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1 COLLABORATIVE PROVISION AT UWS

The key principle for collaboration at the University of the West of Scotland (UWS) is that collaborative arrangements should offer a comparable learning experience to students studying at a partner institution and should widen learning opportunities without prejudice to the standard of the award that is offered to students. This can be achieved via openness between both parties, compliance with regulations and procedures, and clearly defined roles and obligations of both parties to safeguard the standards of the award and protect the student experience.

There are a range of potential collaborative partnerships opportunities that can be explored. These include:

1) **Franchise Model**, which can include:
   
a) **Local delivery** of a UWS award/part of an award at another site with learning and assessment by staff of that organisation that are approved as Recognised Teachers of the University (RTU);
   
b) **Joint delivery** of a UWS award at another site with learning and assessment undertaken by staff of both institutions;

2) **Validated Model** - Validation of another institution’s programme of study as a University of the West of Scotland award;

3) **Dual or Joint award** granted by one or more other awarding bodies;

4) **Collaborative Research Supervision** between UWS and another HE institution for MRes and PhD Research students registered at the University of the West of Scotland;

5) **Professional Development** – development of specialist programmes or short courses to provide various training and skills development opportunities.

Collaboration is constantly evolving and some partnerships do not neatly fit into the above defined categories; sometimes hybrid models exist. Where this occurs the closest model will be applied with bespoke arrangements put in place.

**Transnational Education (TNE)** is the provision of education for students based in a country other than the one in which the awarding institution is located. All the opportunities identified above can be offered through TNE, which supports the UWS Corporate Strategy to deliver an academic portfolio that provides students with globally relevant skills which contribute to global reach.

For the purposes of this guidance, overseas partnerships which lead to streams of students coming to UWS to take its awards in Scotland are not considered collaborative and may be termed as articulation routes/Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL), albeit within the framework of common ambitions and agreement to work together.

**QAA UK Quality Code – Partnerships**

The University has reviewed and embedded the expectations and practices as outlined in the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education, in particular the ‘Partnerships’ Chapter.

From the Quality Code, “Providers work in partnership with a wide range of organisations, including awarding bodies, other education providers, non-academic providers (or those whose purpose is not primarily education) and employers. When doing so, awarding bodies retain responsibility for the academic standards of their awards and for the quality of the student experience.”
The UWS processes and approach to managing collaboration activity have been informed by the Quality Code and a primary core practice states:

“Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them.”

The Partnership Chapter applies to the management of 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 than the degree-awarding body. Teams will also find it helpful to review other relevant chapters of the Quality Code, such as the new ‘Learning and Teaching Chapter’ and ‘Student Engagement Chapter’ to ensure the provider actively engages students, individually and collectively in their educational experience.

If you have any questions or are about to embark on a collaborative development, please contact QuEST who can provide expert guidance and advice. All documents required for completion, which relate to Collaboration, are lodged within the Collaborative Document Catalogue and are available on the SharePoint site https://studentmailuwsac.sharepoint.com/sites/QualityHandbook2021-22/Shared%20Documents/CHAPTER%209%20COLLABORATIVE%20PROVISION. The Collaborative Document Catalogue is intended as an active document which will be updated throughout the year as required.

Scottish Institutions are subject to an external Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR) with the UWS ELIR being held in 2019. The ELIR Outcomes Report (November 2019) confirmed that UWS has ‘effective’ arrangements for managing academic standards and the student learning experience. In particular, the report cited in relation to Collaborative provision – “the University has a strategic and focused approach to managing its collaborative provision which includes targeting a smaller number of core partners and strengthening its processes for approving, monitoring and reviewing the provision to ensure partnerships align with institutional priorities and business processes. The University is encouraged to continue with the implementation of the enhancements it has identified to the management of its collaborative provision which have improved its oversight of these awards and the experience of students studying through collaborative partners.” This positive endorsement provided affirmation that we have robust and flexible processes with respect to collaboration noting that UWS is responsive to the needs of this continually evolving field within the sector in providing assurances that it remains in line with requirements and is effective in its approach.
2 DUE DILIGENCE PROCESSES

The University carries full responsibility for the assurance and control of the quality of any certificate, diploma or degree delivered (either in the UK or overseas) in its name. It is therefore imperative that adequate and appropriate due diligence is undertaken and that the financial, legal, academic and reputational risks of all proposals are adequately assessed in advance of commitments being made to proceed to partnership or the approval to offer awards collaboratively. It is the University’s intention that the due diligence process will facilitate a positive engagement between both partners.

In line with the Partnerships Quality Code, guiding principles state that “Due Diligence enquiries are completed and legally binding written agreements are signed prior to the commencement of student registration – due diligence enquiries are refreshed periodically and before agreements are renewed.”

The due diligence process is outlined in the UWS due diligence procedure which can be accessed on the Legal Services UWS intranet site. The Due Diligence Group (DDG) is responsible for signing off Due Diligence reports and meets on a quarterly basis. The Due Diligence Group determines whether collaborative proposals should proceed, thereafter this feeds into the Partnerships and Collaboration Committee (PCC). Due Diligence is required for all new partners for all collaborative proposals, irrespective of the model (e.g. Franchise, Validated, Dual, Joint or Research). Other circumstances may also require Due Diligence consideration.

The University Secretary is the Chair of the Due Diligence Group. The Secretary to the Due Diligence Group is currently Janice Logan (Legal Services).

2.1 Two-Stage Due Diligence Process

Due Diligence takes place in the following two stages:

(i) Due Diligence Stage 1 (DDS1) - will consider CreditSafe Report and 3-Years Audited accounts prior to any further exploratory work by a Partner. If accounts are not considered satisfactory, then this will cease any further work and effort with respect to the partner under discussion. It will be the role of the School FBP to trigger DDS1 by requesting the Audited Accounts and CreditSafe report from partners. Finance Business Partners (FBPs) will be kept informed. DDS1 will require to be signed off by the FBP, providing recommendations where appropriate (PCC Part 1 form, section 6); and

(ii) Due Diligence Stage 2 (DDS2) - to consider the full due diligence elements necessary once the decision had been made to explore further. In addition, for franchise, DDS2 considers the location of an approval event: i.e. whether this should be held at the Partner institution (for TNE In-Country) or at UWS In-House – DDS2 to consider this in consultation with Dean – risk dependent. Proposals which reach DDS2 will be considered by the Due Diligence Group (DDG).

This approach enables prospective partners to provide essential information at the initial stages and then, only once approval in principle/and satisfaction of DDS1 has been met, further details could be explored via the Site visit/PCC Stage 2.

An Interim Due Diligence procedure has been introduced for existing partners which is normally required to be undertaken prior to Collaborative Review. Schools will be invited to complete a pro-forma either relating to a UK based/FE Partner (CD 2.12) or a TNE...
Partner (CD 2.10) form and seek the necessary evidence from the Partner to support due diligence.

A Health and Safety Declaration form (CD 2.11) was introduced during the Covid-19 pandemic to seek assurances from Partners that Partner are committed to adhering with local public health guidance and government legislation relevant to their region. For our UK-based Partners, there is an expectation that UK legislation shall be followed.

