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**GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ABE** | Association of Business Executives |
| **ACCA** | Association of Chartered Certified Accountants |
| **AEF** | Academic Enhancement Framework |
| **AFP** | Assessment and Feedback Policy |
| **AR** | Academic Registrar |
| **ATP** | Authorisation to Proceed |
| **AWMF** | Academic Workload Management Framework |
| **CAD** | Course Approval Document  |
| **CAMS** | Credit Accumulation & Modular Scheme |
| **CEN** | Course Evaluation Narrative |
| **CCP** | Contract for Collaborative Provision |
| **CPR** | Collaborative Provision Register |
| **CPRED** | Collaborative Provision Review and Evaluation Document |
| **CV** | **Curriculum Vitae** |
| **DBS** | **Disclosure and Barring Service** |
| **DID** | **Department of International Development** |
| **EBE** | **Enterprise and Business Engagement** |
| **FCD** | Finance and Commercial Development |
| **FFL** | Future Facing Learning |
| **FHEQ** | Framework for Higher Education Qualifications |
| **GDPR** | General Data Protection Regulation |
| **HE** | Higher Education |
| **HEI** | Higher Education Institution |
| **HOD** | Head of Department |
| **IfATE** | Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education |
| **IREF** | Institutional Review Evidence File |
| **ISA** | Incoming Student Abroad Agreement |
| **IT** | Information Technology |
| **ITDS** | IT and Digital Services |
| **KPI** | **Key Performance Indicator** |
| **KSB** | **Knowledge, Skills & Behaviours** |
| **LAD** | Location Approval Document |
| **LEO** | Longitudinal Education Outcomes |
| **LGS** | Legal and Governance Services |
| **MoU** | Memorandum of Understanding |
| **MQF** | Malta Qualifications Framework |
| **NARIC** | National Recognition Information Centre |
| **NQF** | National Qualification Framework |
| **NSS** | National Student Survey |
| **OL** | **Online Learning** |
| **OSA** | Outgoing Study Abroad Agreement |
| **PR** | Partner Report |
| **PL** | Principal Lecturer |
| **PSRB** | Professional, Statutory & Regulatory Body |
| **QA** | Quality Assurance |
| **QAA** | Quality Assurance Agency |
| **QAAP** | Quality Assurance Authorisation Panel |
| **QEV** | Quality Enhancement Visit |
| **RoATP** | Register of Apprenticeship Training Providers |
| **RPL** | Recognition of Prior Learning |
| **SITS** | Student Record System |
| **SLAR (ACI)** | Student Learning & Academic Registry (Academic Collaborative Innovation) |
| **SLAR (APR)** | Student Learning & Academic Registry (Academic Policy & Regulations) |
| **SLAR (DX)** | Student Learning & Academic Registry (Digital Transformation) |
| **SLAR (QAV)** | Student Learning & Academic Registry (Quality Assurance & Validation) |
| **SLEC** | **Student Learning & Experience Committee** |
| **SLS** | **Student & Library Services** |
| **SHLS** | **School of Health & Life Sciences** |
| **SIC** | **School International Committee** |
| **SQA** | Scottish Qualifications Authority |
| **SRM** | Student Recruitment and Marketing |
| **SSLESC** | School Student Learning & Experience Sub-Committee |
| **TNE** | Transnational Education |
| **TU** | Teesside University |
| **TUCP** | Teesside University College Partnership |
| **UC** | University Certificate |
| **UET** | University Executive Team |
| **UK HEI** | United Kingdom Higher Education Institution |
| **UKPRN** | UK Provider Reference Number |
| **UKVI** | United Kingdom Home Office Visas & Immigration |

# 1. DEFINITION OF COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) UK Quality Code for Higher Education defines Collaborative Provision with others through expectations for standards and quality that recognise work in partnership with a range of organisations including awarding bodies, other education providers, non-academic providers, and employers. When doing so, the University retains responsibility for the academic standards of its awards and for the quality of the student experience.

The Quality Code describes the following as guiding principles for working in partnership:

* The awarding body is accountable for assuring the overall quality and academic standards of the provision.
* The awarding body will have in place appropriate governance to oversee the development, operation, and closure of partnership arrangements.
* Due Diligence is completed, and written agreements signed prior to the commencement of student registration and refreshed periodically.
* Provision delivered through partnership arrangements is subject to quality procedures which reflect those used for provision delivered within the awarding organisation.
* The awarding body retains the authority and responsibility for awarding certificates and records of study in relation to student achievement.
* The awarding body maintains accurate records of all formal partnership arrangements.
* The awarding body monitors and evaluates partnership arrangements to ensure that academic standards and quality are maintained.

