awards by public or other authorised bodies;
- d) misleading advice about the recognition of awards by professional bodies or bodies in other countries;
- e) bringing UK HE into disrepute;
- f) causing any confusion about the standing of the programme and its relationship with the University.

The University will agree with the partner organisation whether it will publish all publicity and marketing materials or if this is to be done by the partner. Where promotional materials relating to the Programme(s) are produced by either party, the University of Winchester and the partner organisation will adhere to the University of Winchester's Protocol for Publicity and Marketing of Collaborative Provision mechanisms for approval of such materials..

3 Admissions

The delegation for responsibility of admissions will be detailed in the individual agreements.

Where it is agreed that admissions will be the responsibility of the partner organisation, the University may need to ensure that its approved admissions requirements and acceptable entry qualifications are being met by entrants to the programme.

4 Enrolment and Registration

Individual agreements will detail the responsibilities for the enrolment and registration of students.

5 Student Support

Appropriate Student Support must also be in place at the partner. This must include academic, administrative and pastoral support. Students studying on partner delivered awards can expect a comparable experience to University students, although the scale of provision of services may differ.

In the case of partner delivered awards, two types of student are normally distinguished: *registered* and *associate* students. The responsibility for their support differs accordingly. In both cases, the students' details shall be recorded on the University's records database, SITS.

Registered students pay fees directly to the University of Winchester and therefore the University provides support and access to learning resources directly.

Associate students pay their fees to a collaborative partner and therefore the partner has responsibility devolved to them to provide support and access to learning resources.

5.1 Support by the University for Registered Students

The University will provide registered students on collaborative programmes with support equivalent to that provided to registered students on other programmes. Support may however be subject to geographical constraints (eg disability support cannot normally be provided at a distance).

5.2 Support by the University for Associate Students

Associate students do not normally have access to support services supplied by the University. Any access will be as stated in the details of the Agreement.

5.3 Support by Partner for Associate Students

The following defines the minimum set of roles and services the University expects to find as support for associate students at a partner organisation. The University will seek assurances of a partner's ability to provide such roles and services during institutional approval and review. The University accepts that because of the different sizes and structures of institutions, there may not be posts or offices that carry exactly the specified title and that a variety of staff and areas may provide the specified roles and services.

Programme level support

Academic programme leader
Administrative contact
Personal Tutor
Personal Development Planning
Student representation

Partner level support

Library resources and learning resources support
Information Technology resources and support
Disability support
Counselling support
Accommodation advice, where appropriate
Financial advice
Careers advice
Central oversight of administration and records

5.4 Information for Students

The University needs to ensure that students are given accurate and comprehensive information about the programme comparable to the information given to students studying similar programmes at the University. The University requires that documentation for all collaborations should also include:

- a) information about the collaborative arrangement, including the responsibilities of the parties;
- b) information about the academic regulations for the programme, and the policies that apply to the students
- c) information on the opportunities for students to use the University's learning and other resources (as detailed in the Institutional Agreement);
- d) information about the complaints procedure and appeals regulations
- e) named contacts at the University and the partner organisation;
- f) Student Handbook (often in the form of a Programme Handbook);
- g) Information about the Partner, including Health and Safety requirements, and facilities
- h) Student discipline and complaints processes of the partner.

For overseas partnerships, additional information should include:

- i) details of the languages of instruction and assessment;
- j) details of the recognition of the programme or award in other countries or by public and regulatory bodies in the UK and elsewhere;
- k) where appropriate, information about the features of studying in other countries, including costs.

The University may supply this information itself, or it may be supplied by the partner organisation. In the latter case, the University needs to make the partner organisation aware of its requirements and may wish to negotiate a procedure for the approval of information prior to it being distributed to students.

6 Student Engagement

With due adjustment for the particular context of the partner the University will assure itself that partners delivering University awards have processes and procedures in place to meaningfully engage with students as partners in the programme's development. Fundamental to this is the role of the Programme Committee Meeting.

The University has a minimum requirement for gathering feedback, anonymously from students. As a minimum, feedback must be gained at modular and programme level.

7 Approval of staff teaching on collaborative programmes

Staff teaching on an award of the University must be appropriately approved by the University.