An overview of Due Diligence procedures is illustrated in the following Due Diligence Flowchart (CD2.1): (next page)
**DUE DILIGENCE STAGE 1 = DDS1**
**DUE DILIGENCE STAGE 2 = DDS2**
**PRE-COLLABORATIVE CHECKLIST**
Part 2 = PCC Part 2

**Due Diligence Flowchart**

1. **Proposed New Collaborative Partner**
   - Audited Accounts & CreditSafe Report considered
     - Requested by International Centre/Reviewed by Finance
   - DDS1 - Financials
     - Completed in tandem with PCC Part 1
     - Financials MUST be signed off by Chief Finance Officer (CFO).
   - Successful DDS1 - Authorization to proceed to PCC Part 2
   - PCC Part 2 Completed / School Endorsement
     - Authorization to proceed to DDS2

2. "Due Diligence Checklist" Completed (TNE Version) CD2.3
   - Completed by School Risk Rating confirmed by Legal Services
   - "Due Diligence Checklist" Completed (FE Version) CD2.8
   - Completed by School

3. **Due Diligence Group (DDG)**
   - SUCCESSFUL = PROGRESSES TO ACADEMIC APPROVAL
     (See Collaborative Approvals Flowchart)
   - ESTABLISHED PARTNER
     (Following Successful Academic Approval)

4. **Periodic Due Diligence**
   - Due Diligence Group

5. SUCCESSFUL
   - Continuation of Partnership
   - School considers Exit Strategy / Action Plan

6. UNSUCCESSFUL
   - No Partnership / Amendment to Partnership. School contacts Proposed Partner

---
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The following Due diligence guidance and pro-formas exist as detailed in the Collaborative Document Catalogue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro-forma:</th>
<th>Completed by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CD 2.1 Due Diligence Flowchart</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlines the DD process, different stages and pro-formas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CD 2.2 Due Diligence procedure</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This process outlines the responsibilities of UWS and the partner with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regard to DD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CD 2.3 Due Diligence Checklist</strong></td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This must be filled in prior to DD and before proposal can progress to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDG.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CD 2.4 Due Diligence Checklist - Risk Rating Guidance</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To assist with completion of DD checklist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CD 2.5 DD Checklist – Additional Campuses (TNE only)</strong></td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be used when an existing TNE Partner wishes to add a campus for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delivery of pre-approved programme(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CD 2.6 DD Checklist – Existing Partner (TNE only)</strong></td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This pro-forma should be used when a School wishes to collaborate with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an existing partner on a new project or programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**CD 2.7 Due Diligence Checklist Further Education Colleges (Previous</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bespoke for FE Colleges where a Partnership has previously existed; will</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not often be required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CD 2.8 Due Diligence Checklist Further Education Colleges (New Partner)</strong></td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For FE Colleges where a Partnership has not previously existed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CD 2.9 Health and Safety Checklist</strong></td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For inclusion in Annual Site visits to ensure continued H&amp;S requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of delivery sites. This features as an Appendix to CD 1.2, CD 1.5, CD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3 &amp; CD10.4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**CD 2.10 Due Diligence Checklist – Interim Review of Existing Partner</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TNE Only)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is used for TNE to facilitate periodic Due Diligence. Normally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undertaken in tandem with Collaborative Review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CD 2.11 Health and Safety Declaration</strong></td>
<td>N/A for DD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced during Covid-19 to seek assurances from Partners that Partner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is committed to adhering with local public health guidance and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government legislation relevant to their region. For our UK-based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners, there is an expectation that UK legislation shall be followed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**CD 2.12 Due Diligence Checklist – Interim Review of Existing Partner</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(UK-based / FE Partners Only)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is used for UK-based/FE to facilitate periodic Due Diligence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normally undertaken in tandem with Collaborative Review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**CD 2.12 Due Diligence Checklist – Interim Review of Existing Partner</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Change of Legal Entity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N/A Streamlined DD – NO SEPARATE CHECKLIST</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The above DD templates will be used as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due Diligence documentation is owned by Legal Services. This process involves providing supporting material regarding the partner – such as financial reports/audited accounts, references, risk assessment, other evidence as appropriate.

Schools are responsible for the completion of the Due Diligence Checklist, and for providing the necessary supplementary material required for consideration by the DDG. This is irrespective of where the proposed partner originates from, in terms of FE, TNE or other.

Due Diligence must be satisfactorily completed before any proposal with a new partner can proceed any further.
3 COLLABORATIVE APPROVAL PROCESS

3.1 Introduction

The approach to collaborative approval at UWS is outlined in the following sections which are intended to provide guidance in the development, approval and ongoing monitoring of collaborative provision arrangements.

Collaborative provision may be initiated in a number of ways: it may be part of an existing relationship with a partner, the University may be approached with a potential opportunity, or the University may seek to build a relationship with a new partner.

All collaborative proposals are subject to approval, and this guidance has been developed to highlight the approval processes for Franchised programmes (Local and Joint delivery), Validated programmes, Joint and Dual awards, and Collaborative Research Supervision. There is recognition however that proposals develop differently and one size does not fit all. The principles outlined in Chapter 9 should be followed so far as possible where bespoke arrangements can be arranged where necessary.

3.2 Lead-in Time for New Collaborative Proposals:

All proposals should ensure that there is appropriate lead-in time to ensure the necessary steps are completed in order to maximise the efficiency of the process and enable a supportive and developmental dialogue between UWS and the proposed partner. Colleagues should be aware that Due Diligence process can often be quite lengthy.

Schools should allow at least 8-12 months from bringing forward the proposal to when the partnership is proposed to commence. The approval process must NORMALLY be COMPLETED 3 months before delivery. A shorter deadline may be approved by the Deputy Principal or Vice Principal (Teaching, Learning and Students) after consultation with the Vice Chancellors Executive Group (VCEG).

3.3 Academic Approval / Re-Approval Procedures

The approval mechanisms are summarised in the following flowcharts and guidance within this chapter:

- Collaborative Approvals Flowchart (New Partners) (CD 3.1)
- Due Diligence Flowchart (CD 2.1)
- Process Flowchart during Active Partnership (CD 13.1)
- Checklist for New Collaborative Proposals (Stages) (CD 3.4) (Appendix 2)
- Academic Approval Guidance for different Collaborative Models (below)
- Collaborative Review Process Flowchart (CD 11.1)

Approval procedures will normally be consistent for new Partners in the UK and overseas.

For all new Partners, the processes outlined in the following Collaborative Approvals Flowchart (New Partners) should be adopted. This flowchart should be used in conjunction with the Checklist for New Collaborative Proposals (Stages) (CD 3.4) (Appendix 2).
CD3.1 COLLABORATIVE APPROVALS FLOWCHART: (overpage)
3.3a Franchise Model – Collaborative Approval Process
(Also applicable to Joint/Dual)

Please follow the detailed stages outlined in the Checklist for New Collaborative Proposals (Stages) (CD 3.4) (Appendix 2). Thereafter refer to the guidance below in relation to the Academic Approval stage specific for Franchise partnerships.

PREAMBLE
Franchise partnerships involve the delivery of a UWS award at another delivery location. These are existing UWS awards, so no scrutiny is necessary via New Programme Proposals (NPP) procedures. The Portfolio Advisory Group (PAG) should however be notified via the Rationale for Franchising (CD 1.4) pro-forma to advise of any proposed new delivery location and to seek approval in principle – this keep enables an overview of where programmes are delivered out with our own UWS campuses.

Subject to satisfactory School considerations, costings and Due Diligence requirements being met, Franchise partnerships will require a Full Academic Approval Event, led by the Partnerships and Collaboration Committee, to take place.

Key Points – Franchise Academic Approval:

- The Partnerships and Collaboration Committee will lead the approval;
- A Full Academic Approval Event will take place (either In-Country or In-House);
  For new partners, this could be either In-Country or at a UWS Campus, but decisions will be taken on an individual basis to determine the most appropriate approach based on risk.
- Approval Event will normally be Chaired by Chair of the Partnerships and Collaboration Committee (or nominee);
- Secretary to the Partnerships and Collaboration Committee (or nominee) will coordinate the event, making all necessary arrangements and will draft the full approval report;
- Event will consider the ‘Academic Case’ and operational details;
- The Partnerships and Collaboration Committee will conclude the approval by notifying the recommendation of the Approval Panel at a subsequent PCC meeting.

Documentation for Academic Approval of a Franchise Partnership

The Collaborative Proposal Documentation required for the Approval Event will include the following:

- Briefing Paper Coversheet (CD3.5);
- Academic Case for Collaborative Provision – Franchise (CD3.2);
- Confirmed Academic Delivery Model;
- Operational details (depending on nature of proposal);
- Recognised Teachers of the University (RTU) information;
- Resources Library/List (where applicable);
- Exit Strategy;
- Programme Details - including an updated Programme Specification which accurately reflects collaborative delivery;
- A Financial Summary (For information only, not for scrutinising);
- Draft Collaborative Agreement (drafted by QuEST).
The Collaborative Proposal Documentation is prepared by the School together with input from the proposed collaborative partner in consultation with QuEST, Legal Services, International Centre, Finance, Registry, and Admissions/Recruitment, (as appropriate).

