

# University of Glasgow

**Academic Standards Committee – Wednesday 20 April 2011**

## **Framework for Academic Collaborations and Proposed Changes to Policies/ Procedures**

**Jackie McCluskey and Wendy Muir, Senate Office and International Partnerships  
Development Project Manager**

### **Brief description**

The Framework for Academic Collaborations has been developed to provide a comprehensive set of guidance for the development and establishment of a range of academic collaborations. The Framework provides the context for academic collaborations, including strategic priorities and quality assurance requirements.

The Framework has been developed from existing policies, procedures and guidance. We have also sought to address a number of actions arising from ELIR, the Deloitte's internal audit of international partnerships and the Internationalisation Strategy. To address these actions and to enhance our existing procedures, we have researched other institutions' documentation for benchmarking and best practice. As a consequence, some new policies or procedures are proposed, as are changes to existing policies or procedures.

The Framework document is quite lengthy in hard copy format and has therefore not been circulated with this paper but it can be accessed at [http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media\\_195858\\_en.pdf](http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_195858_en.pdf) (NB. The appendices are not yet finalised). It will also be available as a web based resource, and will be designed to allow users to drill down on particular topics or themes.

The focus of this paper is on the proposed new policies/procedures or changes to existing policies/procedures.

### **Action requested**

ASC is asked to **consider and approve** a number of recommendations/proposals for new or proposed changes policies or procedures relating to academic collaborations. For ease of reference, these are summarised at the end of the paper.

### **Recommended Person/s responsible for taking the action(s) forward**

Jackie McCluskey and Wendy Muir.

### **Resource implications**

If the proposed changes to arrangements for an Institutional Site Visit are approved (based on the level of risk associated with the proposal) there may be a reduction in the costs of undertaking a site visit.

### **Timescale for Implementation (where appropriate)**

June 2011.

**Equality Implications**

Equality and diversity issues, including cultural issues have been taken into account in developing the Framework.

**Originator of the paper**

Jackie McCluskey, External Academic Policy Manager, Senate Office  
Wendy Muir, Assistant Director, Senate Office/ International Partnerships  
Development Project Manager

**University of Glasgow**

**Academic Standards Committee – Wednesday 20 April 2011**

**Framework for Academic Collaborations and Proposed Changes to Policies/ Procedures**

**Jackie McCluskey and Wendy Muir, Senate Office and International Partnerships  
Development Project Manager**

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1. The Framework for Academic Collaborations has been developed to provide a comprehensive set of guidance for the development and establishment of a range of academic collaborations. The Framework provides the context for academic collaborations, including strategic priorities and quality assurance requirements. It will form part of a toolkit for academic and administrative staff, which will also include a risk assessment tool, a due diligence checklist, a business case tool, and a Year 1 operational plan/manual.
- 1.2. The Framework has been developed from existing policies, procedures and guidance. We have also sought to address a number of actions arising from ELIR, the Deloitte's internal audit of international partnerships and the Internationalisation Strategy. These actions are summarised in Table 1 below.
- 1.3. To address these actions and to enhance our existing procedures, we have researched other institutions' documentation for benchmarking and best practice. As a consequence, some new policies or procedures are proposed as are changes to existing policies or procedures, and this is the focus of the paper before ASC.
- 1.4. Some further work will be necessary to address additional aspects of collaborative arrangements (eg things that are not a priority at present such as the procedure for the termination of agreements – these are specified in each agreement but we need to develop a procedure at University level). The Framework will also be added to as we gain more experience.
- 1.5. Colleges have been asked to give some thought (if they have not already done so) to the structures within Colleges for supporting the development of collaborative proposals, and for considering and approving/making recommendations on collaborative proposals (the business and academic case). For example, the International Development Manager in the College of Social Sciences has a key role in supporting the development of collaborative proposals and the College has established a Collaborations Committee to consider and approve/ make recommendations on collaborative proposals.

**Table 1: Summary of Actions arising from ELIR, internal audit of international partnerships and the Internationalisation Strategy**

<b>Action</b>	<b>Arising from</b>	<b>Response</b>
(i) Finalise, implement and promote the University's guidance on Collaborative arrangements	ELIR-related	The Framework for Academic Collaborations has been developed

(ii) Review collaborative arrangements/procedures a) To consider the inclusion of an external member on partnership approval panels, particularly where risk might be judged to be significant, and might be mitigated through the addition of external cultural, as well as academic, expertise	ELIR-related	The inclusion of an external member on partnership approval panels is proposed where risk is judged to be significant
b) To consider the periodic review of partnerships (not just Memorandum of Agreement)	ELIR-related	A new procedure is proposed
c) In relation to the use of University Logo on academic certificates that are not its own.	ELIR-related	This will not be permitted if the University is not involved in the awarding of credit.
d) To consider requirement for Year 1 operational plan and year 1 monitoring	ELIR-related	A year 1 operational plan is proposed together with Year 1 monitoring arrangements
e) to improve procedure around due diligence prior to the development of an MoA	Deloitte internal audit report	Improved procedures for due diligence are proposed.
f) to develop specific guidance around the monitoring of agreements	Deloitte internal audit report	
(iii) Ensure Senate policies and procedures for collaborative arrangements achieve an appropriate balance of efficiency and robustness. Make revisions in the light of experience and from benchmarking with other institutions.	Internationalisation strategy	This has been taken into account in responding to 1 + 2 above and in enhancing current procedures.

More detailed information on each of the above follows.

## 2. Proposed Changes to Policies/ Procedures to Address Actions arising from ELIR, internal audit of international partnerships and the Internationalisation Strategy

### Action 1: Finalise, implement and promote the University's guidance on Collaborative arrangements

- (i) The Framework document is quite lengthy in hard copy format (over 90 pages) and has not been circulated but it can be accessed at [http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media\\_195858\\_en.pdf](http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_195858_en.pdf) (NB. The appendices are not yet finalized). It will also be available as a web based resource, and will be designed to

allow users to drill down on particular topics or themes. It is the intention to finalise the Framework for June 2011 and it will be promoted thereafter. Many of the policies or procedures contained within are already implemented but it will be necessary to highlight any that are new or changed.

## Action 2: Review collaborative arrangements/procedures

### a) The inclusion of an external member on partnership approval panels

- (i) The ELIR 2009 Report asked that the University 'consider the inclusion of an external member on partnership approval panels, particularly where risk might be judged to be significant, and might be mitigated through the addition of external cultural, as well as academic, expertise'. There are two aspects to addressing this particular action. One relates to 'risk' and the other relates to the 'inclusion of an external member of the partnership approval panel'.

#### Risk

- (ii) In terms of risk, research of other institutions practices has established that many use a risk assessment tool to determine the level of risk associated with a particular proposal. The risks may be financial, geographical location and distance, cultural differences or organizational. Identifying the risks associated with a proposal will inform those involved in the University's approval process and help determine how the University/ College/ School or RI will manage these risks by varying the nature and extent of delegation to the partner. The mode of partnership enables the University to exercise a specified degree of control over the partner and the provision that it offers.
- (iii) Consequently, the Framework includes several references to risk and to risk management (Sections 5.4 and 8.4 in particular). In addition, **it is recommended** that a risk assessment tool be introduced and that a completed risk assessment form be required as part of the approval procedures to determine the level of 'risk potential' associated with a proposed collaboration.
- (iv) It is intended that the risk assessment tool informs the decision-making and approval process and not that it provides a definitive position on whether or not a proposal should be considered.
- (v) A template has been developed for this purpose and is attached in [Appendix A](#). Different aspects of risk will be assessed on a scale of *low*, *medium*, *high* or *very high* and a score for overall risk will be calculated. [The template is an Excel spreadsheet which, on completion, will calculate the score for overall risk automatically.]