All staff who teach on a programme leading to an award or credit of the University of Winchester must be approved by the University before they begin teaching. In addition staff leading a module, managing a programme, giving academic advice to students or supervising a dissertation must also be approved. Guest lecturers or staff involved in tutorials and seminar presentations need not be approved as long as they are under supervision of an approved member of staff. Teaching staff are approved either at the point of validation or, between validation periods, by the Faculty before they commence teaching.

8. Discipline, Complaints and Appeals

There needs to be clarity about the responsibilities of the University and the partner organisation in matters of student discipline and complaints and appeals procedures.

With regard to discipline and complaints, these matters will be responsive to the particular collaborative arrangement.

With regard to appeals procedures, all students who are studying for a University of Winchester award have access to the University's appeals procedures.

9 Assessment and Examinations

Partners shall normally follow the University Exam Regulations and Invigilation Policy. In order to maintain standards, there must be clarity about responsibility for the setting of assessments and exam papers, about marking and about the conduct of assessments and exams. In practice, these will vary according to the type of collaborative provision and the University may delegate responsibility for assessment and examination to the partner organisation. However, in these cases, the University needs to approve the partner organisation's arrangements for the conduct of assessment and examinations, including invigilation procedures, procedures for preventing candidate impersonation, procedures for the maintenance of the security of examination papers, and procedures for the retention of examination scripts. Finally, it requires that its own marking scheme is used.

For multiple and joint awards, specific arrangements should be negotiated between the awarding institutions. These must enable the University to assure that arrangements for assessment and examination are comparable to those for awards assessed and examined on campus.

10 External Examining

External examiners for partner delivered awards, the criteria for appointment and their responsibilities, is covered in the University's policies and procedures relating to external examining. Operational matters relating to external examining are covered in the respective Operational Handbook.

12 Certificates and Transcripts

As the awarding body, the University is responsible for ensuring that certificates and transcripts/European Diploma Supplements (EDS) or HEARs are accurate and that they are only issued to those who have satisfied the assessment and examination requirements for the award.

13 Mechanisms for Managing the Programme

Most collaborations will be managed, day-to-day by the partner organisation. The University requires that the partner should nominate a member of staff to be responsible for the day to day management of the programme.

It also requires that the partner organisation nominate a contact to liaise with the University. This will normally be the member of staff responsible for the day to day management of the programme. The partner contact should liaise with the Academic Liaison Officer, normally an experienced member of academic staff and, where appropriate, a member of administrative staff. It is the responsibility of the Faculty to appoint appropriate staff as University contacts. Details are set out in the respective Operational Handbooks.

The University requires that there must be Exam Boards, attended or chaired by a member of University staff and that the terms of reference of the Exam Boards should be the same or similar to those for the Exam Boards at the University. In some instances of collaborative provision, the University will manage and run the Exam Boards.

Annual Monitoring will be conducted by the partners and fed into the University's own annual monitoring processes. It is the responsibility of the Faculty to follow up any actions and for the Faculty to monitor the completion of actions resulting from monitoring.

Periodic Review will be managed by the Faculties using University processes and procedures. It is the responsibility of Faculty to follow up and monitor the completion of any recommendations or conditions of re approval of partner delivered awards.

14 Working with Professional Bodies in Collaborative Provision

Some Professional Bodies have specific requirements about accrediting collaborative partners of HEIs. In the first instance it is advisable to ask the PSRB if such guidance exists. If the PSRB is not prescriptive in its requirements the following guidance is offered to collaborative partners working with professional bodies on collaborative projects.

If a collaborative programme is receiving official recognition from a Professional Body the following points should be considered:

- a. the steps required to gain accreditation in Institutional or programme approval documentation, including any University support or interaction needed with the PSRB, required. This should be articulated in the Institutional Approval documentation.

- b. Copies of any approval letters, reports and resulting action plans must be sent to the Dean of Faculty and Quality Office for consideration.
- c. University staff must meet with the PSRB if required, possibly as part of the approval visit.
- d. PSRB staff may be invited to participate in University 'Periodic reviews' in order to combine the accreditation process with review into one event.
- e. Any interaction with professional bodies must be evaluated and recorded within annual monitoring and periodic review.

15 Languages of Instruction and Assessment

The language of instruction and assessment for partner delivered awards will normally be English. Programmes not taught and assessed in English pose a greater challenge to the University in terms of assuring standards.