Appropriate School scrutiny should take place prior to the submission of the final event material. School-led scrutiny with Partner input.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Academic Case for Collaborative Provision is only applicable for the Franchise model. The main headings are outlined below:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Context;  
- Details of the Provision;  
- Quality Assurance and Enhancement (including University policies);  
- Facilities and Resources;  
- Communication Arrangements;  
- Recruitment Selection and Admissions;  
- Recognition of Prior Learning;  
| - Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB);  
- Marketing and Publicity;  
- Staffing Arrangements / RTU;  
- Student Induction Arrangements;  
- Learning, Teaching and Assessment;  
- Student Support and Guidance;  
- Graduation Arrangements;  
- Provisional Exit Strategy. |

**Approval Event – Format for a Franchise Partnership**

For Franchise Partnerships, a Full Academic Approval Event should take place. The event-style approval event will seek to provide increased opportunities for enhanced scrutiny of the proposed collaborative partnership prior to final 'sign-off' as well as providing additional assurances on quality and standards in line with the QAA Quality Code and providing opportunities to discuss the overall strategic direction in more detail. Consideration of the financial model will NOT be considered at the event and will be addressed earlier in the approval processes prior to the event (in line with the proposed Collaborative Approvals Flowchart).

An exemplar/proposed draft Approval Event Agenda for a Franchise In-Country event is outlined in the Collaborative Document Catalogue (CD3.5).

**Location of Approval Event (Franchise): In-Country or UWS In-House**

Inevitably, all proposals will vary and for some Partners there may be clear reasons why an In-Country Approval Event would be desirable; mainly due to associated risk. However, UWS In-House Approval Events may also be considered in certain instances should the risk be considered minimal. Due Diligence will make a recommendation as to the location of the Approval Event for individual Partners and proposals. Furthermore, there may be scope to merge In-Country/and In-House events by identifying some UWS staff members to participate in the event at the Partner location with video conferencing to UWS; individual variants can be considered on a case-by-case basis. The ongoing pandemic will obviously impact the feasibility of overseas events where most approval events will be facilitated remotely with campus use where possible.

If In-Country, the panel will meet with Partner Senior staff and Partner teaching staff and have a tour of facilities. There may be an opportunity to meet with Partner students to gauge their general experiences of the institution, but they would be from an existing programme of the Partners.

If In-House, video conferencing will normally be used, and there will be an expectation that senior staff from the Partner will physically attend UWS for the event. Sessions with Partner teaching staff would be via video conference. As franchise, UWS students on the programme (at UWS campus) could input with views on how a Franchise delivery may benefit from an additional delivery location.
Feedback from both UWS colleagues and from across the sector indicates there are benefits to holding In-Country Events as these facilitate building the relationship with the Partner as well as meeting first hand with teaching staff, assessing their facilities and speaking with existing students as to their experiences. The level of English language competency among teaching staff can also be gauged, which is clearly important as UWS programmes should be taught and assessed in English. Feedback suggests, they also appear to nurture the ongoing relationship with the Partner.

Where existing franchise partners are increasing provision, such as adding a new programme, this would not require an In-Country event.

Any costs associated with an In-Country approval event would be borne by the Partner and should be taken into account when the Costing Model is applied.

**Constitution of Franchise Approval Panel**

The Partnerships and Collaboration Committee will determine the location of the Approval Event on receipt of recommendations from Due Diligence Group. The membership of the Franchise approval panel shall normally comprise:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval Panel – Franchise</th>
<th>Applicable for TNE and FE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair of Panel</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chair of PCC (or nominee)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Academic (eg. Dean/Deputy Dean/Head of Division) (<strong>Interchangeable – one PCC member minimum required from either category</strong>)</td>
<td>To consider academic delivery model (from out with proposing School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic (<strong>PCC member</strong>)</td>
<td>To consider academic delivery model (from out with proposing School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Member of QuEST</td>
<td>To advise on Regulatory aspects and take forward the Collaborative Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of TNE &amp; Mobility or International Partnership Development Manager</td>
<td>For TNE proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor to the Panel (Academic from proposing School)</td>
<td>Normally person who undertook Site Visit to Partner Institution: Programme Leader designate presenting the proposal / Potential Link Tutor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary to PCC (or nominee)</td>
<td>To coordinate and arrange approval as required, and draft approval report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services representative (<strong>normally a member of PCC</strong>)</td>
<td>Optional For FE proposals (where deemed necessary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Registry representative</td>
<td>Optional (Could provide feedback at the scrutiny stage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External subject expert (Optional)</td>
<td>Optional To provide an independent view of the subject area/Partner facilities etc. (Note: As this is a Franchise programme, the curriculum has already been approved via UWS normal approval mechanisms (where external input will have been taken into account) – this is why this panel member is optional).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Outcome of the Franchise Approval Event**

The Secretary to the Partnerships and Collaboration Committee (or nominee) will produce the final approval report and ensure any conditions are made on behalf of the Panel.

If approved at the event, QuEST will finalise the Collaborative Agreement, and the relevant Senate sub-committee will be advised of the outcome. The Financial Annex is also confirmed in consultation with the School, their Finance Business Partner, the Partner and QuEST.

QuEST will also notify existing External Examiner(s) of the additional delivery location(s) for the provision for which they have been assigned.

**3.3b Validated Model – Collaborative Approval Process**

The University may be approached to validate an award at another institution which will be offered collaboratively. For example, where that institution wishes to offer a degree but does not have degree awarding powers. This is referred to as ‘validated model’ at UWS.

Please follow the detailed stages outlined in the Checklist for New Collaborative Proposals (Stages) (CD 3.4) (Appendix 2). Thereafter refer to the guidance below in relation to the Academic Approval stage specific for Validated partnerships.

**PREAMBLE**

Validated partnerships involve the validation of another institution’s programme of study as a UWS award. As these are new UWS titles/awards, these proposals will require scrutiny and endorsement via the New Programme Proposal (NPP) procedure. Completion of an NPP Form (CD1.3) is available for completion and consideration by Portfolio Advisory Group (PAG).

Subject to PAG approval (notifying VCEG), satisfactory School considerations, costings and Due Diligence requirements being met, Validated partnerships will require a Full Academic Approval Event, normally to be held at the Partner Site (either within the UK or overseas). The approval event is co-ordinated by the School in liaison with the partner. The continuing pandemic may impact In-Country approval events and decisions will be made on a case by case basis as to whether the approval can progress by an alternative approach.

Where existing Validated partners are increasing provision, such as adding a new programme, this would not normally require an In-Country event. Decisions may be subject to the nature of the proposal and will be made on a case by case basis.

Any costs associated with an In-Country approval event would be borne by the Partner and should be taken into account when the Costing Model is applied.

As a new programme is being proposed, the University’s guidance on Approval and Accreditation (Chapter 4 of the Quality Handbook) should also be followed. This chapter will also highlight the requirements for School scrutiny and timescales for the circulation of paperwork. Further guidance can be provided by QuEST.
Key Points – Validated Academic Approval (NEW PARTNER):

- NPP procedure is required to be undertaken as new award title;
- The Partnerships and Collaboration Committee will retain oversight of the approval;
- A Full Academic Approval Event will take place *normally at the Partner Site*;
- Approval Event will be Chaired by a Senior UWS Academic (normally Dean or Deputy Dean) (or nominee);
- **The School will coordinate the event** (in liaison with the Partner), making all necessary arrangements and will draft the full approval report and ensure any conditions of approval are met;
- Event will consider the Collaborative Proposal Documentation in line with the University’s guidance on Approval and Accreditation (Chapter 4 of Quality Handbook);
- The Partnerships and Collaboration Committee will conclude the approval by notifying the recommendation of the Approval Panel at a subsequent PCC meeting.

Approval Event – Format for a Validated Partnership (NEW PARTNER)

For the academic approval, the Partner, in collaboration with the School, completes the required paperwork for a validated model (**approval paperwork will be in line with Chapter 4 of Quality Handbook**). The School must arrange a scrutiny event and paperwork amended in accordance with the recommendations. **Validated models require a formal approval event to be arranged at the Partner Institution (current pandemic impacting overseas travel).** The Partner will normally cover all costs associated with the approval event in country. This should be factored into the costing model from the outset to ensure expectations are clear, as should other initial set-up costs.