Overall Risk	Low	Medium	High
Score	16-26	27-39	40-50

- (vi) In addition to an assessment of risk, the proforma includes a confidence measure, ie, the level of confidence with which a risk assessment is made (again, on the basis of Low, Medium or High). This information will be used to help determine the type of institutional visit associated with the proposed collaboration (see (x) below)
- (vii) The risk assessment will be completed by the proposer of the collaboration initially. Relevant staff from RIO and the Senate Office will discuss and agree on the scoring

with the proposer to finalise the risk assessment, which will then be submitted as part of the approval documentation to the Collaborations Group.

*Inclusion of an external member of the partnership approval panel*

- (viii) As part of the current approval procedures, the Collaborations Group may determine, following consideration of the supporting evidence, that further assurances are required concerning the proposed partner institution. If this is the case, the Group will recommend an independent site visit<sup>1</sup>.
- (ix) At present there is only one type of institutional visit and this involves a full panel comprising:
- the Convener of the Academic Standards Committee (or nominee);
  - a senior member of academic staff from a School/Institute other than that or those involved in the proposed collaboration;
  - the Director of Senate Office (or nominee);
- (x) It is **recommended** that the type of institutional visit (where required) should be determined by the level of potential risk associated with the partnership. It is proposed that the Collaborations Group determine the type of institutional visit required on the following basis:

Overall Risk	Type of Visit
<i>High</i>	A full panel visit
<i>Medium*</i>	<b>Either</b> an individual visit by a suitably qualified member of University staff with a degree of independence from the proposal (e.g. International Dean or a College International Lead) <b>or</b> a full panel visit
<i>Low</i>	An individual visit by a suitably qualified member of University staff (e.g. International Dean or a College International Lead)

- (xi) Where the overall risk is in the 'medium' category, any areas of concern in relation to confidence levels will be highlighted to the Collaborations Group (ie low confidence) as will any factors that are considered high risk. This information will be used by the Collaborations Group to determine whether an individual visit or a full panel visit would be appropriate.
- (xii) The panel or individual will prepare a report for the Collaborations Group in line with a template. The Collaborations Group will consider this report in conjunction with the submitted proposal and will reach a recommendation.
- (xiii) It is **further recommended** that an external academic member with, if possible, cultural expertise as well as academic expertise gained through experience of the relevant country, be added as a normal requirement to the membership where a full panel visit is deemed necessary

<sup>1</sup> There are exceptions to this .eg visits are not required for Higher Education Institutions in the UK rated with "confidence" (or equivalent) for quality and standards through a QAA review process or for collaboration with a prestigious EU/overseas institution, as informed by information on quality, reputation and ranking provided by the Recruitment and International Office.

(xiv) Consequently, a full panel visit shall comprise:

- the Convener of the Academic Standards Committee (or nominee);
- a senior member of academic staff from a School/Institute other than that or those involved in the proposed collaboration;
- the Director of Senate Office (or nominee); and
- an external academic member with, if possible, cultural expertise as well as academic expertise gained through experience of the relevant country.

*b) The periodic review of partnerships (not just Memorandum of Agreement)*

- (i) All partnerships are governed by a Memorandum of Agreement (MoA). Prior to the end date of an MoA, arrangements are made to review the MoA but there is no procedure specifically for reviewing the partnership. Research of other institutions practices has established that others do have separate procedures for reviewing the partnership. Such reviews are both retrospective and prospective in that they provide an opportunity for a School and its partner to reflect upon the operation, management and development of the partnership and to also consider the future.
- (ii) Thus, to address the ELIR action, **it is recommended** that the University introduce a new procedure for reviewing collaborative partnerships prior to the end of the period of agreement. Such a procedure has been drafted and is included in [Appendix B](#).
- (iii) It is proposed that the review should be conducted by the College in which the collaboration is based and that the College should recommend to ASC that the collaboration be re-approved or not. An alternative could be an independent panel. However, it is considered more appropriate for the review to be conducted by the College as it is its responsibility:
- to promote, develop and manage the development of strategic partnerships, including international developments:
  - that partnership arrangements are managed effectively
  - to ensure the academic standards of all programmes managed within the College.

*c) The use of University Logo on academic certificates that are not its own*

- (i) When the University set up its partnership between the Faculty of Engineering and MDIS in Singapore it had initially been agreed that MDIS could use the University's logo on certificates of awards which were MDIS alone and to which the University made no contribution. The ELIR reviewers thought there was the potential for confusion amongst students and future employers, and that the University should review this aspect of its agreement with the partner. Our partnership with MDIS has since been terminated but prior to that, steps had been taken to stop their use of the University's logo in this way. As a matter of principle for the future, **it is recommended that** the University should not permit the use of the University Logo on academic certificates that are solely the award of a partner institution and to which the University makes no contribution.

d) *Year 1 operational plan and year 1 monitoring*

- (i) all programmes delivered through collaborative partnerships are
- subject to annual monitoring and review, which is overseen by the College Quality Officer (or Dean of Graduate Studies in the case of PGR students);
  - under the jurisdiction of an External Examiner and a Board of Examiners;
  - considered as part of the relevant University Periodic Subject or Graduate School review process.
- (ii) The ELIR report commented, however, on the lack of any requirement for an operational plan for the first year of a new partnership and encouraged the University to strengthen the first-year monitoring arrangements, particularly for new and complex overseas collaborations.
- (iii) To address this action, it is proposed that a Year 1 operational plan and Year 1 review be introduced. These would be necessary for only certain collaborative arrangements which include:
- Dual/ Double/ Multiple Degree
  - Joint Degree – Taught
  - Joint Teaching
  - Franchise
  - Distance Delivery (depending on role of partner)

*Year 1 operational plan*

- (iv) On the basis of past experience in implementing the partnership with MDIS and of current experience with the new partnership between the School of Engineering and the Singapore Institute of Technology (SIT), **it is recommended** that it be a requirement to develop an operational plan for Year 1 of a new partnership arrangement, which sets out clearly what the responsibilities of each partner are. This would be developed once approval of the partnership had been obtained and would be based on the Memorandum of Agreement but be more detailed and would identify individuals. This is important to ensure that all the necessary arrangements are in place and should be maintained and updated on an annual basis.
- (v) An operational plan template has been developed to assist with this process and is provided in [Appendix C](#). This has been adapted from the University of Derby and can be modified to suit the nature of the collaboration. This will be modified in the light of experience.
- (vi) To ensure that all matters are taken forward and in place for the commencement of the partnership by the due date, the Framework document recommends that a specific individual at either School or College level should be responsible for supporting the post-approval implementation phase. It may be necessary to build this into the business case for the proposal so that appropriate resources are available to support the implementation phase.