Further information and specific guidance can be found in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education – Advice and Guidance [(**Partnership**)](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/partnerships)**.**

## 1.1 Teesside University Principles of Collaborative Provision

The University has determined that collaborative provision should be a significant part of its Academic Strategy, as detailed in Teesside 2027:

* In the Northern region through the operation of the Teesside University College Partnership (TUCP).
* In the development of strategic International Partnerships in line with the international strategy.
* In its strategic commitment to Enterprise and Business Engagement.

The University is responsible for the assurance of the academic quality and standards of its courses, awards, and qualifications wherever they are delivered.

The following guiding principles are generic and apply to all collaborative provision. Definitions of collaborative provision by the type of Partnership are outlined in the table of typologies in **Section 1.8**.

## 1.2 Basis for Partnership

The University adopts the following criteria as the basis for any Partnership delivering awards of the University, that the Partner:

* Has compatible and complementary aims, values and mission that meets the requirements of the University’s Partnership Strategy.
* Is financially stable and legally competent to enter into the necessary arrangements.
* Has effective management systems in place to assure the quality of Higher Education courses.
* Offers an ethos, environment, and resources for teaching, learning and skills development appropriate to Higher Education (HE) and the particular collaboration proposed.
* Has learning, teaching and assessment approaches that are compatible with the University’s Learning and Teaching Strategic Plan.
* Has an appropriate infrastructure that enables the adoption or implementation of Teesside University’s regulatory framework and academic and administrative policies and practices.
* Is committed to enhancing the student experience.

## 1.3 Key Features of Collaborative Provision and its Approval

 The following underpin all collaborative provision leading to an award of Teesside University (TU):

* + - The University must always retain responsibility for the quality and standards of any award made in its name, but it may, in specific cases, delegate the operation of aspects of quality assurance to a Partner whilst retaining oversight and overall control of this activity. The University will not delegate responsibility for the standards of its awards, although it will involve Partners in the assurance of standards.
		- The University requires that all awards approved via collaborative provision meet all statutory requirements of the Office for Students Quality and Standards, and including the expectations of the [**UK Quality Code for Higher Education**](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code) as defined by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA).
		- All types of collaborative provision will be recognised via a formal agreement between the University and the Partner. This Contract for Collaborative Provision (CCP) will define the relationship between the Partners and their rights and obligations.

Formal agreements are signed on behalf of the University by the Vice-Chancellor or nominee.

An [**Operations Manual**](https://www.tees.ac.uk/sections/about/public_information/quality_framework.cfm) underpins the formal agreement. Typically, this will be a generic Operations Manual supported by a School/Course specific Addendum. Student Learning & Academic Registry (Quality Assurance and Validation (SLAR (QAV)) annually review the Operations Manuals, whilst Academic Schools are responsible for revising specific Addendum(s) that form part of the contractual arrangement with the Partner.

## 1.4 Memorandum of Understanding

For some large and complex new International (Transnational Education (TNE)) Partnerships, the first stage in the process will be the development of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). The development of a MoU will follow the establishment of a business case for the proposal and will require the input of the Legal and Governance Services (LGS), the Finance Department, the relevant School and approval and sign off by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (International). Following signature of the MoU by both parties, the proposal can proceed to the Institutional Approval process.

## 1.5 Authorisation in Principle

An enquiry from a potential Partner may be received directly to the University, School, International Development or Student Learning & Academic Registry. In the first instance, initial consideration, discussion and alignment to the University Mission and Values should be considered by the relevant Associate Dean within the Academic School.

Subsequently, the Academic School must complete the Collaborative Provision – Request to University Executive Team for Authorisation in Principle (**E-Annex 3**) form and submit to the appropriate Pro-Vice Chancellor for consideration and approval. The approved document will be progressed to SLAR (QAV) who will co-ordinate the Due Diligence and Authorisation to Proceed (**E-Annex 3a**) through a risk-based approach.

## 1.6 Partnership Process Overview

All new collaborative provision will involve the following components:

* + - Due Diligence and Authorisation to Proceed.
		- Institutional/Organisation Approval – the approval of a Partner as suitable to deliver Teesside University awards.
		- Course Approval – the approval of one or more specific courses where the Partner has developed the course(s) and its constituent modules.