**Documentation for Academic Approval of Validated Partnership**

The paperwork should be drafted by the School and proposed partner, the documentation will be the same as that required for approval of a new award at UWS, i.e.:

- **Programme Design & Development Plan (PDDP);**
- **Programme Specification (UWS template)** (confirming academic delivery model);
- **Module Descriptors (UWS template);**
- Operational details (depending on nature of proposal);
- Resources Library/List (where applicable);
- Exit Strategy;
- CVs of Proposed Staff; and completed Validated New Staff Pro-forma;
- A Financial Summary (For information only, not for scrutinising);
- **Draft Collaborative Agreement** (drafted by QuEST on receipt of material).

The School will review the collaborative proposal documentation. School scrutiny will take place prior to this information being presented at the approval event.

**Professional Support Department Input:**

As part of the development of the documentation to support the validated model, there should be partnership working with relevant professional support departments (specifically Registry and the International Centre). This is essential to ensure clarity on
the student journey, maintenance of academic standards, and effective operation of assessment practices and processing. This will be key to informing the discussions of the panel at the approval event.

**Proposed Partner Teaching Staff:**
Prior to the approval event, staff CVs will be reviewed by the School to ensure their suitability for teaching the validated programme(s). Completed Validated New Staff Pro-forma’s (CD 7.6) will also be required.

**Outcome of the Validated Approval Event**

The School will produce the final approval report and ensure any conditions are made on behalf of the Panel. The outcomes of the approval event for validated model will mirror those of normal programme approval at UWS (see Chapter 4 of the Quality Handbook). The School will be expected to address any conditions within the timescale identified by the panel and provide a formal response to the Chair on any recommendations.

If approved at the event, QuEST will finalise the Collaborative Agreement, and the relevant Senate sub-committee will be advised of the outcome. The Financial Annex is also confirmed in consultation with the School, their Finance Business Partner, the Partner and QuEST.

**Constitution of Validated Approval Panel**

The School will arrange an event normally at the proposed Partner Institution (pandemic pending). The membership of the Validated approval panel shall normally comprise:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval Panel – Validated</th>
<th>Applicable for TNE and FE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Panel</td>
<td>Dean/Deputy Dean (or nominee) (from out with proposing School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic (PCC member)</td>
<td>One internal member of academic staff to consider academic delivery model (from out with proposing School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External subject specific expert(s) (Compulsary)</td>
<td>Nominated by the School To provide an independent view of the proposed programme and determine whether the academic content is suitable; as well as to review the subject area/Partner facilities etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Member of QuEST</td>
<td>To advise on Regulatory aspects and take forward the Collaborative Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Partnership Development Manager</td>
<td>For TNE proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services representative <em>(recommended to be a member of PCC)</em></td>
<td>For FE proposals (where deemed appropriate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor to the Panel (Academic from proposing School)</td>
<td>The School will also identify an appropriate colleague who will act as Advisor to the panel to represent the School and be able to answer subject/School specific questions and queries from the panel and the partner to ensure timely responses and resolution of queries at the event. <em>(Normally person who undertook Site Visit to Partner Institution: Programme Leader designate presenting the proposal / Potential UWS Collaborative Contact)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrator for Event</td>
<td>To coordinate and arrange approval as required, and draft approval report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Normally School staff member)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Registry representative</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Could provide feedback at the scrutiny stage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>The School can invite other members in addition to the above if they deem it necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon approval, **External Examiner(s)** must be appointed to cover the new validated provision. See section 10 for details.

### 3.3c Proposed changes to a Partnership Whilst Active – Approval Process
Where a Partner wishes to propose changes whilst a Partnership is active, a summary of activities is detailed in the **Process Flowchart during Active Partnership (CD 13.1)**. (see next page)

### 3.3d Honorarium Fee for External Panel Members
External Panel members on collaborative approval panels (all models) are eligible to receive an honorarium fee for their participation in an event. Details are available from QuEST on request.
Curricular -: Minor Amendments to an Existing Programme Structure

Franchise Partners
A Franchise Partner is unable to make changes to the programme structure as these are UWS awards.

Where UWS make changes through the relevant Divisional Programme Board, the Partner should be consulted and kept informed of decisions via the Link Tutor.

Validated Partners
A Validated Partner may wish to revise existing programme or module content during the period of agreement (outwith collaborative review timelines). Minor changes can be facilitated annually via the Joint Programme Panel (JPP).

Significant changes may require approval via the School/Divisional Programme Board. QuEST should be consulted and if deemed appropriate an approval event may be necessary.

Contractual -: Proposed Amendments which affect Contractual Arrangements

Proposed Change
A School may wish to revise an existing approved Collaborative Partnership to facilitate proposed amendments and/or additions during the period of agreement. Details of some options listed below:

Collaborative Model (Existing Partners)
Pro-forma applicable to which model?

Collaborative Document Catalogue
Pro-forma Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative Document Catalogue</th>
<th>Franchise</th>
<th>Validated</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW CAMPUS – Academic Case</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW PROGRAMME – Academic Case</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW MODE OF DELIVERY (CD6.3)</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW PROGRAMME &amp; NEW CAMPUS –</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pro-forma Options:
- **CD6.1**: Collaborative Provision: Proposed NEW CAMPUS – Academic Case
  - To be used when a new campus is added to an existing partner (franchise or validated). Existing programmes only.
  - The site visit report (with health & safety checklist) is embedded within this document.
  - Franchise: ✅, Validated: ✅, Research: ✅

- **CD6.2**: Collaborative Provision: Proposed NEW PROGRAMME – Academic Case
  - To be used when a new franchise programme is added to an existing partner.
  - Franchise: ✅, Validated: N/A, Research: N/A

- **CD6.3**: Collaborative Provision: Proposed NEW MODE OF DELIVERY (CD6.3)
  - (e.g. Full or Part-time route to an existing programme.)
  - To be used when a collaborative programme is proposing a new mode of delivery. Rationale required.
  - Franchise: ✅, Validated: ✅, Research: N/A

- **CD6.4**: Collaborative Provision: Proposed NEW PROGRAMME & NEW CAMPUS – Validated
  - (No separate pro-forma exists)
  - Where a Validated partner proposes a new programme and delivery site, this would require a full new Academic Approval cycle (as per Approvals Flowchart–New partners) (i.e. start at the PCC Part 2)
  - Franchise: N/A, Validated: ✅
  - Start at PCC Part 2 (as if new approval)
  - Research: N/A

- **CD6.5**: Collaborative Provision: Proposed NEW RESEARCH COLLABORATION
  - To be used when an existing franchise or validated Partner wishes to explore opportunities to build on the partnership with PhD/Research opportunities.
  - Under Review
  - Liaise with Doctoral College to progress
  - N/A
3.3d Internal Approval Event - Amendments to an Existing Validated Partnership

Where an approval event to process amendments to an existing validated partnership is deemed necessary, there is scope to streamline the event accordingly. The following will normally apply:

The School will coordinate any necessary event (in liaison with the Partner), making all necessary arrangements and will draft the full approval report and ensure any conditions of approval are met.

Internal Event for New Campus (EXISTING Validated Partner)
The event will take place on a UWS campus and will include an opportunity to:

- Meet with colleagues from the School to understand the rationale for expansion and anticipated student numbers;
- Meet with the UWS Collaborative Contact and Programme Co-ordinator at Partner Institution to explore QA and QE approaches, staff expertise to deliver the programme (either physical or virtual attendance);
- To explore the outcome materials supporting the amendment/addition (e.g. NEW Campus Pro-forma include site visit) with the relevant School representative(s);
- Confirm arrangements for enrolment, assessment processing and timescales with Registry;
- Consider current operation of the Joint Programme Panel / Degree Assessment Board in terms of Quality Assurance and Annual Monitoring;
- Receive assurances that staff CVs have been considered;
- Agree date of first intake at new delivery location.

Panel Members
The panel will normally consist of:

- Chair (normally an Dean / Deputy Dean);
- Representative from Registry;
- Representative from QuEST;
- If deemed appropriate: Head of TNE & Mobility/International Partnership Development Manager (TNE) or designated Marketing, Recruitment and Engagement colleague (FE)
- Representative from another School not involved in the proposal.

As external involvement formed part of the initial approval event, it is not required at this stage in line with normal UWS process for adding a new campus and / or PT / FT delivery routes.

