09.2

COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

1

Appendices

1   Initial Vetting Proforma

2   Guidance on Preparing Advertising and Publicity Materials

3   Assessment Guidance

4   'External Moderation' Model of Collaboration

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified
28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

2

CARDIFF METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY

Collaborative Provision

1. **Introduction**

    1.1   In Chapter B10 of the Quality Code 'Working with Others', the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) defines working with others as 'all 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 that the degree-awarding body'.

    Within this broad scope the University defines its collaborative provision activity as falling within one of the following models:

    franchised programme - a programme initially developed and validated for delivery at the University and subsequently delivered at a partner institution. Franchised programmes may be allowed limited, approved modifications deemed by the University to reflect the local context of the collaborating institution;

    validated programme - a programme developed by the collaborating institution and approved by the University to be delivered in that institution;

    In both of the above, delivery of the programme is normally by staff of the collaborating institution, though there may be some delivery by University staff in certain cases.

    outreach franchise - a programme developed and validated at the University delivered at an institution other than the University by staff of the University or a combination of Cardiff Metropolitan University and partner staff.

    The University also operates an External Moderation arrangement whereby University staff provide quality assurance guidance and play a developmental role with a partner. Under this arrangement the students are not enrolled with the University (see appendix 4).

    1.2   The document outlines the procedures operated by the University in respect of collaborative activities both within and outside the United Kingdom. Through the procedures, the University seeks to ensure that programmes operated through collaborative means offer students comparable quality of learning opportunities and equivalent standards of awards to those received by students at the University.

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

3

1.3 The regulations and procedures herein take cognisance of the QAA Quality Code Section B10 *Managing Higher Education Provision with Others* www.qaa.ac.uk

2 Fundamental Principles

2.1 The following principles underpin the University's approach to collaborative provision (see also the University's Collaborative Provision and Internationalisation Strategies):

(i) any arrangements made shall not be in contravention of the laws, agreements, understandings or principles which are in force within the country or region of the collaboration or are local to the collaborative institution or apply in respect of any third party involved in the collaboration;

(ii) whilst this document refers, in the main, to quality and standards issues, it is envisaged that any charges made in regard to collaborative provision will, as a minimum, cover costs incurred by the University in the fulfilment of its associated duties. Detailed costings will be estimated in advance and collaborative provision financial matters will be subject to regular review.

(iii) the University is responsible for the academic standards of awards. The standards achieved by students who are successful in completing collaborative programmes shall be equivalent to the standards achieved by students who are successful on programmes at the University;

(iv) the University shall ensure that the quality of provision on collaborative programmes and the arrangements for the maintenance of such provision are at least at a minimum of acceptable threshold levels at the time of initial scrutiny (franchise approval/validation); or with suitable quality enhancement procedures through setting conditions.

3 Definitions

3.1 The following definitions apply within this document:

(i) **franchise approval event** – a procedure applied to franchised programmes leading to approval for the programme to run in the collaborating institution

(ii) **validation event** - a procedure applied to validated programmes leading to approval for the programme to run in the collaborating institution.

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

4

(iii) **collaborating institution** - an institution approved by the University to run a franchised, validated or outreach franchised programme;

(iv) **associate college** – a collaborating institution may be designated by VCB as an Associate College of the University if it:

 ➢ Has achieved successfully the required initial vetting visit and franchise approval/validation events to deliver the University's programmes;
 ➢ Has had a working association with the University according to the relevant memoranda of agreement delivering collaborative programmes for at least three academic years, and has achieved at least target student numbers;
 ➢ Delivers collaborative degree and/or sub-degree programmes as part of its programme portfolio and has a partnership exclusive to the University in the relevant discipline.

(v) **awarding body** - the body responsible for making awards following students' successful completion of a franchised, validated or outreach franchised programme (e.g. Cardiff Metropolitan University, Edexcel).

(vi) **articulation** - a programme or part of a programme at a partner institution approved for advanced standing for students progressing to the University or a University programme delivered at a partner institution.

3.2 Other terms used in this document are either defined at the point of use or are to be found elsewhere in the University Academic Handbook.

4 **Status of Students**

4.1 Collaborative arrangements for franchised, validated and outreach franchised programmes may be entered into involving awards of Cardiff Metropolitan University or Edexcel under the auspices of the University.

In such circumstances, students enrolled are students of Cardiff Metropolitan University as well as being students of the collaborating institution and are assigned student enrolment numbers of the School (or Schools) under which the programme operates.

4.2 The University and the associated School shall treat franchised, validated, and outreach franchised programmes and their

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

5

associated students in the same way as for internal programmes and students as far as it is possible to do so.

5   Quality Assurance

5.1   The quality assurance procedures to be followed for collaborative provision **are those of the University**, and a statement to this effect must be incorporated into the Memorandum of Programme Agreement. Hence, this Collaborative Provision document should be read in conjunction with other documents produced by the University on its quality assurance procedures. These can be found elsewhere in the University Academic Handbook.

5.2   The regulations for collaborative programmes and for assessment must comply with those given in the extant University Academic Handbook and/or those associated with any third party involvement, as appropriate.

6   Administrative and Reporting Arrangements for Collaborative Provision

6.1   For each franchised, validated or outreach franchised programme, the following details/documents shall be maintained by the University's Collaborative Provision Office:

- the name, address and nature of the collaborating institution;

- the date on which the collaboration formally began and is due to end;

- copies of the Memoranda of Programme and Financial Agreement

- the contact persons at the collaborating institution and their roles;

- the names and other pertinent details of the moderator(s)/link tutor and external examiner(s);

- copies of reports of the Initial Vetting Visit, Vice Chancellor's Board Approval, Franchise Approval/Validation, Review, Modification, Annual Programme Review and of the definitive programme document;

- the date on which the programme is next to be reviewed;

- copies of external examiner reports and information pertaining to their appointment, and of moderator/link tutor reports;

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

6

- details of the numbers of students permitted to be registered, actually registered and who have received an award under the arrangement.

6.2 The University, through its Collaborative Provision Office is also responsible for:

- requesting the appropriate Dean of School to supply a moderator(s)/link tutor(s) for the programme prior to franchise approval/validation and post franchise approval/validation (and subsequent review) working with the school Director of Learning and Teaching to ensure that required documentation is provided;

- administering payments for moderation services;

- issuing the agreed Memoranda of Programme and Financial Agreement in accordance with instruction from the relevant member of the Vice-Chancellor's Board;

- monitoring that moderator/link tutor visits take place as prescribed and that moderator/link tutor reports are produced subsequently;

- presenting moderators'/link tutors' reports and the annual summary of all external examiner reports to the Collaborative Provision Committee and ensuring that these are available to other Committees as required;

- ensuring that copies of such reports are available to the associated School, the Head of Collaborative Provision, and the collaborating institution and monitoring that action, following presentation of such reports to the Collaborative Provision Committee (and other Committees as necessary), as required by the Committee, is followed through;

- ensuring documentation for events is received within the timescales specified and has been deemed by the associated School to be of an appropriate standard, and reporting issues of non-compliance to the Chair of the University's Academic Quality and Standards Board;

- ensuring that collaborating institutions are visited as necessary for advisory or other purposes.

  In all other aspects, (including administration of franchise approval/validation, re-validation and review events; presentation of franchise approval/validation, revalidation and review reports, scrutiny of external examiner reports and operation of required committees) collaborative provision programmes shall follow the same regulatory, reporting,

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

7

procedural and responsibility requirements as for University home programmes.

7 The Stages of a Collaborative Provision Proposal

7.1 Initial contact between a potential collaborating institution and the University may arise through a variety of formal and informal routes but is managed through the Collaborative Provision Office in conjunction with the Pro Vice Chancellor (International).

Where the initial contact arises outside a School, the associated School emerging from such contact must be involved at the earliest stage in any discussion. The Collaborative Provision Office will keep the University authorities (Vice-Chancellor's Board, Academic Registrar, Dean of the associated School, Pro Vice Chancellor (International), Head of Procurement and Dean of Quality and Standards) informed, as appropriate, of pertinent dealings.

Note that where consideration is to be given to a programme to be delivered collaboratively and where that programme involves or is accredited by a professional, statutory or regulatory body, then full consultation with that body/association will take place through the associated School which will keep the Quality & Standards Unit informed.

7.2 The formal stages leading to the franchise approval/validation of a collaborative programme proposal will be administered by the Collaborative Provision Office:

(i) initial vetting visit (Section 9);

(ii) Vice Chancellor's Board approval to proceed (on advice from the Initial Approval Panel- (Section 9); this might also require a further investigative visit, if deemed necessary.

(iii) discussions regarding draft Memoranda of Collaboration (Section 10);

(v) franchise approval/validation event (Section 13)

(vi) Academic Quality & Standards Board approval (subject to any imposed conditions being met) (Sections 11, 12, 13 and 14)

The Collaborative Provision Committee will be kept informed of progress by the Collaborative Provision Office.

7.3 Following final approval as in 7.2 (vi), and assuming that conditions laid down at the franchise approval/validation event are satisfactorily completed, the programme then operates within, and

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

8

is subject to, the University quality assurance processes and procedures.

7.4 An additional mechanism for quality assurance applying to collaborative programmes is the moderator/link tutor system.

8 Criteria pertaining to Proposed Collaborative Programmes

8.1 The University will only enter into collaborative arrangements if programmes proposed are:

(i) in subject areas for which the University has expertise;

(ii) the language of delivery and assessment is English or Welsh;

and if:

(iii) it is confident of the collaborating institution's abilities to deliver the programme and its own abilities to manage the collaboration;

(iv) the documentation presented in regard to the proposed collaboration is of an appropriate standard. Guidance is available from the Collaborative Provision Office and support from the associated School.

9 Initial Vetting Visit and Approval by Vice Chancellor's Board

9.1 Initial Vetting Visit

Where a request has been received that a new collaborative link be explored, an Initial Vetting Visit (IVV) should be carried out by a suitably qualified member(s) of staff (to be agreed by a member of the Vice Chancellor's Board on receipt of outline information regarding the proposal). For institutions with which the University already has collaborative arrangements, an IVV might not be necessary in its full form. This must be formally signed off by a member of the Vice Chancellor's Board. In such cases, information regarding the proposed new programmes (see below) must still be submitted for consideration by the Initial Approval Panel (IAP).

All proposals for new collaborations should be discussed with the Pro Vice Chancellor (Internationalisation).

As part of the preliminary initial visit, the University staff member(s) will meet with:

- members of the collaborating institution's senior management

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

9

- members of the collaborating institution's teaching and appropriate administrative staff

- the librarian and relevant heads of administrative services including those responsible for the allocation and management of learning resources, student and Registry services

- in the case of overseas provision, wherever possible, the Panel will also meet or correspond with any relevant local British Council or other appropriate local education officials.

Initial financial discussions or agreements may take place with the potential collaborating institution in order to inform the internal costing process. Discussions should also take place regarding the nature of the University's programme and financial memoranda.

All proposals will be critically reviewed by the Initial Approval Panel in order to ensure that the proposed development meets with the University's mission/strategy, is sustainable, can be supported by the relevant School(s) and that appropriate due diligence checks have been carried out in respect of the proposed partner.

The Initial Vetting Proforma (See Appendix 1), supported where necessary by additional supporting material, shall be prepared for consideration by the IAP, together with a completed risk matrix form and an IAP form, in order to ensure that the IAP has sufficient information on which to base a decision on whether to proceed with the proposal.

10   Memoranda of Collaboration

10.1 For each collaborative programme there shall be a Memorandum of Programme Agreement and a Memorandum of Financial Agreement (Memoranda of Collaboration). These must be signed by the Vice-Chancellor or his/her nominee, and the Principal of the collaborating institution. Signing of the Memoranda of Collaboration shall follow as soon as possible after approval by the Academic Quality & Standards Board for the collaborative programme to begin. The Memoranda have dates of effectiveness, such that they need to be updated and re-signed thereafter.

10.2 The Memorandum of Programme Agreement determines the allocation of responsibilities between the University and the collaborating institution (and, where appropriate, any third party) in regard to academic and academically related areas such as programme delivery, resources, quality assurance, standards, etc.

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

10

10.3 Financial matters will vary depending upon whether the collaboration is within or outside Wales, and if within Wales whether the collaboration is with a funded educational establishment or otherwise.

10.4 For HEFCW-funded educational institutions within Wales, (for example, colleges in the further education sector), funding for collaborative programmes is normally paid by the Higher Education Funding Council to Cardiff Metropolitan University, and an agreed proportion is passed on to the collaborating institution to operate the programme.

10.5 In other instances, the Memorandum of Financial Agreement determines the financial charges, methods of invoicing and payment, and schedules of payment agreed between the University and the collaborating institution.

10.6 Template Memoranda of Collaboration are held by the Collaborative Provision Office, and changes/additions/deletions may be made to these as necessary to suit the particular circumstances of collaboration.

11 Academic Quality & Standards Board Approval of the Franchise Approval/Validation Event and Chairs and Panellists

11.1 A copy of the Initial Vetting Visit report shall be submitted to the Academic Quality & Standards Board, following which the Academic Quality & Standards Board shall agree the format of the franchise approval/validation event, (and may approve adjustments to the standard format where appropriate), including approval of the Panel Chair, date and any other special arrangements as required.