*Year 1 review*

- (vii) Research has identified that a number of universities have a procedure for Year 1 monitoring. Edinburgh Napier University's procedure was highlighted as a feature of good practice, and a draft procedure has been prepared based on this and **is recommended to ASC** (see [Appendix D](#)).
- (viii) A Year 1 review would provide a mechanism to allow the University to monitor at an early stage and be confident that collaboration agreements and collaborative programmes are being managed and delivered as intended. Typically a review would be scheduled to take place at between 15 to 18 months after the first student cohort has started their studies. This timing would enable a review team to consider the first annual cycle of delivery of the programme. While annual monitoring will be an ongoing requirement for all collaborative programmes, the emphasis of the Year 1 review will be different and broader. The annual monitoring report will inform the Year 1 review.
- (ix) As with periodic partnership review (see 2b) above), it is proposed that this review be conducted at College level, with onward reporting to Senate via ASC and EdPSC. This is considered the appropriate level of responsibility (ie at the College level), for ensuring the effective management and delivery of a programme offered within the College.
- (x) It should be noted that, as the University, Colleges and Schools/RIs gain more experience of academic collaborations the nature of the Year 1 reviews may change over time, and may become lighter in touch.

*e) Due diligence*

- (i) An internal audit of International Partnerships Agreements was conducted in session 2009-10. The audit report contained the recommendation that 'the University should consider introducing standard due diligence checklists to be completed by the lead contact for each prospective partnership governed by a MoA prior to formal approval by the Collaborations Group'. To address this recommendation, **it is proposed** that the proforma to be completed for the approval of a collaborative partnership will include a due diligence checklist. This will embrace strategic, academic, financial and legal due diligence (see section 5.5 of the Framework for Academic Collaborations).

*f) the monitoring of agreements*

- (i) The internal audit report of International Partnerships Agreements also contained the finding that 'that there is no specific framework around monitoring of the agreements in place across the University, albeit the Collaborations Unit is in the process of establishing such a framework'. The report contained three recommendations associated with this, viz:
- Management should develop a clear framework for obtaining information and updates relating to each overseas collaborative arrangement, ensuring responsibilities are clearly assigned given the recent restructure.

- Academics responsible for the partnerships should monitor the agreements on a regular basis, ensuring that the terms of the agreement are upheld by the partner institution.
  - Annual reports could be produced for Senate, as appropriate, on the operation of these collaborations detailing the activity undertaken in the year and an update on any relevant financial or legal considerations
- (ii) The Senate Office responded to this finding and above recommendations, as follows:

*The University has significant responsibilities to the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) and to the Scottish Funding Council in relation to the development, establishment, operation and management of our collaborative arrangements (most particularly those governed by an MoA), and these are subject to audit and review by the QAA on behalf of the Funding Council through Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR).*

*Arrangements are already in place for the ongoing monitoring and review of the operation of the collaboration and for the review of MoAs. The University would be failing in its responsibilities if they were not. Our recent ELIR identified some areas for development, including the formal review of partnerships and Year 1 implementation plan and review. A framework and schedule for the review of partnerships is being developed (including procedures for the termination of agreements), to complement the current process for the review of MoAs and ensure this is done in a consistent manner.*

*The Senate Office will liaise with RIO over the arrangements for the monitoring and review of MoUs, the latter being more within RIO's remit.*

- (iii) In addition, certain types of collaboration require that a Joint Management Board be established to oversee the operation and management of partnerships as set out in the Memorandum of Agreement. They are, therefore, monitoring the agreement. Monitoring arrangements are also in place for other types of collaborations and these are set out in section 9 of the Framework for Academic Collaborations.
- (iv) In terms of annual reports for Senate on collaborations **it is recommended** that Colleges should submit an annual, composite report to ASC on the operation of academic collaborative programmes within the College to provide assurance that academic standards of all programmes and the student experience are being managed effectively and that any failings are being addressed. ASC would report onwards to EdPSC and Senate. Please note, in making this recommendation there would no longer be the requirement for separate reports to ASC on the operation of Joint Programmes. Under the new arrangement these would be scrutinised by the College. This is considered a more appropriate arrangement as it emphasises greater College ownership of collaborative arrangements.
- (v) In view of the new or revised procedures recommended in this paper and the guidance that is available in the Framework for Academic Collaborations, we believe that these measures should be sufficient for the effective monitoring of agreements.

**Action 3: Ensure Senate policies and procedures for collaborative arrangements achieve an appropriate balance of efficiency and robustness. Make revisions in the light of experience and from benchmarking with other institutions.**

- (i) The Internationalisation Strategy includes the above as an objective. In developing the new or revised policies or procedures contained within this paper we have:
  - researched practices at and benchmarked with other institutions.
  - sought to achieve an appropriate balance of efficiency and robustness
- (ii) In terms of robustness, ASC is reminded that in developing, extending or managing collaborative arrangements and their associated provision, the University has to ensure that its policies and practices are consistent with the [QAA Code of Practice for the Assurance of Academic Quality and Standards in Higher Education: Collaborative provision and flexible and distributed learning \(including e-learning\)](#). A summary of the key responsibilities of the University are outlined Section 5.1 of the Framework for Academic Collaborations.
- (iii) As is our normal practice, we will recommend any necessary revisions to ASC in the light of experience, feedback from colleagues and from ongoing benchmarking with other institutions.

### 3. Summary of Recommendations/Proposals

For ease of reference, the recommendations/proposals contained within are summarised below. **ASC is asked to consider and approve** these.

- (i) it is recommended that a risk assessment tool be introduced and that a completed risk assessment form be required as part of the approval procedures to determine the level of 'risk potential' associated with a proposed collaboration.
- (ii) It is recommended that the type of institutional visit (where required) should be determined by the level of potential risk associated with the partnership.
- (iii) It is recommended that an external academic member with, if possible, cultural expertise as well as academic expertise gained through experience of the relevant country, be added as a normal requirement to the membership where a full panel visit is deemed necessary.
- (iv) It is recommended that the University introduce a new procedure for reviewing collaborative partnerships prior to the end of the period of agreement.
- (v) It is recommended that the University should not permit the use of the University Logo on academic certificates that are solely the award of a partner institution and to which the University makes no contribution.
- (vi) It is recommended that it be a requirement to develop an operational plan for Year 1 of a new partnership arrangement, which sets out clearly what the responsibilities of each partner are. This would be developed once approval of the partnership had been obtained and would be based on the Memorandum of Agreement but be more detailed and would identify individuals.

- (vii) It is recommended that a Year 1 review be introduced to provide a mechanism to allow the University to monitor at an early stage and be confident that collaboration agreements and collaborative programmes are being managed and delivered as intended.
- (viii) It is proposed that the proforma to be completed for the approval of a collaborative partnership will include a due diligence checklist. This will embrace strategic, academic, financial and legal due diligence
- (ix) It is recommended that Colleges should submit an annual, composite report to ASC on the operation of academic collaborative programmes within the College to provide assurance that academic standards of all programmes and the student experience are being managed effectively and that any failings are being addressed.