Documentation for the Event
The School should provide the following paperwork:

(i) A completed Collaborative Provision: Proposed NEW CAMPUS – Academic Case Pro-forma.;
(ii) Any proposals for additional Teaching Staff at new campus, including CVs./completed pro-formas;
(iii) Evidence of student feedback;
(iv) Evidence of effective operation of JPPs/DABs in terms of Quality Assurance.;
(v) Confirmation Due Diligence has been satisfied (for new Countries/Regions, this may be of particular relevance).;
(vi) Confirmation Financial Costing model has been agreed.

Please contact QuEST for support and advice for any other queries.
3.4 Validated Model – Responsibilities of Partner

Key aspects of a Validated award are:

- Whilst UWS is the degree awarding body, students enrolled on validated collaborative models are termed as the ‘Partner’s students’ with respect to certain elements of the partnership.
- In general, students will normally be bound to the policies and procedures of the Partner Institution, with the exception of Assessment Regulations and other quality assurance elements. Any exceptional arrangements are identified within the Collaborative Agreement.
- Students will receive a learning experience comparable to that at a UWS campus, wherever they study.

3.5 Revisions to Teaching Staff (Both Franchise and Validated)

Schools are required to confirm on an annual basis their teaching or supervisory staff with respect to all collaborative models.

Any revisions to the staffing complement should be highlighted in the annual report on collaborative staff through the approved mechanism as detailed in the collaborative agreement: normally via the School Board (Franchise) or JPP (_validated).

Depending on the distinct nature of the partnership, it may be appropriate for staff to be approved as Recognised Teachers of the University (RTU) (RTU for Franchise only). RTU staff require to be reapproved annually by the School.

Staff teaching on validated collaborative programmes must be approved either at the original approval event or via the Joint Programme Panel (JPP). A standard pro-forma is available for use (C.D 7.6) and proposed new staff must be approved by the External Examiner or have independent external approval. Validated teaching staff require to be reapproved annually by the School.

Taught Collaborations:
School Boards are required to maintain accurate records of teaching staff at collaborative Partners (for all Collaborative models – both franchise and validated) and to confirm this annually via School Board.

Research Collaborations:
School Boards are required to maintain accurate records of Recognised Supervisors of the University (RSU) (for research Collaborations) and to confirm this annually via School Board.
4 **JOINT & DUAL AWARDS**

The Development of Dual and Joint awards will only be considered where:

- The University and the partner organisation(s) already have successful existing provision in the subject area and at the academic level of the proposal;
- Degree awarding powers are held by the partner organisation(s);
- Learning resources and the learning environment are appropriate to the delivery of the award(s).

**a) Joint Award**

A Joint award involves the granting of a single award with one or more collaborating authorised bodies for the successful completion of one programme of study.

Key aspects of a Joint award are:

- Students will receive a learning experience comparable to that at a UWS campus, wherever they study;
- UWS will be involved in the assessment of all students to whom the Joint award will be made.

**b) Dual Award**

A Dual award involves the granting of separate awards by both the University and a collaborative partner, for a single programme of study. The two awards will be based on the same assessed student work and can only be granted when the objectives of the programme have been achieved at the same point in time.

Key aspects of a Dual award are:

- Students will receive a learning experience comparable to that at a UWS campus, wherever they study;
- UWS and the partner organisation will have reviewed and agreed to accept each other’s assessment marking for components of study undertaken at each institution.

**Approval of Joint & Dual Awards**

Joint and Dual Awards differ from the validated model as students, on a joint/dual are UWS students. The approach for approving these awards is bespoke, dependent on the nature of the proposal. It is recommended that any plans for the development of a Joint or Dual award are discussed with QuEST at the earliest opportunity.
The Academic Approval stage for individual Research partnerships normally comprise of bespoke arrangements involving In-House discussions involving the Partnerships and Collaboration Committee, Doctoral College and REAC. Any enquiries should be directed to the Doctoral College in the first instance.

PREAMBLE
Research at UWS comprises various models. Staff engage in high quality research which is multi-disciplinary and cross-disciplinary and involves collaborations with a wide range of internal and external contacts. Many individual researchers have formal associations with other institutions (e.g. research pools) and many more have informal associations with a wide network of colleagues. A number of research student programmes will involve an external supervisor based within another institution to add breadth to the supervisory team. These arrangements are supported by the work of the Research & Enterprise Advisory Committee (REAC) and managed under the University Regulations, where applicable.

The Doctoral College Board is a sub-group of REAC and ensures compliance with the Research Degree Regulations.

The Board also ensures that the standards of awards are maintained. The University also seeks out formal partnership arrangements with appropriate institutions to further its strategic objectives. The key stages for the Academic Approval stage of collaborative arrangements leading to a research award from UWS are bespoke depending on the nature of the proposal.

Responsibilities for Approval of Research Collaborations
There should be discussions with the Doctoral College with final approval of the proposed partnership resting with REAC. The Partnerships and Collaboration Committee should be kept apprised of all developments and have involvement in the approval stage prior to the outcome of approval agreed by REAC.

Documentation for Approval of Research Collaborations (under review)
A Model of Collaboration including delivery pattern, structure and use of consumables and resource should be developed. The costing model should be completed in liaison with the Doctoral College, affected School and Chief Finance Officer. The Collaborative Agreement should be drafted by The Doctoral College. Depending on the nature of the partnership being proposed, it may also be necessary to prepare a Programme Specification and Module Descriptors to support the approval of the partnership.

Monitoring and Review (Research Collaborations) (under review)
Annual review and monitoring of arrangements will be undertaken and reported to REAC. The Doctoral College will lead on the review and annual monitoring activities and there is a recommendation that one annual site visit to the Partner be undertaken (optional). The continuing pandemic may impact this and remote platforms utilised.

For implementation from 2019/20 onwards, the Doctoral College is required to complete the following table on an annual basis for submission to REAC (normally at Oct/Nov meeting annually) or retain an equivalent record for endorsement:
This new approach will facilitate a mechanism to receive assurances from Partners that the Collaborative Agreements are operating effectively, and will assist when reaching periodic Collaborative Review. In general, confirmation of the continuing support for the research students will be sought in terms of resources, consumables and supervision arrangements. The student experience will form a key aspect of all review activities and feedback will be sought from students and the Partner. The financial annex will be reviewed and agreed on an annual basis by the Doctoral College.

A formal review will be performed at least every five years (by completion of the Collaborative Review Research Pro-forma - CD 11.4). Appropriate Schools and the Partnership and Collaborations Committee will be informed of outcomes. The Doctoral College should alert the Head of QuEST to any concerns about the collaborative partnership which are highlighted as part of annual monitoring or formal review.

6 THE COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENT

A Collaborative Agreement is required for all collaborative partnerships (Franchise, Validated model, Joint/Dual and Collaborative Research Supervision). QuEST is responsible for preparing a draft Collaboration Agreement (for taught provision) detailing operational issues to be drawn up in line with University Regulations and the UK Quality Code in advance of the collaboration and made available to the partner and the panel for comment and development. The Doctoral College is responsible for preparing Collaborative Agreements for Research collaborations.

The Collaborative Agreement is specific to the individual partnership and is not intended to be identical in all cases and covers a range of possible arrangements and will be refined in view of each individual collaboration. Draft templates for Franchise, Validated and Research are available as outlined within the Collaborative Document Catalogue (CD4.2, 4.3 & 4.4); these will be tailored to suit individual collaborative arrangements during the approval process.

The Collaborative Agreement will be finalised by both parties and signed following relevant approval activity. The University of the West of Scotland has approved signatories who can sign off these agreements, this will normally be the Deputy Principal, and the Vice Principal (Teaching, Learning and Students), and Vice Principal (Research, Innovation and Engagement).

The signed Collaborative Agreement is the legally-binding document which outlines the rights and obligations of both parties and will be subject to periodic monitoring and review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative Research Partner</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date of Annual Visit (if applicable)</th>
<th>Outcome of Visit/ or Regular discussions with Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Where no site visit undertaken, please indicate the approach to routine communication)</td>
<td>(To include student numbers, ongoing confirmation of facilities and resources, feedback from students and supervision arrangements)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1 Financial Annex

All Collaborative Agreements are required to have a completed Financial Annex appended.