11.2 Chairs of panels for overseas events must be drawn from a register of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

To qualify for the register, prospective chairs must:

a) have experience of chairing events (home and/or overseas);

b) have experience of external audit and/or review;

c) attend University training and updating sessions relating to overseas events;

d) be independent of the associated School.

11.3 Panellists for overseas events must be drawn from a register of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

To qualify for the register, prospective panellists must:

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

11

a) have experience of panellist participation in events (home and/or overseas);

b) attend University training and updating sessions relating to overseas events;

c) be independent of the associated School.

12 Action Pre-and Post-Franchise Approval/Validation Event

12.1 The collaborating institution (with assistance from the associated School and the Collaborative Provision Office) shall be responsible for the production of the documentation required for the franchise approval/validation event, for its quality, accuracy and completeness, and for ensuring that, wherever possible, it is received by the University Collaborative Provision Office at least 25 working days before the franchise approval/validation event is due to take place (para 26).

Failure to provide the documents according to the required timescale may result in cancellation of the event by the Chair of Academic Quality and Standards Board and thus a delay in the programme start date.

The University Collaborative Provision Office, on receipt of the documentation required for the franchise approval/validation event, shall ascertain whether the said documentation is compliant with requirements. If it is deemed not to be then the Chair of the Academic Quality and Standards Board, in consultation with the Chair of the Panel, may postpone the event until such a time as it is resubmitted and is compliant.

12.2 The University Collaborative Provision Office in consultation with the Chair of the Academic Quality & Standards Board shall select members to serve on the franchise approval/validation panel.

12.3 Copies of the event documentation shall be sent to the Panel Chair and each Panel Member, at least 15 working days before the event. Panel Members should send written comments to the University Collaborative Provision Office to arrive there no later than 8 working days before the event.

If it is the case that a Panel Member or Members hold reservations regarding the submission to an extent which makes them express doubt that the event should proceed, then the Chair of the Panel in consultation the Chair of Academic Quality & Standards Board may determine that the event shall not proceed until such a time as the documentation has been resubmitted to his/her satisfaction. A charge may be imposed to cover any costs involved.

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

12

Areas for concern or other issues to be explored at the subsequent event shall be communicated to the Dean of School by the University Collaborative Provision Office or nominee following a meeting with the Panel Chair.

12.4 The Collaborative Provision Office shall arrange the franchise approval/validation event in accordance with the agreements made by the Academic Quality and Standards Board.

12.5 The event shall take place in the normal way as described elsewhere in the University Academic Handbook, and shall generally conform to normal practices and procedures.

13 The Franchise Approval/Validation Event

13.1 The nature of the event for a collaborative programme will reflect the category of the programme (franchised, validated, outreach franchised or moderation).

13.2 The format of the event will reflect the nature of the proposal and of the collaborating institution and will be broadly agreed between the Chair, the Head of Collaborative Provision and the collaborating institution beforehand.

13.3 For franchised programmes, the franchise approval event will seek to determine whether the collaborating institution is able to deliver the programme such that academic standards will be achieved successfully and such that the quality of provision is at a comparable level. It will also seek to ensure that any minor changes proposed (e.g. to contextualise) are acceptable in terms of content, breadth and academic level.

13.4 For validated programmes, the validation event will seek to determine whether the programme is of an appropriate structure, content, breadth and academic level for the award proposed, whether the collaborating institution is capable of delivering the programme such that academic standards are achieved successfully and such that the quality of provision is at an acceptable level.

13.5 For outreach franchised programmes, whilst it is to be accepted that staffing issues need not be explored (assuming common staffing between the University and outreach franchised programme), the generality of 13.3 also applies.

13.6 Franchise Approval/Validation Panels for collaborative programme events:

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

13

a) Panels for collaborative programme events will normally comprise:

  (i)   Chair - member of University staff, but external to the School concerned, with appropriate training and experience (for overseas events, the Chair shall be drawn from a register of appropriately qualified and experienced staff);

  (ii) At least one person, normally from a UK higher education institution, who is external to the University and has subject expertise relevant to the programme;

  (iii) one University staff member external to the School concerned (for overseas events, the staff member shall be drawn from a register of appropriately qualified and experienced staff);

An Event Secretary nominated by the University Collaborative Provision Office will record the event.

In attendance:

One person from the associated School

13.7 The Chair of Academic Quality & Standards Board in consultation with the Head of Collaborative Provision and the Panel Chair shall, on behalf of the Academic Quality and Standards Board, have the power to vary the composition given above as appropriate to the particular circumstances of the event. For instance, in order to ensure appropriate subject coverage if more than one subject/discipline is being considered as part of the event.

13.8 The Panel Chair, approved by Academic Quality and Standards Board, will normally have experience as a Chair/Panel Member both within and outside the University and need not be a subject specialist in a field relevant to the programme. Close association with the development of the programme will be a bar to Chairing the panel. For overseas events, the Chair shall be drawn from a register of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

13.9 The programme for the event will normally include:

• a private meeting of the Panel;

• a meeting of the Panel with senior members of the collaborating institution to explore the location of the programme within the collaborating institution's portfolio, the familiarity of the prospective delivery organisation with the standards and ethos of UK higher education, other contextual issues, issues relating

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

14

to resourcing in regard to the programme, and initiatives of provision which might affect the programme (e.g. learning resource planning); (Note that if there are issues relating to a previous HE partner withdrawing from a relationship with the collaborating institution which remain outstanding, such issues will be explored at this meeting).

- a meeting of the Panel with the programme teaching team so that the Panel can explore the programme rationale, aims, structure, content, delivery, assessment, entry, staffing, facilities, and programme specific regulations, etc, as appropriate to the particular type of collaborative arrangement;

- an inspection of relevant facilities, using the resources guidelines and questionnaire

  Resources_Guidelines_and_Questionnaire.doc;

- completion of a student services questionnaire;

- a meeting with students from other programmes within the collaborating institution, where applicable;

- a further private meeting of the Panel to formulate conclusions;

- feedback to appropriate staff of the collaborating institution.

NB: All travel and accommodation expenses incurred in connection with the validation visit will normally be charged to the proposing collaborating institution.

13.10 During the initial private meeting, the Panel shall share information with regard to written feedback from Panel Members and any responses such feedback may have prompted from the collaborating institution. Further issues may emerge. The Panel Chair may wish to allocate question topics to Panel Members and to further structure the event depending upon circumstances.

13.11 In the private meeting, the Panel shall discuss its findings and agree upon a statement to be given verbally to the collaborating institution in a feedback session. The statement shall include the recommendation that will be made to the University's Academic Quality & Standards Board with regard to approval (or otherwise) to offer the programme: the statement shall also specify any conditions associated with approval and deadlines for meeting them, and any recommendations that the collaborating institution must consider.

13.12 In considering its recommendations to the University Academic Quality & Standards Board and the conditions and

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

15

recommendations of approval, as appropriate, the Panel shall take full cognisance of the collaborating institution's perceived ability to deliver the programme to at least threshold levels of quality - as adjudged from the staffing expertise and capacity, the learning resource levels and the student support available - and to sustain academic standards equivalent to those achieved by University students qualifying for equivalent awards.

14 **Approval of Additional Programmes Proposed by an Existing Collaborative Partner**

14.1 This process has been prepared to ensure that new proposals received from existing collaborative partners for new degree programmes can be given full consideration, without the need to reconvene full Panels of Assessors at the partner institution. It is intended for use when University staff will have visited the institution relatively recently and will have met with many of the relevant staff and viewed the facilities. Any such proposals shall be considered by the Dean of Quality and Standards in conjunction with the Head of Collaborative Provision and a member of staff in the school in which the programme discipline is based, in order to determine the nature of the approval event.

14.2 An initial approval request form shall be submitted to the University's Initial Approval Panel.

14.3 Following approval, submission documentation shall be submitted in line with the University's normal requirements for the consideration of the University's programmes at collaborative partners.

14.4 One of two procedures is available:

Option 1: to be used where the proposed new degree lies within a cognate subject area to previously approved programmes in the institution seeking the new degree (see 5 below);

Option 2: to be used where the new degree proposed lies within a different subject area to previously approved programmes in the institution (see 6 below).

14.5 Option 1 should normally be considered where the new degree proposed lies within a similar subject area to previously approved programmes in the same institution. The Dean of Quality and Standards, following discussion, may agree that a smaller Panel than that required for a full franchise approval/validation event should visit the partner in order to consider the proposal. The smaller Panel shall normally comprise:

- An experienced chair

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

16

- One member of staff from the relevant academic School
- One member of staff from the Collaborative Provision Office (Recorder)
- External subject expert

If the external subject expert is unable to attend the event, written comments will be requested and shall be taken into consideration by the Panel of Assessors.

14.6 The Panel will provide a report commenting on the staffing, facilities to support the proposed degree programme, and other pertinent information. Written comments on the submission document from an external subject expert should be sought in advance of the event, and the comments will be taken into account by the Panel visiting the institution. The external subject expert will also be invited to comment on the Panel Report following the visit. The approved Panel Report shall be submitted to the Collaborative Provision Committee and to its parent board, Academic Quality and Standards Board.

14.7 Option 2 should be considered where the proposed degree lies within a different subject area to previously approved programmes. In accordance with the Academic Handbook, this should be subject to a full franchise approval/validation event which will be held in the University.

The Dean of Quality and Standards, following discussion, may however agree that the full Panel of Assessors need not visit the partner institution. In such cases, a smaller Panel will visit the partner in order to meet with staff and to view the facilities, in advance of a full event being held at the University. The smaller Panel shall comprise:

- Member of staff from the relevant academic School
- Member of staff from Collaborative Provision Office

14.8 The Panel will provide a report commenting on the staffing, facilities to support the proposed degree programme and other pertinent information (as per the attached *pro forma*). For the event held in Cardiff, staff from the partner institution shall normally be invited to attend the full franchise approval/validation event in Cardiff or to participate by video network. The Panel of Assessors convened at the University will include external expert members.

14.9 The report of the approval event will be submitted to the Collaborative Provision Committee and Academic Quality and Standards Board.

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

17

15 Approval of an Additional Campus Proposed by a Collaborative Partner

15.1 It is now increasingly common for requests to be received from collaborative partners for approval of additional campuses, either at the point of franchise approval/validation or subsequently for programmes to be offered at additional centres. These can be in the same country or in another country. It is important to ensure that such proposals are properly vetted and recorded in order to ensure that any students studying at additional centres have an equivalent learning experience to those studying in the originally approved location, and that appropriate staffing, resources and quality assurance/management arrangements are in place. It is also very important to note that serial arrangements are <u>not</u> permitted (see paragraph 8, below).

15.2 Given the diverse variety of additional campuses that can be proposed, ranging from staff delivering a programme at an additional rented centre through to an entirely different teaching team delivering a programme at another location, a flexible but robust process is required.

15.3 If a prospective **new** partner institution wishes to deliver a collaborative programme at more than one campus, this should be drawn to the University's attention prior to the initial vetting visit. Wherever possible, the initial visit should include a visit to all prospective campuses. Information regarding the resources and staffing at the campuses should be recorded in the University's initial vetting form

15.4 In addition to the University's normal requirements for collaborative programmes, where delivery is being proposed at more than one campus, the submission documentation for the franchise approval/validation should include information regarding the following:

- Full details of ownership of the additional campuses;
- Information regarding resources;
- Details regarding staffing (academic and administrative);
- Details of management / administrative / financial / co-ordination arrangements between centres.

15.5 Arrangements should be made for members of the Panel of Assessors to visit all potential campuses and to meet with staff, students and view facilities. The outcome of these discussions will be recorded in the subsequent franchise approval/validation event report.

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

18

15.6 If an **existing** partner wishes to deliver an approved programme(s) at another campus, a visit to the campus shall normally be undertaken.

15.7 The Panel shall be constituted as follows:

- An experienced chair
- A representative from the relevant School
- An external representative
- A representative from the Collaborative Provision Office (Recorder)

15.8 If the external representative is unable to attend the event, written comments will be requested and shall be taken into consideration by the Panel of Assessors. The Panel shall be provided with the most recent set of External Examiners' reports for the partner's existing provision.

15.9 The following information regarding the additional campus(es) should be submitted to the University:

- Rationale for additional campus(es)
- Details of ownership of the additional campus(es) (e.g. wholly owned subsidiary, joint venture - see below regarding 'serial' arrangements)
- Details of any in-country approval requirements
- Full information regarding resources and a resource development plan
- Full details regarding staffing (academic and administrative) and staff development policy
- Anticipated student numbers for the next three years
- Details of management /administrative /financial /co-ordination arrangements between campuses.

15.10 A report of the visit, concentrating on staffing, resources and quality assurance procedures at the additional campus(es), shall be submitted to the Collaborative Provision Committee and Academic Quality and Standards Board.

15.11 Should a partner wish to deliver a programme at an approved campus and the programme was not part of the original campus approval, the format for considering this should be agreed by the Dean of Quality and Standards, the Director of Learning and Teaching in the relevant School and the Head of Collaborative Provision. The additional approval shall be reported to the Collaborative Provision Committee and the Academic Quality and Standards Board.