**OR**

* + - Location Approval – the approval of one or more Partner locations where approved Teesside University courses will be delivered.

Teesside University will undertake an Institutional Review of each Partnership and course(s) normally on a six-year cycle, unless an alternative approval period is required by the Partners own country accreditation system.

For an overview of the accredited Partnership process for all new Partners, see flowchart **E-Annex 1**, **Single Partnership Approval Framework for New Partners**.

The University will maintain a register of all collaborative provision and all approved proposals for Recognition and Advanced Standing arrangements.

## 1.7 Medium for Communication

 To enable Teesside University assurance of compliance with the Office for Students requirements, all correspondence and supporting evidence for consideration as part of the approval or review of a Partnership must be provided in English.

## 1.8 Types of Collaborative Provision

The University recognises that different types of Partnership activity may expose Partners to different levels of cost, financial commitment, and risk and, therefore, approval processes need to be proportionate to specific circumstances.

The typology chart below summarises the categories in which the University is working with Partners in the delivery of HE. Whilst all categories below involve Partnership working, they do not all constitute collaborative provision for the purposes of Quality Assurance arrangements and inclusion in the Collaborative Provision Register.

## 1.9 Management of Quality Processes

Teesside University has established flexible quality processes to manage the validation of Partnerships, and review and modification for courses and modules. The approaches outlined within the Quality Framework can be delivered through an in-person, virtual meeting, or desk-based process.

|  |
| --- |
| **Typologies** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Recognition** |  |
| **Category** |  |
| **1a****Advanced Standing** | The University gives entry, with Advanced Standing, to one or more of its courses from a specified incoming award. The University enables students of the Partner to join a University course and awards credit on its courses from the incoming award. The University allows the Partner to advertise the arrangement. |
| **1b****Admissions** | The University gives entry, without Advanced Standing, to the start of one or more of its courses from an incoming award. The University enables students from the Partner to be guaranteed entry to join the University course at the entry point, the University does not award credits on its courses from the incoming award and allows the Partner to advertise the arrangement. |
| **2. Partner Delivered Awards** |
| **2****Co-delivery** | A University course involving co-delivery with a Partner where the Partner contributes to its teaching and assessment. The University retains direct oversight of the course content, delivery, assessment, and quality assurance processes. The University retains responsibility for the award.This category normally applies to short awards delivered with Partners, such as Employer Partners. |
| **3. Franchised Provision** |
| **3****Franchised Provision** | The University authorises the delivery and confers the award on a course by a Partner, and retains direct responsibility for the course content, delivery, assessment, and quality assurance processes.Awards approved for delivery through a Franchised model would be recognised as managed numbers of Teesside University. This category normally includes TUCP, Transnational Education (TNE), and Private Colleges. It may occasionally include awards delivered by Employer Partners or individual hybrid agreements. |
| **4. Validated Provision** |
| **4****Validated Provision** | The University authorises delivery and confers the award on a course, which has been designed and developed (in whole or part), by the Partner (UK or International). The University has satisfied itself that the Partner meets all the requirements of external and internal reference points and has robust systems for managing quality and standards. The University retains ultimate responsibility for the quality and standards of the award. |
| **5. Study Abroad and Exchange** |
| **5****Study Abroad and Exchange** | This category is defined as mobility of University students as part of their studies to a Partner for an agreed period leading to the award of credit as part of students’ course of study. |
| **7. Placement/Workplace Learning** |
| **7****Placement/Workplace Learning** | Teesside University provision, which includes learning opportunities in the workplace, necessary for the achievement of the award. The placements/workplace learning elements may be supported by a supervisor and workplace assessor, and the employer may have informed course design. The employer will otherwise have limited input into the delivery of the course, and the approval of these arrangements will follow guidance outlined in **Chapter C** of the Quality Framework.This category may also apply to Professional Apprenticeship awards approved for delivery with Partners. |
| **8. Dual/Joint Awards** |
| **8a****Dual Awards** | A partnership arrangement whereby Teesside University and one or more awarding Institutions together provide and jointly deliver a course which leads to separate awards being granted by each Partner. Each awarding body exercises oversight and is accountable for the academic standards and regulations of its own awards. Teesside University assures standards are ratified through a Quality Mapping process. |
| **8b****Joint Awards** | A partnership arrangement whereby the University and one or more awarding Institutions together provide and jointly deliver a course, which leads to a single award being made jointly by the Partners. A single certificate or document (signed by the relevant authorities) verifies successful completion of the award. |
| **9. Remote Delivery** |
| **9****Remote Delivery** | A Teesside University course delivered at a different location to the University campus. The University undertakes and is directly responsible for all teaching and assessment. The Partner is responsible for providing a physical location and associated infrastructure such as IT facilities, communication with applicants and students. Some additional tutorial and pastoral support may be provided by the Partner. Examples of such Partnership arrangements include hosting “flying faculty” courses or distance learning study centres. |
| **10. Research Collaboration** |
| **10****Research Collaboration** | An arrangement involving collaboration with another awarding body or provider to provide research degree and/or supervision opportunities for students.Further information is provided in **Chapter F** of the Quality Framework. |