The Financial Annex is owned by the University’s Finance Department and advice and support can be provided from Finance in terms of completion. The Financial Annex is often variable between partners but includes some standard sections such as the collection of fees and payment schedules.

7 PARTNER STAFF INVOLVED WITH TEACHING

The requirements associated with partner staff involved with teaching will depend fundamentally on which collaborative model exists with UWS. Regardless of the collaborative model, Partners will identify a Programme Co-ordinator who will be the lead contact for liaison with UWS.

All staff teaching on programmes leading to a UWS award are required to submit CVs to their Link Tutors/Collaborative Contacts on an annual basis. These are reviewed through the appropriate School to ensure that relevant and appropriate expertise remains in place to deliver the programmes.

The following table outlines the key differences in terms of staffing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Franchise Model Partnerships</th>
<th>Validated Model Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognised Teachers of the University (RTU)</td>
<td>Staff CVs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Applicable to RTU on Collaborative Programmes only)</td>
<td>(Not London based RTU)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All partner staff delivering any element (teaching and assessment) of teaching on a franchise programme must complete the University’s RTU process.
- The RTU process is outlined in a flowchart. A person specification and guidance for RTU exists. RT1 forms require completion for new RTUs. (See Franchise Operational Manual (CD 13.2) for details)
- RTU are not employees of UWS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UWS Lead Contact(s):</th>
<th>UWS Lead Contact(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UWS Link Tutor</td>
<td>UWS Collaborative Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Service Delivery Manager (SSDM)</td>
<td>School Service Delivery Manager (SSDM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Link Tutor Role:</th>
<th>Collaborative Contact Role:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Link Tutors are responsible for overseeing the RTU process on behalf of the School in terms of seeking RTU approval and in the ongoing monitoring of this. In liaison with the Programme Team, they will review the CVs of new academic staff at the collaborating institution to ensure they are suitably qualified, experienced and developed.</td>
<td>Collaborative Contacts, on behalf of the School, are responsible for the ongoing monitoring of staff teaching on validated provision. School to determine appropriateness of proposed Teaching Staff nominations during scrutiny PRIOR to the JPP. Where applicable, this may be at the assigned Divisional Programme Board. This is monitored through JPPs annually and sent to School Board for approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As part of School/JPP endorsement, the External Examiner should be consulted on academic expertise prior to JPP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring of RTU staff – annual task:</th>
<th>Monitoring of Validated Partner Teaching Staff – Annual Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Link Tutor has oversight of RTU staff.</td>
<td>• Collaborative Contact has oversight of Partner teaching staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Co-ordinated within Schools</td>
<td>• Co-ordinated via Joint Programme Panels (JPPs) (normally April JPP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School Board notified annually of RTU for the coming AY via SSDOM.</td>
<td>• Proposed changes to staffing (submitted via Validated New Staff proforma and CV).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School Board will note any changes to staffing on an annual basis.</td>
<td>• The Partner Staff Annual Record (CD 7.6) is completed by the School (following confirmation by the JPP) and notified to School Board (normally October).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Partner Staff Annual Record (CD 7.6) is completed by the School and notified to School Board (normally October).</td>
<td>• P&amp;OD and QuEST notified accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• P&amp;OD and QuEST notified accordingly.</td>
<td>• Collaborative Contacts attend relevant Degree Award Boards (DABs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• P&amp;OD retains a record of RTU staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Link Tutors *normally* attend relevant School Board of Examiners (SBEs).

*RTU staff (London only) must ensure UKVI criteria is met and all RTU staff are eligible to teach in the UK.

## 8 UWS STAFF INVOLVED WITH PARTNERSHIPS

The requirements associated with UWS staff involved with collaborative partnerships, either locally or overseas will depend on the nature of the collaborative model being adopted.

**Differences in operational quality assurance arrangements between franchise and validated models are continually emerging** as the demand for collaborative provision increases across the sector. Application of the UK Quality Code provides a baseline for use across the sector.

A designated ‘UWS Link Tutor’ is a recognised role for collaborative partnership models (Key Responsibilities and Person Specification exists – CD 8.1)), but the activities of the Link Tutor is tailored more specifically to franchise models and does not align directly to that of validated models. For the validated model it is now more appropriate to have defined activities for the ‘UWS Collaborative Contact’.

In principle the essence of both roles is similar, but operational differences make the details associated with each role distinct. A separate Key Responsibilities and Person Specification for the UWS Collaborative Contact is available (CD 8.2).

### 8.1 UWS LINK TUTORS (For Franchise Partnerships)

The UWS programme team will appoint one of its members as the UWS Link Tutor who will provide the main point of liaison with the partner institution. The partner institution will be asked to name a member of staff as Programme Coordinator for liaison purposes.
The Link Tutor plays a key role in supporting the collaborative partnership maintaining academic standards and protecting the student experience. They will take an active role in the quality assurance and academic development of programmes delivered through collaborative partners which lead to a UWS award. They are an essential part of the academic support offered to collaborating institutions. Activities will include course-specific development of academic staff, pre and post moderation, providing academic advice to UWS and the collaborating institution, and monitoring teaching and assessment.

In recognition of the key role played by the Link Tutor, key responsibilities and a person specification have been developed to ensure consistency in the approach taken across schools.

In terms of annual monitoring, the Link Tutor will contribute to a designated section of the Collaborative Annual Report (for Franchise) to ensure there is regular reflection on the partnership and to ensure clear reporting and feedback through the collaborative annual report.

Further details on operational elements of Franchise partnership and the role of the Link Tutor can be found in the Collaborative Operations Manual – Franchise Model “How to Guide” (CD13.2).

8.2 UWS COLLABORATIVE CONTACTS (For Validated Partnerships)

The School will appoint one of its members as the UWS Collaborative Contact who will provide the main point of liaison with the partner institution. The partner institution will be asked to name a member of staff as Programme Coordinator for liaison purposes.

A validated award (collaborative) involves the granting of an award by UWS to be delivered by non-degree awarding bodies; this may involve UWS offering provision for a discipline out with those currently available at UWS. The Collaborative Contact may not always be a subject expert.

In such instances, Schools should take cognisance of the associated risks as outlined in the UK Quality Code, “Partnerships”. Guiding principle 2, states “The resource needed to deliver a partnership arrangement should be assessed and confirmed at the outset as part of the preparation of the formal agreement. The awarding organisation ensures that it has sufficient resources (physical and staffing) to fulfil its own obligations including having the knowledge, experience and intellectual capital to underwrite the relevant qualifications. There should be mechanisms in place to confirm that the partner also has sufficient resources (physical and staffing) to fulfil their obligations. When delivery and assessment are delegated to a partner, the awarding organisation will retain oversight and approval of the academic staff appointed to the teaching team, where appropriate and as agreed in the formal agreement.” With cognisance of this principle, Degree-awarding bodies that validate modules or programmes are required to ensure that they have in place (or can secure) the relevant disciplinary expertise to approve, monitor and, if necessary, deliver teaching, learning and assessment in the range of subject areas envisaged.

The Collaborative Contact plays a key role in supporting the collaborative partnership maintaining academic standards and protecting the student experience. Collaborative Contacts will take an active role in the quality assurance of programmes delivered through collaborative partners which lead to a UWS award. They are an essential part of the academic support offered to collaborating institutions. Activities will include taking an
active role in ensuring quality assurance elements are fulfilled by participation in relevant forums (such as JPPs, DABs), providing academic advice to UWS and the collaborating institution, and monitoring teaching and assessment.

In terms of annual monitoring, the Collaborative Contact will contribute to a designated section of the Programme Annual Report for Validated) to ensure there is regular reflection on the partnership and to ensure clear reporting and feedback through the Programme Annual Report.

An operational manual for Validated partnerships, which includes further details surrounding the role of the Collaborative Contact can be found in the Collaborative Operations Manual – Validated Model “How to Guide” (CD13.3).

9 SUPPORT FOR COLLABORATIVE PARTNERS

Staff Development opportunities can be organised through Learning Transformation, Innovation and Environments (LTIE) and can be made available to all collaborative partners. Specific Staff Development sessions (where applicable) can be offered to raise awareness of the facilities offered by Student Services, University policies and regulations, quality assurance and enhancement, or any other specific sessions as deemed appropriate to facilitate the collaborative partnership. Online introductory training is currently under development. Staff at the collaborative partners may also be interested in taking modules from our Postgraduate Portfolio (a refreshed Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice is under development).