Regardless of the nature of the collaboration, you should make use of the following pro-forma at an early stage in your discussions to help assess any potential risks associated with your link. Where more complex arrangements are proposed, i.e. those which require the approval of Senate, you should submit a completed risk assessment form to the Collaborations Unit along with your Collaboration Proposal Form.

It is not intended that this serves to provide a definitive position on whether or not a proposal should be considered. Thus, a low risk initiative may be rejected (for example on commercial grounds) whilst a high risk initiative may be explored further (for example on the basis of its potential).

Risks are scored as follows:

Level of Risk	<i>Low</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Very High</i>
Score	1	2	3	4

Overall Risk	<i>Low</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>High</i>
Score	16-26	27-39	40-50

#### Notes

1. The overall total score of any proposal will lie between 16(min) and 50 (max), with a 'rule of thumb' range of 16-26 regarded as 'low risk'; 27-39 as 'medium risk'; and 40-50 as 'high risk'.
2. The role of the partner in the collaboration is regarded as a particularly significant factor in the assessment of risk, so particular attention is paid to this section

If you have any questions about this pro-forma please contact the Collaborations Unit (Lesley.Welsh@glasgow.ac.uk )

**Risk Assessment Tool**

Please complete each section by entering a number in the relevant score box: 1 for category 1; 2 for category 2; etc. Leave blank if not applicable.												
Where more than one programme is included in the proposal and a School feels that risk varies between programmes then separate templates should be completed eg UG vis a vis PG												
Please indicate the level of confidence in your scores (rated Low, Medium and High)												
Name of Potential Partner:												
Name of Programme(s) being considered:												
<b>Partner</b>	<b>Category 1</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Level of Confidence</b>	<b>Category 2</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Level of Confidence</b>	<b>Category 3</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Level of Confidence</b>	<b>Category 4</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Level of Confidence</b>
<b>Location</b>	UK			Europe			Rest of the world					
<b>Partner status</b>	Publically funded HEI - UG and PG			Publically funded HEI - UG only			Privately funded HEI			Privately or Publicly funded (non-Education provider)		
<b>Educational Context</b>	UK-based HE system			European or North American based HE system			Other developed system			Developing system		
<b>Student English Language</b>	UK or overseas - English 1 <sup>st</sup> language			UK-based – English 2 <sup>nd</sup> language			Overseas based – English 2 <sup>nd</sup> language					
<b>Partner's experience of collaboration</b>	Yes at this level			Yes at a different level			None					
<b>Role of partner</b>	Administrative centre only - eg for Distance Delivery or e-learning Articulation arrangement			Learner support centre for programme - eg for Distance Delivery or e-learning Delivery of Franchised programme			Joint development/delivery of teaching / assessment Delivery of validated programmes					
<b>Partner resources</b>	Large (broad range of provision) & well resourced			Medium/small (limited range or specialist) but well resourced			Any size but limited/ poorly resourcedresources					
<b>Learning &amp; Teaching Strategy</b>	Clearly defined and implemented			Defined but only partly implemented			None					
<b>QA processes</b>	Defined and robust			Adequate			None					
<b>Partner's quality standing</b>	Good QAA report (or equivalent and or local professional body accreditation)			Adequate QAA report (or equivalent and or local professional body accreditation)			No information or QAA report (or equivalent) gives rise to concerns					
<b>Partner's expertise in the discipline</b>	Similar programmes at the same level			Similar programmes at lower level or other programmes at same level in related subjects			No experience					
<b>Partner's staffing in the discipline</b>	Stable and well provided			Relatively small & possible issues re staffing turnover and levels			Small staff base and more serious concerns about staffing level					
<b>Projected numbers</b>	Realistic and achievable			Moderate over inflation			Unrealistic					
<b>Programme</b>	Established collaborative programme			Established programme on home campus			New programme					
<b>Award level</b>	No teaching			Undergraduate (SCQF Level 7-10)			Postgraduate SCQF Level 11/12					
<b>Host School/RI's experience of collaboration</b>	Experience of running similar collaboration			Some experience but limited or less directly relevant			None					
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>0</b>	
										<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	

## Periodic Review of Collaborative Partnerships

1. Collaborative arrangements are normally approved for a five-year period during which time the quality and standards of the provision should be monitored closely.
2. Partnership review is the process through which the University reviews and seeks to re-approve its collaborative provision partnerships prior to the end of the approval period. It has both a retrospective and prospective context in that it provides an opportunity for a School and its partner to reflect upon the operation, management and development of the partnership and to also consider the future. Whilst the emphasis is on the strategic direction of the partnership, in reaching a decision concerning re-approval of the partnership the review will additionally take into account the management of the collaborative arrangements that underpin programmes.
3. Approximately 6 months in advance of the end date of the MoA, the College should undertake a formal review of the partnership to establish:
  - whether the rationale for the collaboration remains valid;
  - the future of the partnership in the light of University and partner strategic priorities.
  - whether the collaboration remains appropriate in the context of the University's commitments;
  - whether it continues to command the support of senior managers in the University and the partner organisation;
  - whether the partner institution retains appropriate academic, financial, and legal status;
  - whether the programme will continue to meet the appropriate academic standards and offer students the learning opportunities and experiences necessary to achieve them;
  - whether the arrangements for collaboration will continue to enable the University to effectively discharge its responsibilities for the academic standards of awards and the quality of the student learning experience;
  - the support and monitoring provided by the home School or RI, for example, the effectiveness of Link Tutor arrangements
  - whether the business case remains valid.
  - developments and enhancements which have taken place since the partnership was established or the last Partnership Review
  - good practice and innovation worthy of dissemination across other collaborative provision and across the University;
4. The review should be undertaken by a panel that should include as a minimum:
  - the Dean (L&T) or Dean (Graduate Studies), as appropriate [Convener]
  - SRC College Convener or other SRC representative
  - College Quality Officer
  - College Finance Manager or delegate
  - an academic member from another College with experience of academic collaborations.
5. The panel will report to the relevant College committee (Learning & Teaching, Graduate School Board, etc) and should consider relevant documentary evidence including: annual monitoring reports including information on student performance; student feedback; External Examiner, PSRB accreditation and periodic subject review reports; Joint Board or visit reports and, where

possible and appropriate, direct evidence through a visit to the partner institution to review resources and meet with staff, students, and graduates.

6. The relevant College committee should review the evidence against the criteria above and, if it is satisfied that they are met, the College should recommend to ASC that the collaboration be re-approved. ASC will report the decision to Senate. If the College is not satisfied but considers that the criteria could be met after improvements are made, it should recommend that the collaboration continue for a defined period subject to further review. If, either initially or after further review, the Committee is still not satisfied that the criteria have been met, it should recommend that the agreement be terminated in line with the procedures outlined in [Section 11 \[embed link\]](#).
7. The Collaborations Unit will maintain a partnership review schedule and will alert Colleges at least **6 months** prior to the commencement of the academic year in which the MoA is due to end.

### THE OPERATIONAL MANUAL

#### Purpose

1. The *Operations Manual's* primary function is to assist with the planning and implementation of a new academic collaboration and the subsequent day-to-day management by both academic and administrative staff at the University and the partner.
2. It should be prepared following formal approval of the collaboration and be completed with as much detail as possible.