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

19

15.12 Arrangements for examination boards, moderator/link tutor visits and (where necessary) external examiner visits should be agreed with the relevant University staff. Agreement documents should contain a reference to all campuses where programmes are to be offered, or a separate agreement for each campus if deemed more appropriate. Information regarding staffing, students and resources at each additional campus shall be documented within the relevant Annual Programme Review (APR) report to the University.

15.13 In accordance with the University's policy, transcripts provided to successful students will record the location of study.

15.14 Serial arrangements are <u>not permitted</u> in normal circumstances - any proposed collaborative arrangement that is not a wholly owned subsidiary or which may be considered to have elements of a serial arrangement shall be referred to the Vice Chancellor's Board (or if deemed necessary the Governors' Transnational Education Committee) for consideration of the safeguards in place to ensure that proper control is retained of the academic standards of the University's award. The QAA Quality Code for Higher Education, Section B10 (Managing higher education provision with others, December 2012), states that:

Indicator 8

The agreement or contract makes it clear that any serial arrangement may be undertaken only with the express written permission of the degree-awarding body in each instance. Degree-awarding bodies take responsibility for ensuring that they retain proper control of the academic standards of awards offered through any such arrangements.

Serial arrangements, whereby the partner organisation (through an arrangement of its own) offers approved collaborative provision elsewhere or assigns to another partner powers delegated to it by a degree-awarding body, can severely curtail the ability of a degree-awarding body to safeguard the academic standards of awards made in its name. In order to discharge their awarding responsibility properly, and to be in a position to manage potential risk, degree-awarding bodies ensure that they have an effective link to any assessment of the academic achievement of students that leads to their awards. While this responsibility may be readily manageable through a direct relationship with a partner organisation, it becomes much more difficult once the chain of responsibility is extended. Therefore, degree-awarding bodies ensure that the chain of information in

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

20

serial arrangements is never so long that they are unable to have full confidence in their ability to control their academic standards effectively.

The University's agreement with its partner institutions states that the partner agrees 'not to subcontract or franchise the Programme or any part thereof to another provider.'

16. Formulation of Franchise Approval/Validation Event Decisions

Franchise Approval/Validation Panels may make the following decisions:

16.1 that the programme be approved;

16.2 that the programme be approved subject to the fulfilment of Conditions in the stated timescale and the full and evidenced (through subsequent Annual Programme Review) consideration of Recommendations; resource issues, including staffing may result in a requirement for an action plan, to be monitored through the Academic Quality & Standards Board;

16.3 that the programme be not approved but resubmitted after a process of further or re-design/development. In the case of Resubmission, the Franchise Approval/Validation Report will identify those issues which need to be addressed before a further event may take place;

16.4 that the programme be rejected, on the grounds that neither the application of Conditions nor further development would result in a programme of appropriate quality or standard.

17 Approval

17.1 Approval should not be recommended to the Academic Quality & Standards Board if the Panel retains major reservations about the aims, academic standard, structure, content, assessment regulations, etc, after the dialogue with the programme team is completed.

17.2 Decisions should be made on the basis of the franchise approval/ validation event and pressures resulting from the timing of an event should not influence the academic decision.

17.3 The situation which causes most difficulty arises where the document is deficient but where the reservations of the Panel have been satisfied in discussion. In such cases the Panel must be satisfied that the issues have been or can be resolved and that the documentation will be amended accordingly (through imposing conditions).

18 Conditions/Recommendations for Approval

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

21

18.1 Conditions of approval should be used for requirements, which MUST be fulfilled, in order to ensure that the programme meets the required standard and quality threshold. Conditions must be expressed precisely, be agreed by the Panel and must be accompanied by a timescale for completion – normally before students are admitted to the programme. Documentation, usually in the form of a revised (definitive) programme document, must be submitted to the Collaborative Provision Office for consideration by the Chair.

18.2 Changes which are desirable in order to enhance the quality of the programme and/or student experience, but which do not affect the threshold standard, should be expressed as Recommendations. Recommendations are advisory as opposed to compulsory, but the University's quality monitoring system would wish to see reference to where such issues have been considered and implemented, or rejected. This might include an action plan of issues to be addressed. Responses to the recommendation should be recorded in the Annual Programme Review report. Recommendations cannot be used as a means of quality or standards enhancement where the Panel judges one or both of these to be below the acceptable threshold level.

The conclusions of the franchise approval/validation event should normally be circulated to the panel and collaborating institution within 5 working days of the event.

18.3 A written report, (in line with the requirements of Section *Validation of New Programmes [where the University has Validation Authority]* in the Academic Handbook), confirmed for accuracy by the Chair of the Panel and including a statement of conditions and recommendations imposed by the Panel shall be produced within **20** working days of the event by the Event Secretary. This shall be sent to the collaborating institution, Panel Members, the School associated with the collaboration, the Academic Quality & Standards Board and the Collaborative Provision Committee.

18.4 Whilst for franchised and outreach franchised programmes, programme specific regulations shall be as for the equivalent University programme, the report shall confirm in particular that the programme specific regulations for a validated programme are acceptable and within the University's requirements, as explored by the Panel.

18.5 It is the responsibility of the Collaborative Provision Office working with the associated School and the collaborating institution to monitor that the conditions imposed at franchise approval/validation are completed properly and on time, demonstrating to the Panel Chair via appropriate documentation and/or revised programme

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

22

document submitted by the collaborating institution that the conditions have been met. It is **essential** that the revised documentation (or a covering paper) should clearly indicate where the changes resulting from conditions have been made. The Chair of the Panel shall, through a written report to the Collaborative Provision Office, confirm (or otherwise) the attainment of the conditions within the required timescale. The Head of Collaborative Provision shall report outcomes to the Academic Quality & Standards Board and the Collaborative Provision Committee.

18.6 Conditions must be completed to the satisfaction of the Panel Chair according to an agreed timescale and the Chair shall submit a written report to the Collaborative Provision Office confirming that conditions have been met. The University CPO shall provide a progress report to Academic Quality and Standards Board, as necessary, on such conditions.

18.7 Action taken on recommendations shall be monitored by the University Quality and Standards Unit and the associated School and such progress shall be reported in the normal way via the Annual Programme Review.

18.8 The Chair of the Academic Quality & Standards Board shall report the findings to the Collaborative Provision Committee.

18.9 Following the Academic Quality & Standards Board approval of the programme, the University Collaborative Provision Office will liaise with partners with regards to registration arrangements.

18.10 The Memoranda of Programme and Financial Agreement shall be signed by the Vice-Chancellor of the University (or his/her nominee) and the Principal of the collaborating institution. Failure to achieve such signing will jeopardise the continuance of the programme. Copies of these Memoranda shall be lodged with the collaborating institution with originals being held in/by the University Collaborative Provision Office.

18.11 The programme may only be advertised with the prior approval of the University. The collaborating institution must submit all draft advertising and publicity material to the Collaborative Provision Office, and the phrases "Subject to Validation" and "Subject to Approval" must be used as appropriate to the relevant stages leading up to final approval (see Appendix 2).

19 **Franchise Approval/Validation Checklist**

19.1 **Pre-Event**

Procedure	Action	Timescale
Initial Approach	School /Collaborative	

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

23

	Provision Office /Dean of International Development/other	
Initial Vetting Visit	See Appendix 1	
Seek VCB approval via IAP	Dean of associated School (in conjunction with Collaborative Provision Office)	Submission to monthly IAP meeting.
Oversee completion of draft Memoranda	Head of Collaborative Provision	
Approve franchise approval/validation event and Chair of Panel	Academic Quality & Standards Board	AQSB meeting or Chair's Action
Appoint Panel, begin franchise approval/validation arrangements	Chair of Academic Quality & Standards Board/ Head of CP	
Preparation of programme document (s)	School/Collaborative institution/CPO	
E-mail draft copy of programme document to CPO	School/Collaborative institution	30 working days before the event
Send copies of documents to CPO	School/Collaborative institution	25 working days before the event
Check documentation to determine compliance with requirements	CPO/Chair of Panel/School	20 working days before the event
Finalise franchise approval/validation arrangements	CPO	20 working days before event
Send programme documents, programme for event, relevant regulations and request for written comments to Panel Members	CPO	15 working days before event
Inform School/ Collaborating Institution of Panel Members' comments and request response	CPO	5 working days before event

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

24

Identify issues likely to be raised at event and brief School/ Collaborating institution	Chair/CPO	5 working days before event

19.2 **Post-Event**

Procedure	Action	Timescale
Send commendations, conditions and recommendations to collaborative partner	CPO	Within 5 days following the event
Complete draft report and send to Panel Chair, Panel Members, School, Collaborating Institution for accuracy check	CPO	20 working days after event
Submit comments to CPO	Panel Chair, Panel Members, School, Collaborating Institution	25 working days after event
Adjust report as appropriate and send to Panel Chair, Panel Members, School, Collaborating Institution	CPO (Panel Chair to confirm)	30 working days after event
Present confirmed report to AQSB and Collaborative Provision Committee	Head of Collaborative Provision	As appropriate
Confirm in writing to CPO that conditions have been met	Chair of Panel	Timescale agreed at event
Inform AQSB and Collaborative Provision Committee that conditions have been met	CPO	As appropriate
Enter programme and module details onto registration system/inform UW if	Academic Registry	As appropriate

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

25

appropriate		
Complete the two Memoranda of Agreement including appropriate signatures and send copies to the Collaborating Institution,)	CPO (which also archives original Memoranda)	10 working days after approval by AQSB
Submit programme advertising material to Collaborative Provision Office	Collaborating Institution	As appropriate
Submit moderator/link tutornominations to Collaborative Provision Committee for approval/information	School through the CPO	As appropriate

Monitor recommendations in Annual Programme Review	School / Moderator / Link Tutor/QSU Report to AQSB/ Collaborative Provision Committee	As appropriate
Send definitive programme document to CPO	School/Moderator/Link Tutor	Before programme begins

19.3 Note that in the above the approval of third party bodies (e.g. Edexcel) must also be sought, as appropriate, to a timescale dictated by such third party bodies, prior to the event. Such bodies may require representation on the Franchise Approval/Validation Panel.

Additionally, reporting to and final approval of such bodies prior to programme commencement will also be required. The Academic Registrar shall act as necessary.

20   **Post-Franchise Approval/Validation Monitoring of Collaborative Provision**

20.1 The associated School via its Moderator/Link Tutor is charged with the responsibility of ensuring that programme quality and the academic standards achieved by students are maintained at an appropriate and acceptable level and for ensuring that quality enhancement takes place.

20.2 It is further incumbent on the associated School via its Moderator/Link Tutor to ensure that any programme modifications

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

26

are undertaken according to the '*Modifications to Programmes*' Modifications_to_Programmes.doc procedure, from seeking approval for such changes through to the completion of any requirements emanating from modification applications.

20.3 The associated School and the Moderator/Link Tutor are responsible for the quality and rigour of ongoing reporting, such as Moderators'/Link Tutors' reports and APRs, and for ensuring that any issues raised through these and from External Examiner reports are actioned accordingly.

20.4 Whereas the Academic Quality & Standards Board shall have the responsibility of approving franchise approval/validation, re-validation and periodic review events, the Collaborative Provision Committee has responsibility for the more detailed monitoring of the operation of collaborative programmes. The Collaborative Provision Committee not only receives (and requires information on action resulting from) reports of franchise approvals/validations as well as reviews, modification events, and Annual Programme Review report summaries, it also receives (and requires information on action resulting from) reports from Chairs of Panels on conditions of Franchise Approval/Validation/Review, Moderators/Link Tutors, and an annual Summary of External Examiner reports.

20.5 Reports of Franchise Approval/Validation/Review events, Panel Chairs' reports on conditions, External Examiners' overview reports etc, shall be transmitted to the Collaborative Provision Committee via the CPO. The CPO shall also ensure that relevant reports are available to the Moderator/Link Tutor, the School and the collaborating institution.

20.6 It is accepted that academic and management structures in collaborating institutions will differ from those at the University. However, the University systems require that there shall be a Programme Committee, responsible at the collaborating institution for the day-to-day operation of the collaborative programme, which meets regularly to discuss and take action on programme related matters.

20.7 Collaborating institutions are required to hold Programme Committees, if this is not already the case, so that programme reporting takes place both internally to the collaborating institution and externally to the University.

20.8 Examination Boards must also be convened as outlined both in this document and elsewhere in the University Academic Handbook (Assessment Regulations).

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

27

20.9 Further, the generality of the regulations (and guidance notes) as given in the University Academic Handbook apply to collaborative provision.

20.10 The quality assurance principles adopted by the University rely upon:

(i) Vice Chancellor's Board approval and initial vetting visit;

(ii) scrutiny of the (proposed) programme by peer review (franchise approval/validation event);

(iii) clear University responsibility for ensuring appropriate programme operation, quality assurance and enhancement, and for standards achieved by students;

(iv) regular monitoring, discussion, evaluation and reporting by both the School and programme staff and Programme Committee to achieve quality enhancement;

(v) an external examiner system, which brings external and independent scrutiny to the judgement of standards;

(vi) a moderator/link tutor system which acts both as a source of advice and linkage for the collaborating institution, a source of regular status reporting to the University Committee structure, and which seeks to ensure comparability of the programme with similar programmes at the University;

(vii) an Examination Board to ensure consistency of standards of award;

(viii) an Annual Programme Review reporting system, which reviews the programme each year, concentrating on quality enhancement processes;

(ix) a periodic review event, which scrutinises the programme by peer judgement every five years;

(x) a periodic review of the partnership against the terms of the University's procedures for collaborative provision and the agreements in place between partners.