Where the collaborative programme is offered at UWS as well as at the partner institution, the University would expect at least one member of the programme team to visit the site of delivery during the academic year and, where appropriate, deliver elements of the programme, share good practice with local academic staff and address any issues partner staff wish to raise.

The partner will normally be visited annually by the Dean of School or nominee. At this visit the Dean of School will review the operation of the programme and discuss any relevant issues, tour the premises to ensure that the standard of facilities, equipment and other resources has not deteriorated from those considered as part of the initial visit and have been updated as appropriate. The visit will include a meeting with the full range of academic and administrative staff involved in delivery and administration of the programme and a meeting with the students in order to obtain face-to-face student feedback and discuss any issues with the students. Feedback from these visits should be reported to the University’s Partnerships and Collaboration Committee. Guidance on areas to be covered during annual site visits is available within the Collaborative Operations Manual or on request.

10 QUALITY ASSURANCE FOR COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

PREAMBLE

Schools and their partners will wish to put in place mechanisms to review the development of the relationship and their knowledge of each other’s operations and expectations. Staff in both institutions should seek to develop an understanding of the QAA/Scottish Funding Council (SFC) requirements and other academic infrastructure as external reference points.

In line with the Quality Code on Partnerships, “Courses delivered through partnership arrangements should be subject to quality assurance procedures that are at least equivalent to those of courses delivered by the awarding organisation.”
10.1 External Examiners and Assessment Boards

External examiners ensure the maintenance of academic standards of the collaborative programme irrespective of location or type of collaboration. All external examiners will be appointed by the University via the Academic Quality Committee (AQC) and will be required to submit an annual report (see Chapter 6 of the Quality Handbook).

The University operates a two-tier system of assessment boards: School Assessment Boards (SABs) which confirm the mark, grade and decision for each student on each module and to which School Assessment Board external examiners are appointed; and School Boards of Examiners (SBEs) to which a SBE’s external examiner is appointed and considers the eligibility of students on a group of programmes to progress or gain an award.

In addition to SABs and SBEs the University also operates Degree Assessment Boards (DABs) to which a DAB external examiner is appointed. It is normally the responsibility of DABs to provide an overall judgement on student performance and the quality and standard of validated programmes delivered by the University’s collaborative partners. In some circumstances, however, such as for newer collaborative partners, the University may decide to implement a SAB and SBE system, as detailed above, until it can be assured that the University’s academic standards are being upheld. The system to be implemented for each collaborative partner will be decided on a case by case basis.

From session 2020/21, the following types of Assessment Boards will exist:

- School Assessment Boards (SAB) – Franchise
- School Board of Examiners (SBE) – Franchise
- Degree Assessment Boards (DAB) – Validated (may require SAB/SBE)

Where the programme is delivered at an institution overseas under the validated model, AQC may consider the institution’s nominee for a local external examiner.

10.2 Annual Monitoring of Collaborative Provision

In line with the Quality Code on Partnerships, “Appropriate monitoring and periodic review arrangements should be put in place in line with the awarding organisation’s quality assurance framework; details of such arrangements should be specified in the formal written agreement.”

In terms of annual monitoring of collaborative partnerships, UWS adopts a robust internal monitoring system to safeguard its academic awards and ensure standards are appropriate across all areas of local delivery. Details relating to research collaborations are contained in section 9 ‘Research Collaborations’. Details pertaining to Franchise and Validated collaborative models are identified below. Further details are available in Chapter 7 of the Quality Handbook on ‘Enhancement and Annual Monitoring’.
10.3 FRANCHISE MODEL

(i) Collaborative Annual Report (CAR):
The Collaborative Annual Report (CAR) forms an important part of the university’s annual monitoring cycle for its franchise provision and will be used by UWS Programme Leaders to inform the Programme Monitoring Report (PMR).

A CAR on the operation of franchised collaborative programme(s) should be prepared by the partner institution in liaison with the Link Tutor; there is a designated section for completion by Link Tutor. The report should be submitted annually by end August and will be considered at the Divisional Programme Board as part of normal annual monitoring activities, usually in mid-November.

The template for the CAR should be circulated by the Link Tutor to the partner annually in June.

(ii) School Board of Examiners (SBE):
SBEs decide the eligibility of each candidate for progression between levels of study, and for awards of the University. This arrangement will apply to franchise provision.

Where a SBE is held at the University and all students considered as a single cohort, the external examiner should be provided with a copy of the appropriate Collaborative Annual Report (CAR) from the site of delivery by the School.

10.4 VALIDATED MODEL

(i) Programme Annual Report (PAR):
Where validation of another institution’s programme of study as a University of the West of Scotland award takes place; this is referred to as a Validated Collaborative Model. These students are students of the partner, but quality elements reside with the degree awarding body.

For such validated provision, UWS still maintains responsibility for monitoring that quality and standards are satisfactory, as well as monitoring elements of the student experience. It is therefore necessary for a Programme Annual Report to be completed by staff at the partner institution for consideration as part of our enhancement and annual monitoring processes.

Partners with validated collaborative models should submit a Programme Annual Report (PAR) by end August annually. The PAR should be prepared by the partner institution in liaison with the UWS Collaborative Contact; there is also a designated section for completion by UWS Collaborative Contact. The PAR will be considered by the Joint Programme Panel (JPP) as noted overleaf.

(ii) Degree Assessment Board (DAB):
Degree Assessment Boards (DABs) combine the functions, responsibilities and authority of SABs and SBEs. The DAB confirms the mark, grade and decision for each student. The DAB also considers the performance of students on a validated programme and determines whether the student is eligible to progress to the next stage of their programme or to gain an award.

For programmes approved via a validated model, a Degree Assessment Board (DAB) (Remit - CD 9.3) will be established under the authority of UWS. The DAB will
normally meet at least twice each academic session and include representation from the University and the partner. As noted above, in some circumstances, the University may decide to implement a SAB and SBE system, until it can be assured that the University’s academic standards are being upheld. The system to be implemented for each collaborative partner will be decided on a case by case basis.

For programmes approved via the validated model, partners will be required to complete the Programme Annual Report (PAR) by end of August.

**Joint Programme Panels (JPP):**

The University retains ultimate responsibility for the maintenance of quality and academic standards for all its awards. A Joint Programme Panel (JPP) monitors the academic standards of a validated model and should be established to monitor the operation of validated collaborative programme(s) once they have been successfully approved. The full remit and membership of the JPP (CD9.1), along with a series of JPP pro-formas are available for use as outlined within section 9 of the Collaborative Document Calendar.

The JPP will meet at least twice per academic year, normally in October and March and include membership from both institutions. As UWS retains ultimate responsibility for the maintenance of quality and academic standards for the validated module programme, the JPP plays a key role in monitoring the maintenance of standards, enhancing the student experience, reviewing the operation of collaborative partnership and facilitating a clear communication channel between the University and the partner.

(iii) **Moderation Arrangements (Validated model)**

In line with the UWS Assessment Handbook for Staff, Moderation should be undertaken and is required to ensure reliability and validity of assessment procedures, of the instruments of assessment and of the resulting student grades.

For validated collaborative arrangements, the responsibility for the standard of the UWS award remains with the University. Assurances that Moderation has been undertaken as appropriate are achieved as follows:

- External Examiners are still required to undertake external moderation.
- The partner will be required to carry out satisfactory internal moderation.
- The partner is required to provide evidence that internal and external moderation has taken place and should complete Module Moderation Reports for submission to the appropriate DAB and/or JPP (as appropriate).
11 COLLABORATIVE REVIEW PROCESS

PREAMBLE
UWS adopts a robust internal monitoring system to safeguard its academic awards and ensure standards are appropriate across all areas of delivery. In addition to normal annual monitoring processes (briefly outlined in section 10), collaborative reviews are undertaken periodically.

Formal review events normally occur every 4-5 years, regardless of the type of collaborative arrangement. The event will look in detail at the Collaborative Agreement, ensuring all matters are being implemented as intended and negotiate any proposed amendments to the agreement for the next period of collaboration.