#### Scope

3. An Operations Manual is required the following types of collaborative provision: distance delivery, jointly taught programmes, jointly degrees (taught), franchising and hybrid arrangements that involve these forms of collaboration. Further guidance should be sought from the Collaborations Unit based in the Senate on other forms of collaboration.
4. The template aims to cover all the information that might be needed in the Manual but, as there are many possible types of collaboration, there can be no set template and the content should be modified to suit the particular partnership. If some of the sections are not be applicable to an individual collaboration, however, they should be included and marked 'not applicable'.

#### Preparation

5. Preparation of the *Operational Manual* should be guided by:
  - the **Collaborations Approval Proforma** which will have been completed as part of the development and approval process.
  - The Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) which will define the formal responsibilities of the partners.
  - Issues discussed and agreed with the **partner institution**, that may not form part of the MoA. Colleagues from partner should be involved in preparing the *Manual*.
  - Advice from the Collaborations Unit and relevant College regarding the content of the *Manual* staff (eg Business Development Manager, Finance or HR Manager, College Quality Officer, etc) and the relevance of certain sections (linked to the nature of the collaboration itself).
  - Information on operational details and good practice from the Collaborations Unit.
6. The *Operational Manual* is the document that guides staff in both the partner and the University in managing the collaboration and the programme(s). It needs, therefore, to be as clear and concise as possible whilst providing sufficient and relevant detail. Other documents may be appended to the *Operational Manual* as appropriate, e.g. organisational charts.
7. It is envisaged that the *Manual* will be published and used electronically and therefore relevant University regulations, policies and procedures may be so linked.



## Operational Manual

Name of partner organisation:	
UoG School/Research Institute:	
Location(s) of delivery of the programme:	
Programme Title:	
Brief description of the nature of the collaboration:	
Date originally approved:	
Date re-approved or date due for re-approval:	
Author's name:	
Approved by School/RI (signature required):??	
Approved by School Quality Officer on behalf of SQC (signature required): ??	

Date:

## OPERATIONAL MANUAL FOR COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

## SECTION 1: PARTNER AND UNIVERSITY INFORMATION AND CONTACTS

## Partner information

**Guidance:** This section contains crucial factual information which underpins the rest of the Manual. You should provide details of the name, address and contact details for the partner organisation together with those of programme and support staff at both the partner and the University. The staff list must be updated each year as part of the annual review.

Name of partner:	Address:	Telephone No:	Web site address:
<b>Address of delivery location(s):</b> <i>(if different from address above, e.g. Learning Centres)</i>	<b>Address:</b>	<b>Telephone No:</b>	<b>Web site address:</b>
	<b>Address:</b>	<b>Telephone No:</b>	<b>Web site address:</b>

Date:

**Programme Staff**

<b>Programme Co-ordinator name (partner) :</b>	<b>Telephone No:</b>	<b>E-mail address:</b>
<b>Programme Leader name (UoG) :</b>	<b>Telephone No:</b>	<b>E-mail address:</b>
<b>Project Manager name (UoG) :</b>	<b>Telephone No:</b>	<b>E-mail address:</b>

<b>Course Tutors name (partner):</b>	<b>Telephone No:</b>	<b>E-mail address:</b>	<b>Course Title and code:</b>	<b>Course Leaders name (UoG):</b>	<b>Telephone No:</b>	<b>E-mail address:</b>

**Support Staff (Partner and UoG key contacts)**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Title / Department:</b>	<b>Telephone No:</b>	<b>E-mail address:</b>

Date:

## SECTION 2: PROGRAMME INFORMATION

**Guidance:** This section contains information relating to the programme which is the subject of the collaboration and the regulations which underpin it. The guidance is aimed largely at franchise arrangements and additional guidance should be sought from the Partnership Office and/or the Centre for Quality for other collaborative arrangements such as validation, articulation and off-campus.

It is particularly important that full details are provided in cases where the programme differs from any associate programme delivered at the University.

<b>Title of programme:</b>	Include: the title(s) of the programme(s) and link to the relevant Programme Specification or Programme Handbook
----------------------------	--

<b>Named awards:</b>	Indicate all relevant awards including interim awards
----------------------	---

<b>Credit Framework*</b> <b>Guidance:</b> This will normally be that of UoG unless a partner's own programme has been validated by the University in which case the partner's framework may apply.	<b>UoG:</b> Yes / No	If 'no' please state whose framework applies:	
<b>Regulations</b> (including those relating to appeals and academic offences)* <b>Guidance:</b> These will nearly always be those of the University unless a partner's own programme has been validated by the University and its own regulations have been approved.	<b>UoG:</b> Yes / No	If 'no' please state whose regulations apply:	
<b>Complaints procedures*</b> <b>Guidance:</b> These will almost always be those of the partner organisation. Where this is not the case, you should explain clearly but succinctly why this is the case and how the University's procedure will work in practice.	<b>Partner:</b> Yes / No	<b>UoG:</b> Yes / No	

\*Hyperlink to relevant sections of the University Calendar, regulations and complaints procedures where relevant

Date:

<p><b>The programme structure is identical to that delivered at Glasgow:</b>  <i>Link to Programme Specification/Programme Handbook</i></p> <p><b>Guidance:</b> <i>It is critical to indicate clearly that either the programme delivered is identical to one delivered at the University or, where this is not the case, to clearly state the precise structure as delivered by the partner. A helpful way of depicting this is in a diagrammatic format.</i></p>	Yes / No
<p><i>If 'no' Indicate the precise structure of the programmes as delivered by the partner:</i></p>	
<p><b>Indicate the normal duration of study</b> (if different from that indicated in the Programme Specification/Handbook):</p>	
<p><b>Placement included</b>  <i>Link to Work Placement Policy</i></p> <p><b>Guidance:</b> <i>Indicate clearly whether there is a placement included as either a mandatory or optional element of the programme. Where a placement is a mandatory element of any corresponding home programme, then it must also be included in a collaborative programme unless special approval has been conferred to the contrary.</i></p>	Yes / No / Optional
<p><b>Indicate the arrangements for Personal Development Planning</b> (if different from those detailed in the Programme Specification/Handbook) <i>link to PDP Policy</i></p>	
<p><b>Entry requirements including those related to English language ability</b>          (if different from that outlined in the Programme Specification/Handbook):</p> <p><b>Guidance:</b> <i>Indicate clearly where the requirements vary from those of the associate home programme. It is particularly important to include reference to English language requirements for international collaborations or for those where it is anticipated that students will be recruited for whom English is not a first language. An approval panel will require evidence to confirm that any non-UK qualifications (including those relating to English language competence) calibrate with those required on any associate home programme. Similarly, a panel will also seek to assure itself of any required arrangements for a preparatory English language course and/or on-going support. Note that where delivery and/or assessment are in a language other than English then students must possess a defined level of competence in the English Language, in accordance with the <b>Language Policy</b>.</i></p>	
<p><b>Learning and Teaching Strategy</b></p>	<p><b>Identical to that outlined in the Programme Validation Document/Programme Handbook:</b> Yes / No</p> <p><i>If 'no' indicate precisely how it differs e.g. different delivery mode; uses trimesters rather than semester; part time as opposed to full times or vice versa etc.</i></p>