20.11 (iv) to (x) above are described briefly in what follows, but reference should also be made to the relevant entries elsewhere in the University Academic Handbook.

21 New Staff/Staff Changes

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

28

21.1 Staff to deliver the collaborative programme are approved at the franchise approval/validation event via scrutiny of staff CVs which must be included in the submission documentation.

21.2 With the exception of instances where a short term arrangement of duration not more than four weeks (under which circumstances the collaborating institution will use its own judgement), the curriculum vitae of any new staff must be submitted to the Collaborative Provision Office for scrutiny by the Academic School. Wherever possible CV's should be submitted for approval **prior** to the new staff member beginning to teach/supervise University students.

21.3 The process will be undertaken with confidentiality, with only those individuals concerned having sight of the CVs. Any concerns regarding the new staff member will be discussed confidentially with the Head of the Collaborating institution and monitored.

21.4 The University will ensure that decisions are communicated to the collaborating institution within five working days.

22 Programme Committee

22.1 The Programme Committee is the body within the collaborating institution responsible for the oversight of the collaborative programme. The Programme Committee consists of all staff teaching on the collaborative programme, representatives of technicians and other support staff, student representatives and University moderator(s)/link tutor(s) (ex-officio). Programme Committees should meet frequently (at least three times a year) and maintain records of their meetings. At least one Programme Committee meeting each year should be held at which the University Moderator(s)/Link Turo(s) is (are) present.

Collaborating Institutions are responsible for all aspects of the servicing of Programme Committees.

Records of Programme Committee meetings must be sent to the CPO for submission to the Collaborative Provision Committee for scrutiny.

22.2 At the University, the CPO will ensure that the Moderator(s)/Link Tutor(s) receive copies of Programme Committee records.

22.3 The Terms of Reference of Programme Committees are to:

- monitor and review the programme with regard to all aspects of the organisation, teaching strategies used and quality of teaching;

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

29

- liaise with institutional library and learning resource functions to ensure adequacy for the programme;

- highlight areas of development with a view to programme improvement, modification (where appropriate) and staff development;

- monitor arrangements for the examination and assessment of the programme;

- monitor the implementation of the regulations and requirements of the University (and/or other examining/validation bodies) and to ensure the full involvement of the examiners and moderators/link tutors where appropriate;

- present information to the University (Collaborative Provision Committee, Learning and Teaching Board) and to equivalent Committees of the collaborating institution, including final examination results, as required;

- provide an Annual Programme Review report to the CPO for distribution in accordance with the University's quality assurance procedures.

23   External Examiners

23.1 Arrangements for external examining shall comply with the generality of the University Academic Handbook entries *Assessment Regulations* and *External Examiners*.

23.2 External Examiners have an important role in ensuring that programmes and students achieve standards appropriate to the particular award and comparability of standards with the University programmes, and they make valuable independent comment on the programme's operation.   The University receives External Examiner reports via the QSU from all External Examiners and this is an important part of the University quality system.   External Examiner reports are valuable evidence in Annual Programme Review reports, Periodic and Elective Reviews and other scrutiny events.

23.3 Nominations for External Examiner appointments are made via Schools on a standard proforma, and approved by a sub-group of the Academic Quality & Standards Board.

New External Examiners take-up their appointments before the retirement of their predecessors where possible, and have a term of office of four years with an extension of one year if there are special circumstances [such as the imminent closure of a programme, or a particular requirement for continuity].

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

30

For new programmes, appointments are normally made such that External Examiners are involved from the point at which programme assessments begin to contribute to the final award (e.g. from the beginning of year two of a three-year degree; from the beginning of year one of a two-year HND).

23.4 External Examiners will not teach on the programme; they must be independent and objective.

23.5 The responsibilities of External Examiners are given in the University Academic Handbook under *External Examiners* and include:

- moderating the totality of the assessment process;

- approving the overall scheme of assessment and any proposed modification(s)

- comparing the performance of/standards achieved by students with that of their peers on comparable programmes at the University and elsewhere;

- approving the form and content of assignments and examinations that count towards the award before they are provided to students;

- attending, and contributing to, meetings of the Examination Board

- moderating the marks of Internal (collaborating institution) Examiners as appropriate.

23.6 External Examiners are required to send External Examiner reports on the programme to the University's Quality and Standards Unit, which forwards copies to the relevant Programme Director, Director of Learning and Teaching, Dean of School, Dean of Quality and Standards and (for collaborative provision) to the Partner Institution and the Collaborative Provision Office. Reports are considered at programme level and responses to the issues raised are submitted by the Partner Institution and sent via the Quality & Standards Unit to the External Examiner. The School Director of Learning and Teaching prepares a summary of issues raised in reports on their school's programmes, for submission to the Learning and Teaching Board. The Dean of Quality and Standards prepares a summary of the reports from all the External Examiners and identifies issues for action at the University's corporate level for submission to the Academic Quality and Standards Board, Collaborative Provision Committee, Learning and Teaching Board and Academic Board.

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

31

23.7 External Examiner reports must be referred to in Annual Programme Review reports, citing issues arising and action taken.

23.8 Each External Examiner report utilises a standard report form and will include observations on:

- the academic standards achieved by students and, where appropriate, other levels of competence;

- the general quality of the programme including resource adequacy, the student experience, teaching and learning quality;

- assessment in relation to programme learning outcomes;

- recommendations on academic and other matters requiring attention;

- any student comments regarding the programme and its delivery;

- the conduct of the Examination Board;

- benchmarking;

- other pertinent matters.

External Examiner reports should not make reference to individual students by name (except for Master's dissertation reports/research degrees).

23.9 External Examiners for collaborative programmes should be in a position to calibrate standards achieved by students against those for similar UK programmes and in particular for franchised and outreach franchised programmes, against the University equivalent programme. Hence, for these it is essential that wherever possible there is commonality of external examining across the University and collaborating institution programme. Where this is not possible, linkages will be organised.

23.10 All External Examiners will be inducted into the University (and third party, as appropriate) external examining requirements and systems.

24 Moderators/Link Tutors

24.1 Moderators are appointed to all collaborative programmes situated in the Schools of Education, Sport, Health Sciences and Art. They are also appointed for Wales-based programmes situated in the School of Management. Link Tutors are appointed for Cardiff School of Management (non Wales-based) TNE activity. Their efforts ensure that programme quality and academic standards achieved by students are maintained at an appropriate and acceptable level (in line with the FHEQ) and that quality enhancement takes place.

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

32

Moderators are appointed by the Collaborative Provision Committee after nomination by their School. Link Tutors are appointed through their School via an application and interview process and are reported to the Collaborative Provision Committee.

For programmes situated in the Cardiff School of Management a minimum of two Link Tutors will be appointed to each partnership and will be responsible for all programmes within that partnership.

Moderators shall be nominated on the basis of their expertise in relation to the programme and the actual number of programme moderators will depend upon the spread of expertise required.

24.2 The purpose of Moderators is to:

- act as a reporting and action link between the associated School, University and the collaborating institution;

- act in consultation with the Dean of Quality and Standards as an advisor to the collaborating institution programme team on regulatory issues, quality assurance and enhancement processes, mechanisms for effecting programme changes, interpretation of aspects of the programme document (where appropriate), programme delivery, and other pertinent issues;

- where necessary, ensure that student entrance qualifications comply with the requirements determined at validation;

- ensure, via inspection and moderation as necessary, that assessment/examination exercises and questions are of an appropriate level and that marking schemes and marking are similarly of an appropriate level, and are fair; for franchised programmes it is desirable that common assessment across the "home" and collaborative programme takes place wherever possible;

- advise the collaborating institution on resourcing issues for the programme;

- monitor staffing changes and additions to the programme team;

- attend at least one meeting of the Programme Committee each academic year and ensure that the Programme Committee is operating effectively and addressing issues that affect quality and standards;

- attend meetings of the Examination Board and where necessary advise upon procedures and moderate gradings; and invite the External Examiner to appropriate meetings of the Examination Board;

- provide and/or facilitate where possible and appropriate, staff development/training sessions for staff of the programme team;

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

33

- Ensure that students' concerns are being discussed in the relevant fora.

  The above are intended to ensure that the programme is delivered at an appropriate quality level and that graduating students do so to required standards.

24.3 The purpose of the Link Tutor is to be the main point of contact within the School for a particular collaborative partnership. [LINK 1]

This includes:

- Quality assurance role: including advising on the University's regulations and procedures and advising partners on programme modifications) [LINK 1 OR 2]
- Quality enhancement role: identify staff development needs at the partner institution, participate in or facilitate training events and share good practice with partners [LINK 1 OR 2]
- Advise partners on draft APRs prior to their submission to the University [LINK 1 OR 2]
- Meet students during visits to partner institution [LINK 1]
- Attend programme committee at partner institution or videoconference/skype (at least one p.a.) [LINK 1]
- Attend Exam Boards [LINK 1]
- Assist with staff and student induction (where necessary) [LINK 1]
- Agree academic calendar with partners [LINK 1 OR 2]
- Report to the University Collaborative Provision Committee and relevant School Committees on partnership issues [LINK 1 OR 2]
- Monitor recruitment (with CPO) and support recruitment activities at the partner, including transfers on-campus [LINK 1 OR 2]
- Assist with the admissions process and ensure that student qualifications comply with the entry requirements agreed at validation [LINK 1 OR 2]
- Monitor marketing and publicity materials, and provide marketing assistance where required (with CPO/IO) [LINK 1 OR 2]
- Advise on and monitor student handbooks (with CPO) [LINK 1 OR 2]
- Peer observation of teaching (where necessary) [LINK 1]
- Approve new staff members at partner institutions (and interview, if deemed necessary) [LINK 1 OR 2]
- Review resources at the partner institution on an on-going basis and advise on and monitor any necessary improvements [LINK 1]
- Provide advice (in conjunction with colleagues in the relevant School) on draft assessments (coursework and examinations) prior to transmission to External Examiner(s) {LINK 1 OR 2]

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

34

- Provide assistance to partners on learning materials and Blackboard [LINK 1 OR 2]
- Report to the University on the above following visits (at least two p.a. by Link Tutor One) [LINK 1 AND 2]

The above are intended to ensure that the programme is delivered at an appropriate quality level and that graduating students do so to required standards.

24.4 Moderators/Link Tutors will visit the collaborating institution as necessary to ensure that the programme progresses appropriately. Moderators/Link Tutors will normally visit the collaborating institution twice during each academic session to a schedule negotiated with the collaborating institution. If this is not possible, the moderator/link tutor should make arrangements to interact with staff and students of the Partner Institution via alternative means, for example, video conference meetings. Such Moderator/Link Tutor visits should include participation in a Programme Committee meeting and in meetings of Examination Boards. It is also envisaged that Moderators/Link Tutors will:

- meet and discuss the programme with students;
- review facilities in relation to programme developments and student numbers;
- review students' work;
- review Programme Committee records;
- review assignment schedules and where possible (franchised programmes) harmonise these with the 'home' programme;
- review teaching plans;
- meet informally with the Programme Director and members of the programme team.

Moderators/Link Tutors may also take action, make recommendations, and contribute to staff development activities during their visits, or assist in any other way such that they may fulfil the function of mentor and advisor to the programme team.

24.5 Apart from contact via visits, Moderators/Link Tutors shall receive from the collaborating institution, via the Collaborative Provision Office, for approval by the Moderator/Link Tutor and to agreed timescales:

- draft assessments and examination papers, and marking schemes (based on intended learning outcomes) associated with these and/or, for franchised programmes, facilitate the

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

35

development of common assessment wherever possible across the University and the collaborating institution;

- copies of examination papers to be lodged in the University Collaborative Provision Office;

- if not included in the review of students' work as in 22.3, an agreed sample of student assignment work and examination scripts before the visit;

- any other documentation requested by the Moderator/Link Tutor for assurance that the quality of the programme and the standards achieved by students are appropriate.

24.6 The Moderator/Link Tutor will insist on equivalence of assessment, such arrangements to include assessment approval by the University.

24.7 An annual report and an interim report must be submitted by the Moderator/Link Tutor to the CPO for presentation to the collaborating institution and to the Collaborative Provision Committee in parallel. Moderator/Link Tutor reports shall address the following:

- issues raised by students and any action taken or proposed to consider/address them;

- observations regarding the resources - including staffing, physical, library and other learning resources - with recommendations for enhancement where necessary;

- staff development undertaken by the programme team, perceived staff development needs, and how such activities will benefit the programme;

- observations on programme delivery and programme management;

- issues arising from Programme Committees and records of meetings, and any resulting discussion and action taken as a result of Moderator/Link Tutor, External Examiner and student consultation issues;

- progress made in regard to issues arising from franchise approval/validation recommendations, periodic review conditions and recommendations;

- matters relating to the University (and any third party, as appropriate) regulations and procedures, including compliance observations;

- where applicable comments on the standard of assignments and examination papers set, marking schemes and the standard of marking, in comparison to equivalent programmes at the University;

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

36

- observations on assignment schedules and teaching plans;

- any other general issues pertaining to the programme.