Periodically, arrangements for delivering learning opportunities with others are reviewed to ensure that they are achieving the intended objectives, that the organisations involved remain compatible, and to reassess the academic, financial, legal, ethical and reputational risks.

Whilst the criteria surrounding collaborative reviews hold similar principles for different models, there are slight differences. In particular validated models require re-approval of programmes at collaborative reviews, thereby requiring external subject input.

The collaborative review process for the three main collaborative models is outlined in the following CR Process Flowchart:
COLLABORATIVE REVIEW (CR) PROCESS
Applicable to Franchise/Validated/Research (TNE and FE)

KICK OFF EVENT – Normally Term 1
Arranged by QuEST, involves senior School representatives and Link Tutor / Collaborative Contact.

FRANCHISE/VALIDATED:
QUEST IDENTIFIES DATE for review event & co-ordinates Panel, in liaison with School and Partner – must take place before April of that academic session. All paperwork must be submitted to QuEST two weeks before event.

RESEARCH:
Normally no event required

CR Financial Health Pro-forma – completed by School/Finance (for TNE only) / Periodic Due Diligence (Completed prior to CR)

PREPARATION OF REFLECTIVE REVIEW DOCUMENT (RRD)
FRANCHISE – Template Provided
RRD Franchise pro-forma - Completed by SCHOOL in consultation with Partner

VALIDATED - Template Provided
RRD Validated pro-forma - Completed by PARTNER in conjunction with School

RESEARCH – Complete bespoke
template – RRD Research Review pro-forma - Completed by Doctoral College (in liaison: School & Partner),

SCRUTINY of RRD
Undertaken by School prior to submission of paperwork to QuEST. Partner can attend if validated. Documents signed off by School / Partner

RESEARCH – SCRUTINY
DC undertake their own scrutiny, with guidance from QuEST.

OTHER DOCUMENTS

FRANCHISE –
• RRD (Franchise) – as above
• Report of Original Approval
• Report of last CR (if applicable)
• Latest CAR & Programme PMR
• Latest Annual Site Visit Checklist (F)
• Revised Draft Collaborative Agreement (QuEST provide)
• Latest External Examiner Reports & Responses
• SSG/Student Evaluation evidence
• Other documents as appropriate, (e.g.; any revised PSMD)

VALIDATED –
• RRD (Validated) – as above
• Report of Original Approval
• Report of last CR (if applicable)
• Latest PAR
• Latest Annual Site Visit Checklist (V)
• Revised Draft Collaborative Agreement (QuEST provide)
• Programme Specification & Module descriptors (outlining proposals for change)
• External Examiner Reports & Responses
• IPP minutes / evidence of Student Evaluation,
• Other documents as appropriate

RESEARCH –
As part of approval process, the following may be required:
• RRD Pro-Forma – as above,
• Report of Original Approval,
• Report of last CR (if applicable)
• Latest Annual Monitoring report (notified to REAC)
• Revised Draft Collaborative Agreement (DC provide)
• Evidence of Student Evaluation
• Doctoral College Research Handbook

THE REVIEW
FRANCHISE – led by QuEST
Panel consists of:
• Chair (Chair of PCC or nominate)
• At least one academic from outside School under review
• Member of QuEST
• Member of International Centre (Partnerships) or appropriate Professional Support Staff member (FE)
• Externally Subject expert (optional)
• Advisor to the Panel (normally WUS Collaborative Contact)

VALIDATED – led by QuEST
Panel consists of:
• Chair (Chair of PCC or nominate)
• At least one academic from outside School under review
• Member of QuEST
• Member of International Centre (Partnerships) or appropriate Professional Support Staff member (FE)
• Advisor to the Panel (normally UWS Collaborative Contact)
• PLUS External Subject Expert nominated by Partner (compulsory).

RESEARCH – led by Doctoral College (DC)
No event- normally considered by PCC. However, Visit to Partner normally undertaken by Senior member of DC.
• Pro-forma to be completed on visit to Partner.
• DC meets with Staff and Students on the Partnership

REAC holds responsibility for monitoring and reporting to Senate on standards and quality of research awards. Research Review Pro-forma signed off by Chair of REAC. Reported to PCC.

SUMMARY OUTCOMES prepared by QuEST; Partner / School to meet actions within one month.
FULL REPORT follows (QuEST). Outcome reported to PCC on behalf of EAC which holds responsibility for monitoring and reporting to Senate on standards and quality of taught provision.

QUEST PREPARES UPDATED COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENT – NORMALLY FOR A PERIOD OF 5 YEARS
Documents required for Collaborative Review are outlined below as detailed in the Collaborative Document Catalogue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative Review (CR): Pro-forma / Guidance</th>
<th>Completed by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD 11.1 Collaborative Review Process Chart</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides an overview of the review process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 11.2 Reflective Review Pro-forma – Franchise</td>
<td>School - Franchise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 11.3 Reflective Review Pro-forma - Validated</td>
<td>Partner - Validated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 11.4 CR Research Pro-forma</td>
<td>School – Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be completed by Doctoral College and signed off by REAC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 11.5 Collaborative Review Desk-Based Approach Pro-forma</td>
<td>School – various models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For situations where a full review not appropriate (e.g. Dual).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 11.6 CR Financial Health Assurance Pro-forma (TNE only)</td>
<td>School (TNE only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A pro-forma to assess financial viability of a partnership in tandem with CR. Applicable for TNE only. For implementation from 2018/19 onwards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 11.7 Nomination from for External Subject Expert for re-approval Panel</td>
<td>School – to nominate a subject expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must be completed by Partner to nominate a Subject Expert. External subject experts are compulsory for Validated model, optional for Franchise model.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 EXIT PROTOCOL FOR WITHDRAWING FROM A COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENT

The exit strategy will have been considered and developed as part of the due diligence process. From the Quality Code, “The awarding organisation should have clear internal academic governance arrangements for partnerships. This includes where the authority resides for making decisions about the establishment and management of partnership arrangements and their closure, as well as the allocation of resources.”

In the event of the University deciding to withdraw from a Collaborative Agreement a written rationale and recommendation will be required from the appropriate Dean of School to the Deputy Principal or Vice Principal (Teaching, Learning & Students).

Schools will be required to complete the relevant Withdrawal Pro-forma (outlined below) to reflect the current position of the agreement and to provide a rationale for withdrawal. This should be completed by the Dean of School and the necessary notification letters issued thereafter by the appropriate Vice Principal.

The following withdrawal pro-formas exist:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidance for Withdrawing from a Collaborative Partnership, and accompanying Pro-formas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD 12.1 Exit Protocol from withdrawing from a Collaborative Agreement (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 12.2 Withdrawal Pro-forma 1 – No Students exist:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be completed when withdrawing a Partnership where there are no student commitments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residual obligations of both parties to students to enable them to complete their studies will be specified in general terms within the Collaborative Agreement and detailed arrangements will be drawn up by the School in consultation with the Deputy Principal/or Vice Principal as part of the due diligence.

Should a collaborative partner decide to terminate the Collaborative Agreement, written notice should be forwarded to the appropriate Dean of School in accordance with the terms of the Collaborative Agreement. The Dean of School will be responsible for informing the Deputy Principal/or Vice Principal.

13 REGISTER OF COLLABORATIVE ACTIVITY

The University maintains a register of all current Collaborative Provision leading to the awards of the University. This is held by QuEST and is available on request.

14 MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

A Memorandum of Understanding confirms the intention to establish a co-operative relationship between the University and the Partner Institution. The document reflects the interests of both institutions in developing links, which will widen opportunities and access for students and staff and create enhanced opportunities for both institutions.

A Memorandum of Understanding (CD4.5) is not legally binding and a full written agreement, signed by the University Secretary (or equivalent) of the University and the Partner will be required before any formal collaboration commences.

15 OPERATIONAL GUIDANCE AND SUPPORT

15.1 OPERATIONAL MANUAL – FRANCHISE MODEL

A Collaborative Operations Manual – Franchise Model “How to Guide” (CD 13.2) is available as a source of operational guidance and support.

15.2 OPERATIONAL MANUAL – VALIDATED MODEL

A Collaborative Operations Manual – Validated Model “How to Guide” (CD 13.3) will shortly be available as a source of operational guidance and support.