Date:

	<p><b>Guidance:</b> Where these differ from the associate home programme it is important to clearly and succinctly indicate what they are. Reference should be made to differences including delivery mode (online for example), trimester or semester delivery, part/full time etc. Where there are differences, an approval panel will seek to ensure that they provide opportunities for the programme aims and outcomes to be achieved by all students.</p>
--	---

<p><b>Delivery arrangements at the partner</b></p>	<p><b>Programme delivered by:</b> Partner only / Partner and University (please indicate as appropriate)</p>
	<p><b>Where the programme is delivered jointly, indicate precisely the arrangements i.e. which Courses are delivered by UoG and which by the partner:</b></p>
<p><b>Guidance:</b> Indicate clearly who will deliver the programme. This may be the partner only or it may be joint delivery where some Courses/stages are delivered by the University. In this latter case, it is important to indicate where the students are taught and precisely which staff (University or partner) are involved in the delivery.</p>	

<p><b>External Examiners and External Moderators</b></p> <p><b>Guidance:</b> Indicate the names of all those appointed to externally examine and/or moderate.</p>	<p><b>Name:</b></p>	<p><b>Date of appointment:</b></p>	<p><b>Date appointment expires:</b></p>
<p><b>Identify the nature and frequency of External Examiner Visits to the partner organisation.</b></p> <p><b>Guidance:</b> Refer to External Examiners guidance on visiting requirements. Also clarify how comparability of standards with home programmes will be achieved.</p>			

<p><b>Professional Body Accreditation</b></p> <p><b>Guidance:</b> Clarify whether any existing recognition applies to the collaborative arrangement or whether such recognition will be sought. It is important to note that such accreditation is not always automatic and an approval panel will seek assurance in this respect.</p>	<p><b>Programme accredited by</b> (state the name of the professional body) :</p>
	<p><b>Professional body accreditation to be sought from</b> (state the name of the professional body) :</p>

Date:

<p><b>Estimated student numbers</b> (indicate the number and whether they are University or Partner numbers)</p> <p><i>Guidance: Simply state the numbers but, importantly, indicate from which institution – partner or University – the numbers will be drawn. If in doubt, check with the Partnership Office as this may have financial implications on your Business Plan.</i></p>	
--	--

<p><b>Memorandum of Agreement</b></p> <p><i>Guidance: This is an important aspect of all collaborative work</i></p>	<p><b>Initial contract signed on</b> (date):</p>
	<p><b>Contract due for renegotiation / renewal</b> (date) :</p>

## SECTION 3: RESPONSIBILITIES

**Guidance:** This is a really critical part of the Manual and the various sections may be used as prompts when staff from the University and the partner are discussing the various management arrangements. It is important that wherever possible you indicate the names of the relevant staff and not just their job titles. Where a particular responsibility is shared then the last column should be used to provide the necessary information to explain specifically how the responsibility is carried out. The last column should also be used to provide any relevant additional information where, for example, the responsibility for undertaking the particular procedure is exercised at variance with the University regulation, policy or procedure. Such variation will, of course, require careful consideration at the approval stage.

It is important when completing this section that communication takes place with all of those staff whose names are to be inserted.

Task	Partner (insert name and job title of person responsible)	University (insert name and job title of person responsible)	Further information, e.g. How will this responsibility be carried out? When will this responsibility be carried out? (cross reference to the Operational Calendar)
<b>Marketing</b>			
<b>Guidance:</b> Reference to the marketing protocol (Annex T) should be referred to during initial discussions between the partner and the University so that you are able to clearly indicate respective responsibilities and the need for UoG approval.			
Marketing materials are produced by (Link to Marketing Protocol)			
Partner marketing materials monitored and approved by			
Partner web site monitored by			
<b>Recruitment</b>			
<b>Guidance:</b> Indicate responsibilities for recruiting students. This often lies with the partner but can also involve University staff. Make clear who has responsibilities for each aspect of the process.			
Recruitment (including initial student counselling) undertaken by			
Interviews take place at			
Interviews undertaken by			
Monitoring of recruitment against target is undertaken by			

Date:

Task	Partner (insert name and job title of person responsible)	University (insert name and job title of person responsible)	Further information, e.g. How will this responsibility be carried out? When will this responsibility be carried out? (cross reference to the Operational Calendar)
<b>Admissions</b>			
<i><b>Guidance:</b> Reference the programme handbook/programme specification which will include the admissions criteria and use the final column to indicate any diversions from these criteria which will have to be considered for approval by the approval panel. Don't forget to include any specific criteria which may apply relative to the country in which the collaboration operates and/or the requirements of a professional body. In the case of non-UK qualifications, it is particularly important to specify by what means and through which agencies equivalence of qualifications is established. In the vast majority of cases, the ultimate approval of admissions rests with the University and so it is important to indicate precisely who at the University has this responsibility and who therefore signs enrolment forms. Student qualifications must always be checked for authenticity by the University and here again the person responsible should be indicated. Sometimes, once a collaborative partnership has been operating for some time a process of standard decision making may be applied which means that the partner initially approves standard admissions i.e. those which precisely meet the programme criteria and all those non-standard applications are considered by the identified University person. In such cases a process of auditing will be required and relevant information should indicate the process and who has responsibility for it. A similar process must operate in relation to claims in relation to Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL).</i>			
Student applications are considered initially by			
Indicate whose application form is used			
Student applications are approved by			
Student qualifications are checked for authenticity by <b>OR</b> admissions audits are carried out by			
APL claims are reviewed initially by			
<b>Enrolment</b>			
<i><b>Guidance:</b> Student enrolment and registration may take place either at the University or at the partner's premises. Check with Partnership Office about the arrangements for your partnership so that you are able to indicate the persons responsible for the various elements of the process.</i>			
Enrolment takes place at			
Enrolment is undertaken by			
Student fees are collected by			
Student cards are produced by			
Students are registered by			
UoG user names and passwords are provided by			
Student records are established and maintained by			

Date:

Task	Partner (insert name and job title of person responsible)	University (insert name and job title of person responsible)	Further information, e.g. How will this responsibility be carried out? When will this responsibility be carried out? (cross reference to the Operational Calendar)
<b>Partner invoicing</b>			
<i>Guidance: This may be done by the College or the Finance Office. Ascertain this so that you are able to indicate the relevant name.</i>			
Partner is invoiced by			

Task	Partner (insert name and job title of person responsible)	University (insert name and job title of person responsible)	Further information, e.g. How will this responsibility be carried out? When will this responsibility be carried out? (cross reference to the Operational Calendar)
<b>Student Information</b>			
<i>Guidance: It is crucial that students are provided with all the relevant information to include Course and programme handbooks.</i>			
Course Handbooks are produced by			
Course Handbooks are approved by			
The Programme Handbook is produced by			
The Programme Handbook is approved by			
<b>Student Induction</b>			
<i>Guidance: The principles described above in respect of student information applies equally to the student induction programme: it may be designed and delivered by the partner but it is important, certainly in the early stages of a partnership, that relevant University staff have some input and are able to approve the proposed arrangements. It is therefore good practice in the early days of a partnership for this to be a joint exercise, even better if the University Programme Leader or Project Manager is able to attend for some or the entire induction programme.</i>			
The student induction programme is produced by			
The student induction programme is approved by			
The student induction programme is delivered by			
Feedback on the student induction programme is gathered by			