Following meetings that coincide with the Moderator's/Link Tutor's attendance at Examination Boards, reports should also consider:

- the overall standards attained by students;

- the conduct of assessments and examinations;

- the conduct of the Examination Board and any pre-meeting, and the appropriateness of preparation and organisation of papers for the Examination Board;

- any problems encountered, and any consequent proposals for staff development.

24.8 Further details regarding the role and responsibilities of the Moderator/Link Tutor can be found in the University Collaborative Provision Handbook and Moderator/Link Tutor Handbook. These are provided to all Moderators/Link Tutors at the beginning of each academic year.

25 Examination Boards

25.1 The Examination Board is the body responsible for the consideration of student performance on the programme and for confirming assessment and examination results, and any resulting awards classifications.

25.2 The Terms of Reference and Conduct of Examination Boards shall be as for the University's own programmes as given in the University Academic Handbook under *'Assessment Regulations' Assessment_Regulations.doc*. Where it is possible, common Examination Boards with the University home programme will be held.

25.3 Membership of Examination Boards shall be as given in the Academic Handbook with the following differences in instances where there is not a common Examination Board:

- the University Moderator(s)/Link Tutor(s) shall be present at all Examination Boards and shall have an equal say with that of Internal Examiners on outcomes, and may additionally advise on University procedures where appropriate;

- the Chair shall be nominated and approved as described under '*Assessment Regulations'* as given in the University Academic Handbook.

For common Examination Boards, the Moderator/Link Tutor should also be present.

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

37

25.4 Reports of Examination Board meetings shall be produced by the University and shall be forwarded to the School, the Moderator/Link Tutor and the Partner Institution.

26 Annual Programme Review

26.1 The annual monitoring of programmes is the cornerstone of the University's quality assurance process and is the vehicle for effecting progressive improvements in the academic health of the programme. Emphasis is placed upon action following scrutiny which identifies issues to be addressed, and upon the traceability of such identification and action through, for example, Programme Committee records. The Annual Programme Review report also forms the basis of each periodic review.

26.2 Annual Programme Review reports for collaborative programmes are submitted by Partner Institutions to the CPO. APR reports are scrutinised by the associated University School, by the Moderator/Link Tutor and the Collaborative Provision Office. The School Director of Learning and Teaching includes all the school's collaborative programmes in his/her summary of Collaborative Provision APR reports. The Reports may also be made available to External Examiners and external agencies (such as QAA).

26.3 All Annual Programme Review reports must be in English.

26.4 The format of the Annual Programme Review report for collaborative programmes is as for the University's programmes. However, in completing the Annual Programme Review report, the Moderator/Link Tutor must work fully with the collaborating institution to:

- produce reports that are of equivalent quality and comprehensiveness to that expected for programmes delivered at the University;

- take cognisance of where changes in headings are required, such as entry qualifications and geographical information;

- pay full and particular attention to reporting in sections from which indicators of equivalence in standards might be gleaned, such as student destination and further study. Such sections should not only give statistical information but should, under 'comments', report examples of job titles, programmes entered, where and at what level, etc.

27 Periodic Review

27.1 All University programmes undergo Periodic Review at intervals of approximately five years and information pertaining to such reviews

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

38

is given in the Academic Handbook. Reviews might additionally arise at shorter intervals as a result of Franchise Approval/Validation Conditions.

27.2 The essential purpose of the Periodic Review is to ensure that quality and standards set at the introduction of a programme have been maintained and that relevant developments and changes have taken place and are properly documented.

27.3 Franchise Approval/Periodic Reviews may involve individual programme scrutiny or the scrutiny of groups of related programmes. Therefore a programme offered collaboratively may be reviewed as part of a periodic review of the programme at the University or on its own.

27.4 If the periodic review takes place at the collaborating institution, it is the responsibility of the associated School, the Moderator/Link Tutor and the Collaborating Institution to ensure that documentation for the Periodic Review is of the required quality and comprehensiveness. It is the responsibility of the associated School and the Moderator/Link Tutor to ensure that the Collaborating Institution has been fully apprised and prepared for the event and that due timescales are observed.

27.5 Documentation for a Periodic Review event must be received from the associated School by the CPO at least 25 working days before the event; failure to achieve this may result in cancellation of the event and any consequences of such cancellation. Documentation for review events should generally conform to that given in the University Academic Handbook entry '*Periodic Review of Existing Programmes'*.

27.6 Periodic Review Panels will normally consist of:

(i) Chair - member of University staff, but external to the School concerned (for overseas events, the Chair will be drawn from a register of appropriately qualified and experienced staff);

(ii) At least one person normally from a UK higher education establishment, who is external to the University and has subject expertise relevant to the programme;

(iii) one member of the University staff external to the School concerned (for overseas events, the staff member will be drawn from a register of appropriately qualified and experienced staff);

Staff from the CPO will record the event.

In attendance:

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

39

One person from the School concerned.

27.7 The Periodic Review Panel Chair will normally have experience as a Chair or Panel Member of franchise approval/validation/review events both within and outside the University. The Panel Chair need not be a subject specialist in a field relevant to the programme. Close association with the programme will be a bar to chairing the Periodic Review Panel. For overseas events, the Chair will be drawn from a register of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

27.8 The nature of the periodic review event will reflect the nature of the programme and the particular collaborative arrangement.

27.9 The programme for the periodic review event will normally include:

- a private meeting of the Panel to review the documentation provided; the Panel will identify issues it wishes to raise with the programme team.

- a meeting of the Panel with relevant management of the collaborating institution; this will allow the programme to be contextualised within the collaborating institution's portfolio and an exploration of issues relating to resourcing, staffing/staff development and initiatives in programme provision (e.g. learning resource planning).

- a meeting of the Panel with the programme team so that the Panel can explore the programme performance since franchise approval/validation or the last review, quality and standards issues, quality enhancement issues, programme management, assessment practices, etc;

- a meeting with students from the programme (and, where possible, past students and employers).

27.10 The Periodic Review Panel Chair will conclude the review with an oral report of the Panel's main conclusions and recommendations. An agreed written report, with conditions, recommendations and timescales, will be produced within four weeks by the CPO and be circulated to the School concerned, the Moderator/Link Tutor, the Academic Registrar, collaborating institution, Panel Members, Academic Quality & Standards Board and the Collaborative Provision Committee.

27.11 The associated School and the Moderator/Link Tutor, working with the Collaborating Institution, have the responsibility to ensure that any conditions are met according to the required timescale and for ensuring that the Panel Chair, via the CPO, receives the required documentation to make judgements on attainment of the

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

40

conditions. The Chair of the Panel shall, through a written report to the CPO, confirm (or otherwise) the attainment of the conditions within the required timescale. The CPO shall report outcomes to the Collaborative Provision Committee.

28   Periodic Review of Collaborative Provision Partnerships

28.1 All collaborative partnerships will be reviewed, normally on a quinquennial basis, against the terms of the Cardiff Metropolitan University procedures for collaborative provision and the agreements in place between partners in which the expectations of both partners are expressed.

28.2 **Aims and Objectives of Partnership Review**

The main aim of partnership review is to provide assurance that the collaborative partnership is operating, on the part of both partners, in accordance with the terms of the agreements in place and that it is an arrangement to be recommended for continuation.

The objectives of partnership review are to:

- Provide an opportunity to reflect at institutional level on the experience of academic collaboration
- Consider both strategic and operational arrangements for the effective management of the partnership
- Review ways of working, identifying potential improvements to the management and operation of the partnership and enhancing the quality of the student experience
- Check the effectiveness of arrangements for quality assurance and enhancement on the part of the partner and the University
- Evaluate and confirm the overall academic standards and quality of the programmes delivered under the partnership arrangement
- Review the support provided to partners by the University, and make recommendations regarding the term of office of the Moderator/Link Tutor.

Cardiff Metropolitan University is committed to making partnership review a consultative, self-critical and genuinely collaborative process. Reviews should also be proportionate to the scale of the partnerships, with account taken of smaller scale partnerships, Conducted in this manner, partnership review is intended to serve as a means of improving the overall learning experience, improving communication and fostering a shared understanding of the partnership.

On establishing that the principles of the partnership have been broadly observed by both partners, the key outcome of partnership review is to re-affirm the partnership normally for a further period of

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

41

five years, subject to engagement with the terms of any action plan, as appropriate and continued adherence to the terms of the annual memoranda.

A formal report of the partnership review and the action plan will be submitted to the Collaborative Provision Committee for initial scrutiny and then to Academic Quality and Standards Board for approval, and will be reported to Academic Board.

28.3 Review Documentation

The documentation will comprise:

From the Partner:

- A partnership evaluation document which includes:

  o Synopsis of institution position (i.e. history, size, current HE provision, and strategy, particularly in partnership with the University
  o Current University provision and developments over the five year period, and plans for future development
  o Evaluation of operation of the partnership, to include:

  - Engagement with quality assurance and enhancement
  - Staff development
  - Development of the portfolio

Documentation should also include:

- Staff CVs
- Updated resources and student services checklists
- Examples of publicity and marketing materials (including websites)

From Cardiff Metropolitan University:

- A partnership evaluation document (compiled by the Head of Collaborative Provision) which summarises generic institutional and management matters relevant to partnership operations arising from:

  o External examiners' reports for the past two sessions
  o Moderators' reports for the past two sessions
  o Annual monitoring reports (APRs) for past two sessions. Any periodic/elective review events affecting provision at the partner
  o Engagement with University regulations and systems
  o Feedback from Academic Schools and Units who liaise with the partner

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

42

  o Original franchise approval/validation report(s)

Each partner should identify areas of good practice, as well as areas for development. It is recommended that partners share drafts of their documents in advance of submission.

28.4 Outline of the Process

The Collaborative Provision Office (CPO) will co-ordinate the preparations for a partnership review. Reviews will normally take place over a day, normally (but not necessarily) at the Partner institution.

Review Panel

The **Review Panel** will comprise:

- Trained and experienced Chair from another academic school, or an experienced senior manager
- External representative, with experience of collaborative provision
- Trained and experienced member of academic staff not previously involved with the partner

Meetings

The Review Panel will expect to meet with senior managers from the partner institution, course leaders and representatives from staff teaching on the collaborative programmes, and any other individuals who play a key role in the programmes (for instance administrators or technicians).

It is expected that the review team will also meet with the relevant University Moderator(s)/Link Tutors. This may take place by telephone or videoconference if required. An outcome of the review process will be to make recommendations regarding the term of office of the Moderator(s)/partnership leader.

Meeting with Partner Senior Managers.

To discuss the effectiveness of the partnership

- Developments within the aims of the partnership to date
- Successes and challenges encountered to date
- Experience of working with University systems
- Relationship with the University
- To discuss plans for future development

Meeting with students

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

43

To discuss the experience of studying on a collaborative programme including:

- Overall learning experience
- Experiences of being a student of both the Partner and Cardiff Met

Meeting with course leaders, teaching and administrative staff from the partner

To discuss generic rather than course specific issues relating to the experience of delivering and managing collaborative programmes, including:

- Experience of course development
- Engagement with University processes
- Liaison with University staff and Units
- Teaching and learning issues

Meeting with Moderator(s)/Link Tutor

To discuss:

- Engagement with University colleagues and processes
- Quality assurance and enhancement issues

28.5 Outcomes of the process

The review panel will reach a recommendation on the basis of the discussions held during the review meetings. Normally, this will be a recommendation to continue with the partnership for a further five years, although a shorter time-span may be agreed if substantial areas for development, or to address, are identified. In exceptional circumstances, the recommendation may be that the partnership be discontinued (see below).

In recommending the continuation of the partnership, the review panel may identify areas for development by the partner (or Cardiff Metropolitan University), as conditions (to be met by a specific date) or recommendations (not mandatory but response to be reported through next APR report) based on their implications for the effective continuation of the partnership.

The review panel may also identify areas of good practice in partnership working, which will be disseminated to relevant staff in the University and at partner institutions.

If the outcome of the review is to recommend discontinuation of the partnership, both partners should work closely to ensure that any existing students already enrolled on programmes at the partner

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

44

institution are given the opportunity to complete their studies (as stipulated in the Memorandum of Agreement).

The Partnership Review Report will be submitted to Collaborative Provision Committee for initial scrutiny and to Academic Quality and Standards Board for approval. The review outcomes will be reported to Academic Board in due course. Collaborative Provision Committee will monitor progress in adherence to action plans.

28.6 Evaluation of the Partnership Review Process

Cardiff Metropolitan University will monitor participant comments on the partnership review processes through the distribution of evaluative questionnaires at each meeting. These are scrutinised for both general and specific issues.

29 Periodic Due Diligence Checks

In line with Section B10 of the QAA Quality Code, the University will carry out periodic due diligence reviews of its collaborative partners.