The language of instruction and assessment will be clearly identified at the Institutional approval stage. The Faculty's risk management will be tested. The following will be taken into consideration by proposing Faculties:

a) Documentation and conduct of events

Validation documents, external examiner appointments and reports, PCM minutes, and APes must be completed in English. Exam Board minutes and papers must be prepared in English. There must be clarity on the language of transcripts and Certificates. There must be provision of adequate resources to allow for the translation of all the necessary documentation or the capacity for the Faculty to access documentation in its original language. For some programmes extra care will be required to check the accuracy of the translation especially when conveying complex concepts and ideas;

b) External Examining

The Faculty will need to ensure that there is availability of suitable bilingual or multilingual external examiners (employed by a QAA subscribing institution) both at present and for the future duration of the programme;

c) Assessment

The University needs to assure itself of the standards of awards when they are assessed in a language other than English. Details of how the Faculty proposes to approve and moderate any assessments not done in English should be provided. This will cover both the normal check that the assessments are appropriate in style, content and standard and any Faculty moderation of the students' works.

d) Staff

The University will reserve the right to not validate a programme delivered and/or assessed in a language other than English if it has no staff of its own competent in the language of tuition and/or assessment, as well as in the relevant Subject, and judges this to constitute an impediment to the successful quality assurance of the Programme.

e) Translation

The Faculty should confirm that all parties are clear that translation of material must be done by translators approved by the University as competent and independent and that the cost will normally be borne by the partner institution.

16 Financial arrangements

Financial arrangements have to be agreed with the partner:

- a) which comply with statutory and funding council requirements;
- b) which provide for the recording and accounting of all transactions in connection with the transfer of funds between the University and the partner organisation;
- c) which provide safeguards so that, in the event of changes in the financial environment, academic standards and the interests of students are protected;

- d) where appropriate in overseas provision, which cover contingencies for dealing with currency fluctuations, including meeting obligations to students adversely affected by changes;
- e) which have a clear schedule for financial payments.

17 Legal Arrangements

The University normally requires that disputes will be resolved within the jurisdiction of English law, although it reserves the right to take action in any other jurisdiction at its discretion. The partner organisation has to agree to these conditions.

APPENDIX 5 SCITT ARRANGEMENTS

1 Introduction

SCITTs (School Centred Initial Teacher Training) represent a type of collaborative provision. SCITTs are approved by NCTL and inspected by OFSTED. As they normally adopt the University's PGCE programmes an amended process of approval – of the partner and of the pattern of delivery – is appropriate. This appendix details the arrangements that pertain to: institutional approval of the partnership and approval of the pattern of delivery.

2 Institutional Approval of the Partnership

2.1 Preparation for an Institutional Approval Event

Following initial discussions between the SCITT and the Department for Teacher Development (hereafter 'the Department') an Institutional Approval Event is requested of AQD by the Director for Teacher Development.

The following are the normal baseline requirements for discussions between a SCITT and the Department:

- a) Good/Outstanding provision confirmed by OFSTED
- b) Previous/existing involvement with University or ITT
- c) Evidence of (or request for) approval by NCTL
- d) A satisfactory initial Site Visit

In the preliminary discussions with the SCITT the Director of the Department, or representative, will discuss such matters as the process for approval of the partnership and of the delivery and management of the partnership *inter alia*.

It is also recommended that a pre-meeting between AQD, Finance, the Department and the partner is convened ahead of the Institutional Approval Panel meeting, so that business at the approval meeting itself may be expedited as efficiently as possible.

For consideration by the Approval Panel the University Proposer should complete the Template for Institutional Consideration and Approval of the Proposed Collaboration and Partner. Particular attention should be paid to detailing the proposed programme details - initial details of the delivery and the nature of any split between the University and the partner in terms of delivery. The Risk Template should also be completed.

The following supporting documents are required (either provided by the Partner or the Director of the Department):

These will normally form part of the initial NCTL submission:

- a) Context of how the partner operates i.e. management structure
- b) Relevant strategic details
- c) Appropriate confirmation or clarification of NCTL status of the partner
- d) Financial accounts, suitably audited
- e) Academic Quality processes at the partner

The next two following initial discussions between the Department and the partner:

- f) Annual Monitoring Reports/External Examiner for the last 3 years and/or last OFSTED report/School Evaluation Framework (SEF) Document.
- g) CVs of staff involved in the delivery of the programme *or* details of qualifications of staff likely to be involved, including the nature of their involvement

The following may be confirmed by an initial Site Visit:

h) Details of Partner Resources – IT, teaching spaces, administration, library etc

The SCITT proposal documents are to be sent to the Quality Officer (Collaborative Provision) who will ensure the documentation is complete before the Panel meets.