Date:

Task	Partner (insert name and job title of person responsible)	University (insert name and job title of person responsible)	Further information, e.g. How will this responsibility be carried out? When will this responsibility be carried out? (cross reference to the Operational Calendar)
<p><b>Resources</b></p> <p><i><b>Guidance:</b> Identify responsibilities for the provision of physical resources including books and journals, and for the production and quality control of other teaching and learning resources. The arrangements in relation to physical/on site resources and any agreed access to electronic/on-line resources, e.g. University library or learning resources and UoG access must also be indicated. If it is proposed that students have physical access to the University's learning resources, then it is important that such access has been discussed with relevant staff in the University Library and that the contract reflects these arrangements.</i></p>			
Learning and teaching materials are produced by			
Learning and teaching materials are approved by			
Students have access to library resources at			
Students have access to IT resources at			
Programme specific resources are provided by			This may need to be expanded

Task	Partner (insert name and job title of person responsible)	University (insert name and job title of person responsible)	Further information, e.g. How will this responsibility be carried out? When will this responsibility be carried out? (cross reference to the Operational Calendar)
<p><b>Assessment</b> (Link to Code of Assessment)</p> <p><b>Guidance:</b> This is a critically important section of the Manual as it relates to the ever-important question of the maintenance of standards and great care should be taken when discussing the various responsibilities in this area. The general principle is that the University does not delegate responsibility for standards and so care should be taken to ensure that the allocation of responsibilities does not depart from this over-riding principle. The responsibility for setting assessments will nearly always reside with UoG staff. The proposed arrangements for marking should be specified, i.e. who will undertake the marking, whether any second marking will be carried out and if so by whom, indicating whether there is any intention that these arrangements should change over time, for example as the partner gains more experience. It will normally be appropriate for the partner to undertake at least some marking, but in all cases involving a University award or credits internal moderation will be undertaken by the University. A partner may have their own internal moderation process, which is good practice, but this should not be used in place of the application of the University's own internal moderation process which must always be followed. Where assessment takes place at any location outside the University, the Manual should clarify the proposed arrangements, specifically in relation to the security of examination papers, invigilation and the training of invigilators, and the conduct of examinations in accordance with UoG requirements. This section should also detail the method for auditing the exam process in the partner institution.</p> <p>* Clarify the arrangements for approving assessments where the proposed arrangements include deviations from the home programme, e.g. the use of local case studies</p>			
Coursework assignments are set by			
Coursework assignments are approved by *			
Examinations are set by			
Examinations are approved by *			
Responsibility for the provision of coursework assignment briefs and exam papers for external examiner approval rests with			
Examinations take place at			
Responsibility for ensuring security of examination papers rest with			
Where examinations take place at the partner, regulations on the conduct of examination and associate briefing are provided by (link to examination regulations)			
Invigilators are provided by			
Viva voce examinations are carried out by			
First marking of assessments is the responsibility of			
Feedback on assessment uses the			

Date:

feedback pro formas of			
ECF arrangements are those of <i>Link to ECF Policy</i>			
UoG internal moderation is carried out by <i>Link to Internal Moderation Policy</i>			
Selection of moderation sample is made by <i>or*</i> Approval of the moderation sample is the responsibility of <i>*Indicate as appropriate</i>			
Responsibility for the provision of student assessed work to external examiners rests with			
Responsibility for input of grades rests with			
<b>Board of Examiners</b>			
<b>Guidance:</b> <i>These will nearly always be chaired and held under the auspices of the University.</i>			
Board of Examiners take place at			
Indicate the frequency and anticipated timing/dates of boards			
Board of Examiners are chaired by			
Board of Examiners are serviced by			
Post-Board work is carried out by			
Results sent to students by			

Date:

Task	Partner (insert name and job title of person responsible)	University (insert name and job title of person responsible)	Further information, e.g. How will this responsibility be carried out? When will this responsibility be carried out? (cross reference to the Operational Calendar)
<b>External Examiners</b> (Link to external examiner regulations in 3Rs) <i>Guidance: These will always be approved and appointed by the University but may be proposed by the partner. Responsibility for responding to their reports normally resides with the UoG programme leader/project manager but it is essential that the partner receives the report (which is provided to them by the Centre for Quality) and has the opportunity to input into the response. Approval panels will always seek assurance that external examiners are either in place or have had their conditions of appointment extended to include the partnership where the home examiner is being used (and this is of course the preferable position). For programmes delivered and assessed in a language other than English, the panel will seek assurances about the continuity of supply of bi-lingual examiners and/or moderators.</i>			
External examiners are proposed by			
External examiners are approved by			
External examiner(s) report(s) are provided to the partner by			
Responsibility for considering and responding to external examiners' reports rests with			

Task	Partner (insert name and job title of person responsible)	University (insert name and job title of person responsible)	Further information, e.g. How will this responsibility be carried out? When will this responsibility be carried out? (cross reference to the Operational Calendar)
<b>Programme Committee</b>			
<i>(Guidance: This is the term we use at the University but in some partnerships such activity may have a different title. This is acceptable, of course, but the important thing is that there is some form of forum for enabling students to provide feedback and to contribute to the ongoing development of the programme.</i>			
Programme Committee terms of reference and constitution are those of			
Programme Committees take place at			
Programme Committees are chaired by			
Programme Committees are serviced by			
Responsibility for reporting outcomes of partner programme committees to the home programme committee rests with			
<b>Student Representation</b>			
<i>Link to Code of Practice on Student Representation</i> <b>Guidance:</b> <i>The principle above with reference to programme committees applies to student feedback. This means that the partners own feedback mechanisms may be proposed and will be considered for approval by the approval panel.</i>			
Student representatives are sourced and elected by			
Responsibility for organising staff student liaison committees lies with			
Staff student liaison committees are chaired by			
Staff student liaison committees are serviced by			
Responsibility for meeting student representatives where they have not attended the programme committee rests with			

Date:

<b>Student Feedback</b>			
<i>Link to Student Feedback Policy <b>Guidance:</b> The principle above with reference to programme committees applies to student feedback. This means that the partners own feedback mechanisms may be proposed and will be considered for approval by the approval panel.</i>			
Student feedback is sought by			
Student feedback questionnaires are those of			
Students are informed of the outcome of the consideration of their feedback by			

Task	Partner <i>(insert name and job title of person responsible)</i>	University <i>(insert name and job title of person responsible)</i>	Further information, e.g. How will this responsibility be carried out? When will this responsibility be carried out? <i>(cross reference to the Operational Calendar)</i>
<b>Liaison</b>			
<b>Guidance:</b> <i>Indicate who is responsible for the various functions listed here. The student meeting as part of the annual visit is particularly important and students should be provided with the opportunity of meeting with University staff without partner staff in attendance.</i>			
Hard copies Collaborative Handbook, Staff Guide and Programme Leaders Handbook are supplied by			
The annual recorded visit to the partner is undertaken by <i>Link to Visit Policy</i>			
The travel and accommodation arrangements for the annual visit are organised by			
The costs of the annual visit are borne by			
The student meeting required as part of the annual visit is organised by			
The report of the annual visit is submitted to			
Responsibility for monitoring actions required as a result of the annual visit rests with			