The following information will be collected every three years, or at shorter intervals if deemed necessary by the Vice Chancellor's Board (VCB) or the Governors' TNE Sub- Committee:

1. Audited financial accounts for the previous two years;
2. Details of the ownership of the partner institution;
3. Details of any changes to the legal status of the partner and details of any pending legal action;
4. Details of the requirements for formal recognition/accreditation/approval requirements by the relevant authorities in country for collaborative providers and programmes;
5. The University will also carry out a credit check on the partner institution;
6. The University will also assess whether there are any legal/political/ethical/cultural issues that need to be considered.

The updated due diligence information will be considered by appropriate University staff and the outcomes reported to the Initial Approval Panel (IAP), VCB and the Governors' TNE Sub-Committee.

[For Wales-based Further Education partners, the need for updated due diligence will be waived.]

30 Documentation for Collaborative Franchise Approval/Validation Events

30.1 A submission document for franchise approval/validation enables a programme team to demonstrate what it proposes to achieve

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

45

and/or has achieved and how it expects to do so and/or has done so. Concise, explicit documentation should enable the reader readily to understand the programme and its progress and identify relevant issues. It is the responsibility of the associated University School that documentation submitted for franchise approval/validation and review is compliant with the University's requirements and is appropriate in quality.

30.2 The quality of the documentation is an important element in the successful franchise approval/validation or review of a programme. To that end, the nature of the language used and the presentation adopted are important. The writing should be clear and precise, the language simple and jargon-free and excessive verbosity should be avoided. Diagrams and charts may be used with benefit.

30.3 The submission document should be organised in such a way as to make for ease of access, referencing and reading, (see below). The various areas encompassed should be differentiated either as subsections of a larger document or as separate documents. The overall product should be manageable and usable.

30.4 The submission document for collaborative programmes should include information on the collaborating institution as below:

- a brief historical background with particular reference to recent developments and the context for the programme;

- reference to any external and internal reports on the quality of existing provision, and a self appraisal with regard to these;

- academic and management structure;

- staff development policy;

- student numbers;

- staffing including recent staff development;

- teaching accommodation and equipment;

- library and computing;

- technician and administrative support services.

30.5 The submission document for franchise and outreach franchise programmes should incorporate the following:

(i) the University definitive programme document;

(ii) the proposed franchise or outreach franchise programme document (see '*Validation of New Programmes*' Validation_of_New_Programmes.doc): this should include the items listed in 26.4 and thereafter follow the general format of the University's requirements for documentation to be submitted (as given in '*Validation of New Programmes*'),

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

46

making only necessary changes - for example, institutional description, school structure, CVs etc - and exceptionally changes to programme content which are appropriate in the context of the collaborating institution such as for regional or cultural reasons but note that the franchise programme may only include minimal new material (i.e. one new module for HNC, 2 for HND);

The University's module descriptors must be used for existing modules, but with the module tutor name changed as appropriate;

(iii) the proposed Programme Handbook and other relevant information such as dissertation and/or placement handbooks; Note that the University will supply a Student Handbook to cover its regulatory issues and these should not be duplicated or contravened in the franchise partner's Programme Handbook.

(iv) a statement, with justification, of what changes have been made compared to the University programme;

(v) a completed programme specification proforma;

(vi) examples of advertising material

(vii) any other relevant documents/reports.

30.6 Documentation for a validated programme should incorporate the following:

(i) the proposed programme document: this should include the items listed in 30.4 and thereafter follow the University "documentation" information given in the University Academic Handbook under '*Validation of New Programmes*';

(ii) the proposed Programme Handbook and other relevant information such as dissertation and/or placement handbooks. Note that the University will supply a Student Handbook to cover its regulatory issues and these should not be duplicated or contravened in the franchise partner's Programme Handbook;

(iii) a completed programme/scheme specification proforma;

(iv) a copy of the relevant benchmark statement(s) (where appropriate);

(v) examples of advertising material, where appropriate;

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

47

(vi) any other relevant documents/papers.

30.7 Once a collaborative programme has been approved, the collaborating institution is required to send to the CPO, three copies of the definitive programme document, which will be held as the definitive source of information about the collaborative programme. Amendments to the collaborative programme document* must be sent to the QSU immediately after such amendments have been approved.

[*Note that changes to validated programmes can only be made with the approval of the University and must be made under extant University processes for change.]

30.8 All programmes must have a Programme Handbook, which must be produced in advance of students being enrolled. A current copy of those sections relating to the programme must be sent to the University Academic Registrar at the start of each academic year. There may be considerable overlap between the information in the definitive programme document and the Programme Handbook.

30.9 All documentation must be presented in English.

31 **Administrative Responsibilities**

31.1 The administration of collaborative provision programmes will be managed as follows:

- the enrolment and registration of students on the collaborative programme information on individual students, including entry qualifications, being supplied in a prescribed manner and to agreed timescales *(Collaborative Provision Office)*

- administration of the External Examiner appointment and payment system *(Quality and Standards Unit)*

- the integrity of assessment arrangements, including invigilation; the Academic Registrar has the right to require information on these and to approve them; and as necessary to inspect such arrangements; the Academic Registrar may also request reports on such arrangements; *(Academic Registry)*

- notifying the Academic Board of the names of Chairs of Examination Boards and dates, for approval *(Academic Registry)*

- processing the outcomes of Examination Board decisions for awards, producing certificates and transcripts where appropriate, and controlling the security and distribution of these as appropriate *(Academic Registry/CPO)*

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

48

- administering student appeals against decisions of Examination Boards and unfair practice *(Academic Registry)*

31.2 Schools and collaborating institutions shall respond to requests on the above as and when required by the University.

32 Modification to Programmes

32.1 Changes may be made to programmes following initial franchise approval/validation through the modification procedure or a re-franchise/re-validation event. Such changes need thus to be the subject of consultation between the University and the Collaborating Institution and considered at the joint Programme Committee and subsequently approved by AQSB.

33 Procedure for Addressing Quality Concerns

In cases where serious concerns affecting quality and standards are identified at a partner organisation (by a Committee, Moderator, Link Tutor, External Examiner or elsewhere) a sub group of the Collaborative Provision Committee should be established to consider the concerns and recommend further action, which may include bringing forward a review of the programme or the partnership. Evidence will be sought from all relevant parties prior to a recommendation for action being made to the Committee. It is proposed that the group should comprise:

a) Chair of Collaborative Provision Committee (or Deputy Chair)
b) Dean of Quality and Standards
c) Director of Learning and Teaching in the relevant School
d) One member of the Committee not associated with the School(s) in which the provision in question lies

34 Withdrawal of Franchise Approval/Validation

34.1 In circumstances under which withdrawal of franchise approval/validation of a franchised, outreach franchised or validated programme is deemed to be necessary, the Collaborative Provision Committee may recommend such withdrawal via the University AQSB to Academic Board. Academic Board following due consideration and a recommendation by IAP may approve withdrawal and subsequently transmit this decision to any third party involved.

34.2 Issues leading to a decision to withdrawal of franchise approval/validation might include:

- a decline in outcome standards below the threshold level as evidenced by External Examiner reports, Moderator/Link Tutor

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

49

reports, External Assessment reports, etc, following repeated attempts to cause reversal of the decline;

- a decline in programme quality and/or the quality of the student experience below that envisaged at franchise approval/validation, following repeated and/or multiple attempts to cause reversal of the decline;

- a breakdown of relationships between the University and the collaborating institution, perceived to be irreversible;

- repeated non-adherence to the University regulatory requirements, following repeated warnings;

- serious breaches of the financial arrangements by the collaborating institution;

- low student numbers.

34.3 Following a decision by Academic Board (on the recommendation of the IAP) to withdraw franchise approval/validation, the University shall ensure by suitable means that the interests of students on the programme are protected as far as is possible by one or more of the following measures:

- arranging for existing students to undertake the remainder of their studies at the University or elsewhere;

- allowing existing students to complete the programme at the collaborating institution whilst permitting no new cohorts to enrol on the programme; (this measure might also be used as an interim mechanism until such time as the collaborating institution can demonstrate to the University that franchise approval/validation should be reinstated);

- issuing University "stage" certificates (such as University Certificates and Diplomas) such that students may use these for advanced standing purposes either immediately or at a later time for entry onto programmes, as arranged by themselves, elsewhere.

34.4 In any of the above cases, full consultation with students, Moderators/Link Tutors, External Examiners and the collaborating institution must take place for determination of the best programme(s) of action. This shall also be approved by Academic Board following a recommendation by the Academic Quality and Standards Board.

34.5 Upon withdrawal of franchise approval/validation, the collaborating institution shall be informed in writing by the University Deputy

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

50

Vice-Chancellor and Teaching that it may not advertise the programme utilising the name of the University (or any third party involved in the franchise approval/validation) or in any other way implicate the University, save for those necessary and approved (by Academic Board) instances associated with the cohorts of students completing their studies at the collaborating institution.

35   **Exit Strategy following the Termination of a Collaborative Partnership**

Responsibility for Quality and Standards

As the degree-awarding body for its franchised and validated programmes the University has ultimate responsibility for academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities, regardless of where these opportunities are delivered and who provides them. Partners involved in the delivery of a collaborative arrangement are required to adhere to the University's quality assurance policies and procedures and these responsibilities are outlined in the Memorandum of Agreement signed at the commencement of the collaboration.

In the Event of Termination

Section B10, Quality Assurance Agency Quality Code states:

'Degree-awarding bodies retain responsibility for ensuring that students admitted to a programme who wish to complete it under their awarding authority can do so in the event that a delivery organisation or support provider or partner withdraws from an arrangement or that the degree-awarding body decides to terminate an arrangement.'

At the commencement of any collaborative arrangement both parties sign a Memorandum of Programme Agreement. The Agreement states that:

'In the case of a notice period which does not allow the most recent cohort of students to complete the Programmes, the two parties hereby agree to seek appropriate alternative arrangements for such students, such arrangements including enrolment on appropriate stages of closely related Programmes either at Cardiff Metropolitan University, the Collaborating Institution or elsewhere.'

Exit Strategy

To minimise the risks associated with the termination of a collaborative arrangement the University has two key stages at which it manages these risks. The first takes place at the commencement of the collaboration and is built into the University's due diligence procedures. The second takes place at the termination of a collaborative arrangement and is the development of an exit strategy.

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

51

The purpose of an exit strategy is to safeguard academic standards and the student experience following the termination of a collaborative arrangement and to allow enrolled students to complete their programme of study, or a similar programme, with the minimum possible disruption.

In the majority of cases no new cohorts of students will be enrolled following termination of a collaborative arrangement. In exceptional circumstances where commitments have been made to prospective students who have yet to begin study, the University may consider allowing the enrolment of additional cohorts. In such cases these additional cohorts must be included in the exit strategy.

Following the termination of the collaborative arrangement by either party an exit strategy should be submitted to the University's Initial Approval Panel (IAP) for consideration.

The exit strategy should be produced by the Collaborative Provision Office in consultation with the Partner, School and any other parties that are to contribute to the strategy. If the strategy includes the transfer of students to another institution which is not the University or the partner institution the accepting institution must also contribute to the production and agreement of the strategy. Only in exceptional cases, and with the express agreement of the students involved, will the awarding authority be transferred to a third party degree-awarding body.

In occasions where a partner institution becomes insolvent or ceases trading the responsibilities associated with supporting remaining students, as outlined in the Memorandum of Agreement, still apply. Every effort should be made by the partner institution to contribute to the production and operation of the exit strategy. At a minimum, arrangements should be made to transfer all student information to the University.

The exit strategy should detail:

- The reasons for termination;
- The date of notice of termination and the date of termination;
- The date the strategy will commence and projected period of completion of the strategy;
- A breakdown of current and pending student numbers, their stages of completion and projected minimum and maximum completion dates;
- The financial arrangements that will govern the collaboration during the strategy;
- A breakdown of the responsibilities and expectations of all parties and a summary of how these may differ from those outlined in the Memorandum of Agreement;

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

52

- Detailed information on how the programme will be taught and administered during the run-down period;
- What information has been given to students to date;
- How communication between the parties will be maintained;
- How the strategy will be monitored on a day-to-day basis.

Once the strategy has been approved by IAP it will be monitored by the Collaborative Provision Committee with an annual update to IAP and the University's Academic Quality and Standards Board (AQSB). If the strategy requires amendment this must be approved by IAP. Any concerns regarding the quality and standards of the programme will be referred to AQSB.

Following approval of the exit strategy the partner institution will provide the University with contact details of all affected students. The students will be informed of the termination by the University an provided with full details of progression options available to the (interim awards, awarding of credits and APL to another institution, transfer to the University). They will be provided with details of who they may contact to discuss the options.

36 Movement of Students between Programmes

36.1 It may be the case that students on a franchised programme wish to undertake part of their studies on the home version of the programme, or indeed that students on the home programme wish to undertake part of their studies on the franchised version of the programme.

36.2 Two basic scenarios exist to accommodate the above:

(i) the student may terminate his/her place on the programme at an appropriate stage and apply to the alternative programme for entry with advanced standing at the appropriate stage. Control of issues such as enrolment, examining, fees, etc thus transfer to the alternative programme, the student now being a student of that programme;

(ii) the student undertakes parts of the alternative programme but remains a student of the original programme.