2.2 Institutional Approval Panel Event

The First Deputy Vice-Chancellor will chair the Institutional Approval Panel which will normally include:

- The Dean of EHSC,
- Director of Finance,
- Director of Academic Quality and Development.

The Director of the Department for Teacher Development, as University Proposer, will also attend. The meeting will normally be serviced by the Quality Officer (Collaborative Provision).

Central to the decision making of the Panel are the following four overarching criteria:

1. That there is a strategic 'fit' between the University's Strategy and the proposal;
2. That the benefits to the Faculty/institution are clearly and convincingly articulated;
3. That appropriate and proportionate due diligence processes have been carried out;
4. That the risks associated with the proposed partnership have been anticipated and proportionately managed.

In the light of these criteria the Approval Panel will make judgments about (a) – (q) as specified on section 3.3 of the policy.

Consideration will be given to the nature of any additional Site Visit that is required, and any additional areas that need attention during the course of this Site Visit. This Site Visit may have membership external to the Department and the Panel has the discretion to appoint members external to the University to the Site Visit team. Alternatively, on the grounds of considering the proposal expeditiously, the Department in collaboration with AQD may have conducted an appropriate Site Visit *before* the Institutional Approval Event. In this circumstance, the Panel may determine only minor issues that need to be followed up with the Partner without a Site Visit.

Where an (additional) Site Visit is recommended, the First Deputy Vice-Chancellor together with the Director of Academic Quality and Development will consider the site report and approve the proposal and prospective partner organisation on behalf of the Panel.

At the conclusion of the Panel Event, if the Panel is satisfied to approve the partnership, consideration is given to the next stage of the process – the Approval of the Pattern of Delivery.

Minutes from the Institutional Approval meeting received at the next SADC.

3 Approval of the Pattern of Delivery

Following institutional approval of the Partner, and assuming the Partner is drawing from *already validated* University of Winchester programmes, the next stage is the Approval of the Pattern of Delivery.

This process is paper-based/ electronic and is based on the Interim Validation Process. The Quality Office will prepare a schedule.

The following documentation is required:

- a) Relevant Programme Specification and Module Descriptors

- b) Pattern of Delivery details – this to include details of responsibility for delivering particular parts of the programme, drawn from initial proposal
- c) CVs of teaching staff *or* relevant details of teaching staff (this can be incorporated into the details above)
- d) Institutional Approval Panel minutes – provided by Quality Office
- e) Draft Institutional Agreement – provided by Quality Office
- f) Draft Operational Handbook – template provided by Quality Office and developed by the Department

Quality Office and the FADC Chair will confirm that the documentation is ready for external scrutiny.

Panel members are defined as follows:

- A senior academic member of the University, normally with experience of Collaborative Provision, as Chair
- An academic member of the University, from another Department
- An external examiner from the Department
- A student from the University
- Quality Officer (Collaborative Provision), as Officer

The Chair of the Approval of the Pattern of Delivery will meet with the Director of the Department for Teacher Development and the Quality Officer to discuss any comments that have arisen. It is expected that a representative from the SCITT will also be invited to attend. The Quality Officer will then draft a brief report to be approved by the Chair, who will then add recommendations for approval. The report and recommendations will be received by an Executive of SADC who will confirm the final conditions and recommendations.

The Department will respond to the conditions and recommendations as agreed by the Executive Committee of SADC and produce the Definitive Document within four weeks of receiving the confirmed report.

The Chair of the Panel, in liaison with the Quality Officer, is responsible for ensuring that the Conditions are met, Recommendations responded to and a Definitive Document is produced.

Standing Conditions are agreement of the Institutional Agreement and Operational Handbook.

When all Conditions are met the programme is **approved** for delivery with the partner. The length of the approval is guided by the University's Programme Approval processes.

Sections 3.5, 3.6, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4 (amended in the light of Section 3 above), 5, and 6, of this policy apply to SCITTs.