Task	Partner (insert name and job title of person responsible)	University (insert name and job title of person responsible)	Further information, e.g. How will this responsibility be carried out? When will this responsibility be carried out? (cross reference to the Operational Calendar)
<b>Annual Monitoring</b>			
<i>Link to Quality Management Handbook 5: Annual Monitoring</i>			
<b>Guidance:</b> Data for the annual monitoring report is normally provided for the partner by the Centre for Quality via the Partnership Office.			
Data required for the Annual monitoring Report is provided to the partner by			
The annual monitoring report is prepared by			
The annual monitoring report is submitted to			
Associate home Annual Monitoring Report is provided to the partner by			
The annual monitoring report will be forwarded to the UoG School Quality Officer by			
<b>Student Guidance and Support</b>			
<b>Guidance:</b> Indicate precisely who has responsibility in the various areas listed. Where it is proposed that students have access to University support and guidance services, then make sure that the relevant departments are consulted. It is important to note that the appeals process is normally that of the University and the complaints procedure that of the partner.			
Responsibility for the provision of academic support to students rests with			
Responsibility for the provision of pastoral support to students rests with			
Responsibility for English language support rests with			
Responsibility for career education, information and guidance rests with			
Requests for an authorised break from study (intercalation) are			

Date:

handled by			
Requests for withdrawal are handled by			
Students are advised to direct complaints to			
Students are advised to direct appeals to			
<b>Staffing and Staff Development</b>			
<i>Link to Policy on accredited lecturers</i>			
<b>Guidance:</b> <i>Indicate the names of those who have responsibilities in the areas listed. All staff once approved by completion of Annex U, will be accredited lecturers of the University. Discussions with the partner will need to identify the arrangements proposed for peer support and observation of teaching.</i>			
Partner staff have their contracts of employment with			
Partner staff cvs are held by			
Partner staff UoG accounts are created and provided by			
Planned changes to partner staffing are advised to			
UoG responsibility for approving partner staff rests with			
Partner staff induction to UoG and its processes is the responsibility of			
Initial partner staff development is the responsibility of			
Responsibility for identifying, planning and delivering ongoing staff development rests with			
Peer observation of teaching (or equivalent) is carried out by <i>Link to POT guidelines or partner's equivalent</i>			
P&DR??			

<b>Awards</b>			
<i><b>Guidance:</b> In most cases certificates and transcripts will be produced by the University but do check with the Partnership Office to clarify. Awards ceremonies are usually the responsibility of the partner organisation unless it is agreed that students will join ceremonies at UoG. This also requires clarification with the Partnership Office.</i>			
Parchments and transcripts are produced by			
Awards ceremonies take place at			
The timing of the ceremony will be			
Responsibility for the organisation of awards ceremonies rests with			

## SECTION 4: OPERATIONAL CALENDAR

## Insert the completed template

**Guidance:** A template is provided below. For initial approval purposes the calendar should be presented in draft format as a model. Subsequently when put into operation it will need to specify actual dates, months and periods as appropriate. A new Operational Calendar **must** be provided each Academic Year. Remember that although this is your calendar for your partnership, what goes into the Operational Manual should make it simple for anyone to see key dates and deadlines, and who has specific responsibility for each item. It is therefore essential that you design the calendar with the full support and advice from your colleagues within the partnership and across the University.

Shown below is a simplified example based on previous good practice. The calendar should of course be amended to suit your own circumstances and needs.

The following list shows some (but not necessarily all) of the key events and gives you guidance on the sort of activity that we would normally expect to find in an Operational Calendar:

- staff development events (at Partner or UoG)
- applications and interviews
- enrolment and registration
- semester framework including induction and teaching weeks
- setting, marking and local moderation of assessment
- submission of assessed work for UoG moderation
- examinations
- transmission of marks to UoG
- Board of Examiners
- programme reports for annual monitoring
- programme committees
- publication of results
- awards ceremonies, including issuing of certificates and transcripts
- local, national and public holidays

## EXAMPLE

DATE	ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBILITY	NOTES
Sept 3	Staff Development	Project Manager (UoG)	To discuss changes to the programme following Minor Modification
Sept 5	Interviews	Programme Leader (Partner) Project Manager (UoG)	
Sept 19	Enrolment	Programme Leader (Partner) Project Manager (UoG) Administrative Staff (Partnership Office)	UoG Project Manager to sign all application forms
Sept 22	Induction	Programme Leader (Partner) Project Manager (UoG)	
Oct 1	Production of Student ID cards	Registry	To be distributed by Programme Leader (Partner) along with User Names and Passwords

### Year 1 Review

- i. The first year review provides a mechanism to allow the University to monitor at an early stage and be confident that collaboration agreements and collaborative programmes are being managed and delivered as intended. Typically a review would be scheduled to take place at between 15 to 18 months after the first student cohort has started their studies. This timing would enable a review team to consider the first annual cycle of delivery of the programme and is the same regardless of whether the programme is delivered on a full or part-time basis.
- ii. The programme co-ordinator will provide a short self evaluation commentary on:
  - how effectively the programme is operating in terms of the approved programme and signed collaboration agreement, including aspects relating to viability and demand
  - the quality of the student learning experience
  - areas of good practice and plans for the enhancement of the programme and or partnership
  - the effectiveness of mechanisms for the approval of published information provided by the partner organisation to prospective and current students
- iii. The review should be undertaken by a panel that should include as a minimum:
  - the Dean (L&T) or Dean (Graduate Studies), as appropriate [Convener]
  - SRC College Convener or other SRC representative
  - College Quality Officer
  - College Finance Manager or delegate
  - an academic member from another College with experience of academic collaborations
- iv. The review is undertaken through dialogue between panel members and representatives from the programme team from all partners involved in the collaboration. The following would be considered as part of the review.
  - the collaboration agreement (including full annexes)
  - minutes of meetings relevant to the management of the programme such as Boards of Studies and the Student-Staff Liaison Committee (or equivalent)
  - programme annual monitoring report, including student performance data and student feedback
  - External Examiner reports
  - student handbook and other learning resources provided to students (eg Moodle resources)
  - sample publicity and marketing material
  - a sample of learning and teaching material, such as teaching packs
- v. The panel will report to the relevant College committee (Learning & Teaching, Graduate School Board, etc. on the effectiveness of the management and delivery of the collaboration agreement and collaborative programmes within the scope of the review.
- vi. The report will be written as an evaluative commentary on:
  - how effectively the programme is operating in terms of the approved programme and signed collaboration agreement, including aspects relating to viability and demand
  - the quality of the student learning experience

- areas of good practice for dissemination within the College or University and recommendations for the enhancement of the programme
  - the effectiveness of mechanisms for the approval of published information provided by the partner organisation to prospective and current students to ensure that all marketing, publicity and promotional material is approved by the University
- vii. The review will be initiated by the Collaborations Unit who will notify the relevant College Head of Academic and Student Administration who will contact the relevant programme co-ordinator or leader.