36.3 Under scenario 36.2(ii), the following apply:

- programme teams may arrange study on the alternative programme under the regulations given in *Complementary Study and Assessment at Overseas Institutions: Variations to Validated Programmes for Individual Students* [Complementary_Study_and_Assessment_at_Overseas_Instituti ons.doc](#) (Academic Handbook). This allows for up to 5 modules of study to be taken on the alternative programme, on an

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

53

individual student basis, after certain assurances have been gained;

- the movement of students is built into the franchise approval/validation of the programme(s).

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

54

INITIAL VETTING VISIT: COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

Please note that this information is used to gather accurate information as part of the University's initial approval and due diligence processes. It is essential that all information included is accurate and verifiable (including financial information). Failure to abide by these requirements can lead to the termination of the initial approval process.

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

Name and location of the collaborating institution:

Details of the ownership and governance structure of the institution:

[Please attach CVs or biographical details for all owners.]

Legal Status of the institution:

Is the organisation permitted to enter into legally binding collaborative agreements?:

Sources of funding for the institution:

Strategic plan and organisational mission details (required to determine the degree of fit):

Date of Foundation:

Management structure :
Please attach an organisational chart for how the institution is managed

2. ACADEMIC BACKGROUND

Current size of the institution:

Details of programmes currently offered (including awarding bodies):

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

55

Number of students, number of staff (including breakdown of full time/part time):

Links with other organisations:

Current Quality Assurance processes and committee structure:

3. FACILITIES AND RESOURCES

Location of all campus(es):

Are the teaching premises owned or leased?:

Teaching Staff-including balance of full time and part time:

Support Staff-including balance of full time and part time:

Details of Staff Development, Equal Opportunities and Health and Safety Policies:

IT facilities:

Classroom facilities:

Library facilities:
As well as physical library holdings, please include details of electronic library resources currently available to students and list any database/journal subscriptions.

Laboratory facilities (if applicable):

Details of access for disabled students:

[NB: The requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act, 2005, do not currently apply to overseas partners.]

Details of student support services:

Budget for supporting all the above:

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

56

4. DUE DILIGENCE CHECKS

Financial status - including audited financial accounts for the previous three financial years, bankers' references and business plans, where available.

NB: The University will request updated financial information and carry out credit checks as part of its periodic updating of due diligence.

Details of the education system in the country concerned:

Details regarding the requirements for formal recognition/accreditation/approval by the relevant national authorities of collaborative providers and programmes in-country-

Details of any current or previous partnerships with Universities, Colleges or other awarding bodies (in country or overseas). If a relationship has been terminated, please provide details of the reason for termination.

Details of checks carried out by University staff with the authorities in-country:

Legal/Political/Ethical/Cultural issues to be considered in the proposed collaboration:

Levels and Type of insurance held by the institution:

Details of any legal judgements in the last three years against the institution or any pending legal action:

5. THE PROPOSED COLLABORATION

Nature of the initial contact - e.g. via an agent, British Council, overseas government agency, existing collaborating institution, etc:

Planned programmes:

Type of collaboration-franchise/validation/outreach:

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

57

Does the proposal include a dual award (made by the partner or other awarding body)?:

Anticipated student numbers on the University programmes (for three academic years):

A business plan should be appended, to be completed jointly by the prospective partner and University staff-see example at appendix.

Qualifications of students on entry, including English language requirements:

Mode(s) of study:

Source of student funding:

Professional Body requirements:

Perceived benefits of the collaboration to the associated School and/or to the University:

Has a link staff member been identified within the School to develop the project?

Proposed start date:

Details of input or resources required from the University:

Details of key proposers:

- in the University

- in the Partner

Does the proposal comply with the University's regulations?

Exit Strategy: In the event of the partnership terminating, how will the students enrolled with the University be seen through to completion of their studies? Options

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

58

include (i) the partner to 'teach out', use of University staff to deliver modules and provide support, FDL delivery and support or transfer on-campus or to other institutions.

<u>Please note:</u> It is the responsibility of the institution seeking to collaborate with the University to disclose any material facts that you are aware of regarding any legal issues or publicity related issues that may have arisen at the institution.

6. ANY FURTHER INFORMATION

Recommendation of whether to proceed: YES/NO

Form Submitted by

Date:

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

59

Example of outline business plan for TNE partnership

		2012/13	**2013/14**	**2014/15**
Income				
Number of Students		15	25	30
Net Stage Fee (GBP£)		1,200	1,200	1,200
Total fee income (GBP£)		18,000	30,000	36,000
Expenditure				
Payment to School	20%	3,600	6,000	7,200
Consultancy Payment	0.00%	0	0	0
External Examiners				1,200
Assessors				500
Moderators				
Flights		1,200	1,200	1,200
Travel & subsistence		700	700	700
Other		300	300	300
Legal				
Total Income		18,000	30,000	36,000
Total Expenditure		5,500	7,900	10,800
Contribution		12,500	22,100	25,200
Contribution % sales		69	74	70

NOTES:

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified
28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

60

GUIDANCE ON PREPARING ADVERTISING AND OTHER PUBLICITY

Procedure for preparing advertising and publicity materials

Procedure for preparing advertising and publicity materials for collaborative partners

Persons responsible for preparing advertising and publicity material should read this guidance in conjunction with:

- Cardiff Metropolitan University Commitment to Students - Systems and Responsibilities Handbook:

  http://www3.uwic.ac.uk/English/studentservices/Documents/Commitment%20to%20Students-Systems%20and%20Responsibilities%20Handbook%202012.pdf

- Part C of the Quality Assurance Agency Quality Code for Higher Education 'Information About Higher Education Provision':

  http://www.qaa.ac.uk/AssuringStandardsAndQuality/quality-code/Pages/Quality-Code-Part-C.aspx

- Cardiff Metropolitan University Brand Guidelines. Available via Cardiff Metropolitan University's Creative Services (see below for contact details).

Definitions

Marketing/publicity material includes the following items:

- Advertisements;
- Corporate brochures including prospectus entries;
- Direct marketing material;
- Posters;
- Press releases;
- Product brochures and fliers;
- Mail shots;
- E-mail marketing;
- Use of Twitter, Facebook and other social media;
- Websites.

Photographs of Cardiff Metropolitan University, copies of Cardiff Metropolitan University's logo and other publicity materials are available from the Collaborative Provision Office. Cardiff Metropolitan University will retain the ownership of copyright, trademarks and any other applicable intellectual property rights at all times.

Rationale

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

61

Cardiff Metropolitan University and its partners need to promote a clear and consistent message regarding its programmes offered on a collaborative basis to ensure that intended audiences receive accurate and appropriate information about higher education programmes. Such information should be fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy (QAA Quality Code: Section C). These procedures advise on the production of publicity materials, which enables Cardiff Metropolitan University to oversee the messages communicated to partners, students and to external audiences. The potential for damage arising from publicity is very real and Cardiff Metropolitan University will continue to exercise great vigilance and take action wherever necessary.

These procedures are designed to ensure that:
- The consistency of marketing and publicity materials using Cardiff Metropolitan University's name is maintained;
- The message communicated is accurate, consistent and not contradictory;
- Cardiff Metropolitan University's corporate image is maintained and protected;
- Marketing and publicity materials do not compromise but enhance Cardiff Metropolitan University's image;

All publicity and advertising materials should ensure that:
- the institutional relationship with regard to the programme is accurate (e.g. franchise or validated);
- the awarding body and title of the award are correct;
- all programme information is an accurate reflection of its approval at franchise approval/validation;
- progression details are accurate;
- accurate information regarding fees, accommodation and transfer opportunities to Cardiff Metropolitan University are included;
- the Cardiff Metropolitan University logo (where used) complies with corporate image requirements.

The Collaborative Provision Office will make checks against the above and will also ensure that:

- there are no inappropriate or misleading comparisons with other programmes or providers;
- there are no derogatory statements about other institutions or organisations;
- there are no misleading statements about the awarding body, the recognition of awards by public or other authorised bodies;
- prospective students are not mislead with regard to the recognition of the award by a professional or statutory body;
- there are no misleading statements about entry requirements, credit for prior learning or length of time that may be required to secure an award.

Where necessary, advice will be sought from the relevant programme Moderator(s)/Link Tutors in order to ensure that any statements regarding a collaborative programme or partner institution are accurate. The Collaborative Provision Office will also liaise, where necessary, with Cardiff Metropolitan University's Communications, Marketing and Student Recruitment Unit to ensure the correct use of Cardiff Metropolitan University's brand.

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

62

Institutions that have submitted a programme for consideration by Cardiff Metropolitan University can only advertise the degree as 'subject to validation/final approval' with approval from the Cardiff Metropolitan University Collaborative Provision Manager. This "subject to validation/final approval" status will need to be maintained until all the conditions of franchise approval/validation have been met to the Panel's satisfaction. Any admission offers made to prospective students on the basis of this advertising must be made conditionally, subject to approval of the degree by Cardiff Metropolitan University.

Creative Services and Brand Use Guidance

For support and advice when developing promotional material you may contact Cardiff Metropolitan University Creative Services at:

Creative Services
Communications, Marketing and Student Recruitment (CMSR) Unit
Cardiff Metropolitan University
Western Avenue
Cardiff
CF5 2SG

Email: creativeservices@cardiffmet.ac.uk
Tel: 0044 29 2041 6044

Procedure for the Approval of Marketing/Publicity Materials

All marketing materials should be sent to the Collaborative Provision Office for review and approval on behalf of Cardiff Metropolitan University. Alternatively, materials can be sent in hard copy to Collaborative Provision Office at the following address:

Collaborative Provision Office
Cardiff Metropolitan University
Western Avenue
Cardiff
CF5 2SG

Email: collaborativeprovision@cardiffmet.ac.uk

Please allow five working days for approval. Cardiff Metropolitan University will have absolute discretion as to the contents of any statements, advertisements or other promotional material prepared by the Institution for publication for the purposes of attracting the candidates to the collaborative programme.

The Collaborative Provision Office will maintain a record of marketing materials.

Monitoring

The Collaborative Provision Office routinely (every 2 months) check collaborative partners websites to review the content included. Should any material found to be misleading or inaccurate it will be required to be amended or removed with immediate effect.

Pro Forma

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

63

All institutions will be required to complete a pro forma issued annually by the Collaborative Provision Office indicating compliance with these procedures.

Penalties

Cardiff Metropolitan University reserves the right to take action on institutions failing to adhere to these procedures. These might range from suspending the right to use Cardiff Metropolitan University's name in advertisements and, ultimately, to the possible withdrawal of franchise approval/validation.

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

64

ASSESSMENT APPROVAL PROCESS FOR CARDIFF METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

Under no circumstances should any assessment that contributes to a final award be undertaken until it has been approved by the External Examiner.

1. **Draft Coursework Assignments / Examination Papers**

   All coursework assignments and examination papers that contribute to the final award of a programme should be approved by the External Examiner prior to being given to students. This also applies to re-sit examinations.

   Where the assessments undertaken on a collaborative programme are the same as those on a University programme delivered at Cardiff Metropolitan University, the assessment approval process used at the University should take precedence over this assessment approval process.

2. **Submission of all Draft Assessments**

   Draft examination questions and coursework assignments must be sent to the Collaborative Provision Office **at least 10 weeks** before the examination/hand-out dates. If assessments are received less than ten weeks before the examination date/hand out date, then the assessment may be postponed. It is expected that re-sit assessments (both examinations and coursework) are submitted at the same time as the first assessments.

   All assessments must be accompanied by assessment criteria and must include clear rubric (see below). Institutions may send draft assessments by email. Assessments should be sent to the University's Collaborative Provision Office. Alternatively, please send hard copies to the Collaborative Provision Office by ordinary mail.

   In certain cases 'banks' of questions may be collated by collaborative partners to be used for assessment. In these cases the approval by the relevant Moderator/Link Tutor and the External Examiner must be received for each assessment.

3. **Information to be supplied with Draft Assessments**

   All assessed work should contain the appropriate rubric (name of module, programme, date, duration, materials allowed, open or closed book. See the example below for rubric which should be included on the front page of an examination paper.

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

65

- Title of Programme
- Title of Module (and module No.)
- Duration of Examination
- Date of Examination

Instructions to Candidates

- Specify clearly how many questions should be attempted, for example: 'All questions to be attempted' or 'Answer 2 out of 5 questions' or 'Answer 3 questions, at least 1 from Section A and 1 from Section B'.

- Provide information on marks available, for example: "All questions carry equal marks" or "Marks for each question are shown in brackets".

- If multiple choice questions are being used, state clearly whether or not <u>negative</u> marking is to be used.

- Statements are required defining any books or equipment which students may bring in to the examination. (In general it is accepted that non-programmable calculators may be used.)

- Paginate if examination paper continues overleaf and/or on another page. State clearly 'turn over' or 'continued on p.' at foot of page.

4. **Transmission to Moderators/Link Tutors and External Examiner(s)**

The Collaborative Provision Office will forward all draft assessments to the Moderator/Link Tutor for consideration and suggested amendments. Moderators/Link Tutors are asked to comment within 5 working days of receiving the draft assessment, where possible. Comments will be referred back to the Partner Institution and a revised version, incorporating any changes arising from Moderator/Link Tutor comments should be sent to the Collaborative Provision Office within 5 working days.

The draft assessments, will then be forwarded to the External Examiner by the Collaborative Provision Office for approval. If necessary, the External Examiner and the Moderator/Link Tutor should consult with regard to draft assessments. The External Examiner may approve all assessments (with or without comment) or may request that revisions are made to all/some assessments and may then request to see the final drafts before final approval, using the attached proforma. Institutions will be advised by the Collaborative Provision Office.

Institutions should incorporate External Examiner comments into final assessments to be taken by candidates - in the event of a disagreement over a recommendation, the Moderator/Link Tutor should discuss the issues concerned with the Programme Director and External Examiner.

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

66

5. **Assessment Calendar**

   An Assessment Calendar which specifies the dates that assessments are to be taken with estimated dates for the submission of draft assessments should be sent by the Partner Institution to the Collaborative Provision Office at the start of the academic year. Please refer to the attached example.

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

67

Draft Assessment Cover Sheet

Institution Name:

Programme:

Module:

☐ **Exam**

Exam Title:

Date of Exam:

Duration of Exam:

Open or closed book exam:

Detail any allowable materials in the exam room:

Instructions to candidates included ☐

☐ **Assignment**

Assignment Title:

Assignment Hand out date:

Marking Scheme included ☐

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

68

Draft Assessment Approval Proforma

External Examiner Name:

Institution Name:

Programme:

Module: Assignment/Exam Title:

☐ I confirm that I have considered the above draft assignment/exam and I am content to approve the content.

☐ I confirm that I have considered the above draft assignment/exam and I am content to approve the content subject to the following amendments:

```



```

☐ I confirm that I have considered the above draft assignment/exam and suggest the below amendments. I would like to see the final amended version of the assignment before I confirm approval.

```



```

NB. Comments may also be added onto the draft assignment/examination paper.

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

69

Sample Assessment Approval Calendar

Name of Institution:	
Assessment Approval Calendar Part 1: Draft Examinations	
Examination Period Dates:	Semester 1: December 15-19
	Semester 2 : May 21-25
Send draft assessments to the Collaborative Provision Office for Moderator/link tutor consideration:	Semester 1: 6 October
	Semester 2: 12 March
Deadline for return of Moderator/link tutor Comments:	Semester 1: 5 working days
	Semester 2: 5 working days
Send revised draft assessments to Collaborative Provision Office for External Examiner approval:	Semester 1: 5 working days
	Semester 2: 5 working days
Deadline for Collaborative Provision Office to return External Examiner Comments:	Semester 1: usually within 10 working days
	Semester 2: usually 10 working days
Final amendments to draft assessments and resubmission if required:	Semester 1: 5 working days
	Semester 2: 5 working days
Assessment Approval Calendar Part 2: Draft Assignments	
Assignment handout dates:	Semester 1: December 15
	Semester 2 : May 21
Send draft Exams to the Collaborative Provision Office for Moderator/link tutor consideration:	Semester 1: 6 October
	Semester 2: 12 March
Deadline for return of Moderator/link tutor Comments:	Semester 1: 5 working days
	Semester 2: 5 working days
Send revised draft exams to Collaborative Provision Office for External Examiner approval:	Semester 1: 5 working days
	Semester 2: 5 working days
Deadline for Collaborative Provision Office to return External Examiner Comments:	Semester 1: usually within 10 working days
	Semester 2: usually within 10 working days
Final amendments to draft exams and resubmission if required:	Semester 1: 5 working days
	Semester 2: 5 working days

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

70

'External Moderation' Model of Collaboration

1. Rationale

Under the 'external moderation' model of partnership, Cardiff Metropolitan University staff will provide quality assurance guidance on behalf of the University and play a developmental role with partners. The University logo may, if local laws permit, appear on any certificates issued to students in order to recognise this role.

2. Responsibility

The University's role is solely limited to that of the provision of quality assurance guidance and assisting with the development of the partner. Any awards granted will not be awards of the University. For the avoidance of doubt students will not be enrolled with the University.

The University shall not be awarding the degree and accepts no liability whatsoever for any claim or challenge made by any student any prospective student or any other person.

In the event of any such claim being directed at the University, the partner shall indemnify the University against all such claims and liabilities, costs, expenses, damages and losses (including but not limited to any direct, indirect or consequential losses, loss of profit, loss of reputation and all interest, penalties and legal costs (calculated on a full indemnity basis) and all other professional costs and expenses) suffered or incurred by the University.

3. Definition

The 'External Moderation' process involves a member of the University staff acting as external quality and standards moderator, on behalf of Cardiff Metropolitan University, for programmes offered at partner institutions. The role is similar to, but broader than that of a traditional External Examiner in the UK system. The role is external in the sense that the staff member is external to the partner institution.

The awards are not those of the University, nor are students enrolled with the University: the role is developmental, with an aim of providing quality assurance and enhancement support to partners overseas and to support their academic development as institutions. In time, other collaborations may develop from such a partnership, including on-campus transfers, joint research and staff/student exchanges.

4. Duties

The external moderator will have the following specific duties on behalf of

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

71

Cardiff Metropolitan University:

(a)   to moderate the work of the partner (including: draft assessments and marked assessed work)

(b)   to attend Assessment Board meetings, up to twice per year

(c)   to be satisfied that the students have been assessed within the partner institution's regulations and have attained standards consistent with similar programmes

(d)   to visit the partner organisation at least once a year to meet staff and students

(e)   to report annually to the University's Collaborative Provision Committee on the assessment process and other issues related to the operation of the programme

(f)   to liaise with the partner institution and Collaborative Provision Office to ensure that any recruitment, publicity or other literature relevant to the programmes which is produced by the partner is approved by the University in advance of publication.

5.   Overview of the Role

The University is seeking to develop partnerships with institutions overseas through appointing 'external moderators' to support the development of partners.

In order to approve a new partnership of this nature, documentation regarding the partner and the proposed programmes should be submitted for consideration. A check on the prospective partner's standing in-country will be carried out. At least one member of staff from the University shall undertake a visit to the prospective partner in order to meet with colleagues and view facilities.

A written report on the visit should be submitted to the University Collaborative Provision Committee and the Academic Quality and Standards Board.

Following the approval of the report, an agreement between both parties will be signed. The agreement will require the University appointed external moderator to provide quality assurance support for an award, which while conferred by the partner, have the assessment and quality processes overseen by the University external moderator.

Certificates awarded to successful candidates will be issued by the partner organisation. However, in recognition of the partnership, the certificates awarded may include, if local laws permit, both the partner and the University logos. In addition, accompanying text along the lines of "Award quality assured and moderated by Cardiff Metropolitan University" will also be

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

72

included on the certificate. The exact wording of the text and the size and location of the University logo must all be approved by the Collaborative Provision Office. An example certificate is included in Appendix 2. It is also expected that the partner institution will market the fact that the University is quality assuring and moderating their award (with any publicity material submitted to the University for approval). Transcripts issued to students by the partner should also record that the award was made by the partner and quality assured by the University.

The partner institution will pay a fee for this arrangement and this document outlines the minimum requirements and role of the University external moderator.

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

73

1. The external moderator role in practice

(i) Getting Started

The first role of the external moderator is to get to know the staff that they will be working with at the partner institution. It is useful if you can identify a single point of contact who you can communicate all matters to and who will be able to disseminate this information to the staff working/teaching at the institution.

The second task is to become familiar with the programme that the partner institution is delivering, its modules, learning and teaching methods and assessment. Specifically you should know how many modules there are and the type and number of assessments you can expect to moderate for each of these. It is recommended that you obtain a copy of the equivalent to the programme specification and read and understand it. Any issues/inconsistencies with the documentation and the programme that you identify should be raised with the partner at this time. If the partner doesn't have a programme specification document then get them to write one and supply them with an example of one of yours if this helps them.

Next, you should familiarise yourself with the operation and delivery of the programme. Specifically you should know the start and end dates of the programme, when and how students are recruited to the programme, when the boards of examiners are likely to be. This is important as you may be called upon at short order to perform moderation duties as the staff at the partner institution may well be operating under tight deadlines etc. Furthermore, a role of the external moderator is to attend the award board and getting this date into the diary as early as possible is useful.

Finally, you should familiarise yourself with the rules and regulations of the programme which the partner institution is operating to. Specifically you should be fully aware of the rules regarding passing/failing a module, reassessment, infringements and the overall rules governing the conferment of the award. In some cases this will not be documented and in which case you should help the partner write this document if required. It is important to remember that the award is that of the partner, rather than the University, and if the partner wishes to offer "Distinctions", "Merits" or "Commendations" on a two year Diploma then this is permitted, as long as the rules and criteria for the award of these are clearly defined.

The operation and number of module assessment boards, programme assessment boards and programme boards of studies each year is negotiable and should be agreed at the outset of each academic year and timetabled accordingly.

(ii) Pre-Moderation

Assuming that you have visited the partner institution, been introduced to your contact, read and understood all of the documentation and are happy with

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

74

this, then your role as external moderator begins with pre-moderation. The partner institution should provide you with any assessments that they intend to release to their students in order to give you an opportunity to view these well in advance of them being issued to students. Assessment criteria should also be provided, where these are available. The timescale for this should be agreed with the partner institution. If the institution provides electronic copies of the assessment via email this is a good way to speed up this process.

Having read the supplied assessments you should provide some feedback to the assessor on the level, appropriateness of, complexity, content and mapping to the module learning outcomes. There is no formal feedback sheet for this, but you may wish to implement one based upon those used in your own School. You should also indicate whether or not you wish to see a revised copy of the assessment before it is issued to students or whether you are happy for the institution to distribute to their students assuming but insisting that they will act upon the comments you have made.

(iii)   Post-Moderation

After students have completed their assessments and they have been marked by the partner staff, you should visit the institution in order to conduct at least part of the next stage of the moderation process. However, depending on the number of assessment boards which have been agreed you may not visit on every occasion that a board is held. You may wish for example to have some assessed work sent to you and only attend certain assessment boards in person – you may participate by telephone or videoconference. You will need to negotiate this with the partner institution.

The first stage of the post moderation process is to examine the marked work. The institution will need to be made aware that all marked work should be retained for you to view, however you may only be able to view a sample of the work if the cohort of students is very large. The institution should also be informed that it is good practice to prepare a "module box" for each module, where sample work for each cohort is retained as are the moderation feedback comments you will make during the visit. In viewing the assessments, marking and feedback you should comment on the quality of the marking, the consistency of the marking and the feedback given to students. Feedback should be in a written form and may be provided on a feedback sheet so that the module leader can benefit from the transfer of knowledge and improve upon the marking/assessment for the next iteration.

Meeting with students and collecting student feedback is essential for determining how the operation of the programme is perceived from the student body and also to ensure that the students are aware of you and your role. You may wish to collect feedback through a formal feedback form or conduct a student meeting (ideally in private). Any issues raised by students should be fed back to the relevant staff in the partner, and the confidentiality of the students should be observed wherever possible.

As an external moderator you should ensure that the partner institution

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

75

convenes an assessment board and a programme committee. As a minimum this should include the chair (a senior member of staff from the partner institution), an officer, the teaching team and you. These should be operated in a similar fashion to how Examination Boards operate within the University. As moderator you will provide comments regarding the level of the work scrutinised (similar to the External Examiner role for the University programmes). You may also wish to recommend altering marks if you feel that this is necessary. You should ensure that the board operates to the agreed rules and regulations set down for the programme. You may be asked to sign a formal record of the decision of the board in terms of the agreed awards.

Following the assessment board, it is recommended that a Programme Committee (along the lines of those held at the University) is held, including student representation. The Programme Committee may also agree and implement changes to the programme and rules and regulations, provided that this fits in with the processes at the partner.

Institutions may require the external moderator to sign the certificates awarded to successful students (see Appendix A). Whilst this can be time consuming, especially if there are large numbers of students, please bear in mind that this is very important to the students.

In the event of serious concerns being expressed by the University external moderator regarding the standard of the awards being made, the concerns will be discussed with senior management of the partner institution and if remedial action is not taken to the external moderator's satisfaction within the agreed timescale, the University reserves the right to withdraw from the arrangement.

(iv) Written Report

You are required to provide a written report to the partner institution at the end of each academic year.

This should also be sent to the University's Collaborative Provision Office and to your Director of Learning and Teaching. An example report is in included in Appendix 3. The report should cover all aspects of the operation of the programme and highlight any changes that you would like addressed, preferably before the next operation of the programme. Information in the report will have been informed from all aspects of the processes described above. The partner should confirm receipt of this report and may wish to respond to the comments you have made.

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

76

Appendix 2 – Example Certificate

NB: To be issued by partner not by the University

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified 28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

77

Appendix 3 – Example External Moderator's Report

External moderator's Report

Institution:	
External moderator(s):	
Visit Date(s):	
Reporting Period:	

Overview:

Overall Points Of Commendation:

Areas For Consideration:

Signed:	
Date:	

Academic Handbook 2013/14 – Volume 2 - 09.2 – Collaborative Provision Principles and Procedures – modified
28.06.13, last modified 06.12.13

78