# 2. INSTITUTIONAL APPROVAL PROCESS

Following an ‘in principle’ decision, as outlined in **Section 1.5**, by the relevant member of the University Executive Team, (and if required an MoU (see **Section 1.4**), and subsequent notification to the SLAR (QAV) all Partner Institutions wishing to enter into a Partnership to offer courses leading to a University award (typologies 2-4, 8(a & b), and 9) must first be approved at Institutional level.

The Institutional Approval process provides the University with the means of assuring itself that any Partner can satisfy the following criteria:

* Its aims and mission meets the requirements of the University’s Collaborative Provision Strategy.
* Has an appropriate learning environment in terms of the provision of physical and human resources to support academic delivery to an appropriate level and to manage the academic progress and welfare of students.
* Has the necessary infrastructure and organisational capacity to secure the effective management and academic oversight of course delivery and support?
* Demonstrates an appropriate educational ethos and commitment to the Partnership.
* Demonstrates familiarity with relevant UK external reference points consistent with its status and for International Partners, meets appropriate reference points in the country of delivery.
* Confirm all courses will be delivered and assessed in English.

## 2.1 Definition and Consideration of Risk associated with Partnership

After initial enquiries and discussion between the relevant School and Partner to assess the level of risk and value of the award to be considered for approval, in conjunction with SLAR (QAV), an agreement will be made to confirm whether approval of the partnership would be considered via either:

* The Institutional Approval process as outlined in **Section 2** or
* Through the University Approval method described in **Section 4**.

For example, the value of credits delivered and assessed by the Partner, as part of an overall award, may be considered a lower risk and therefore it could be deemed appropriate to manage the Partnership approval based on the processes outlined within **University Approval for Partners** (see **Section 4**).

* Therefore, for short awards, involving a Partner, a process is utilised which encompasses joint approval of the Partner and the short award. Approval of this type of award with a Partner does not require a separate Institutional Approval Event. This process is utilised for up to 60 credits at undergraduate and postgraduate level. An enhanced short award process will be managed by the SLAR (QAV) and will involve a risk assessment and approval of the Partner and its business case, as well as approval of the short award. Please refer to processes outlined in **Section 4.**
* In the case of a **professional apprenticeship**, where part of an award (i.e., taught credit) is delivered through a subcontracting arrangement with a new Partner, approval of the partnership is normally considered through a separate University Approval event. The enhanced University Approval event will be managed by the SLAR (QAV) and will involve a risk assessment and approval of the Partner and its business case - please refer to processes outlined in **Section 4. N.B.** SLAR (QAV) (in consultation with the Academic School) will determine the appropriate Partner approval process, based on the anticipated value of credits to be delivered by the Partner.

## 2.2 Due Diligence and Authorisation to Proceed Process for Institutional Approval and Review

Teesside University adopts a risk-based approach through its institutional approval and review procedures to ensure potential risks are considered, managed, and mitigated. The level and profile of risk is evaluated through academic, business, and financial due diligence. This acts as a prerequisite to entering a collaborative arrangement (and renewing collaborative partnerships).

A **Declaration of Interest for Partner Institutions** form (see **E-Annex 2**) must be completed alongside the Due Diligence processes and prior to entering a contract with a Partner.

The Academic Registrar (or nominee) will undertake a process of Due Diligence with all new Partners who are proposing credit-bearing provision. The Due Diligence process will test the reputation, financial stability, and strategic alignment of the proposed Collaborative Partner and will include a Risk Assessment (see forms **E-Annex 3a: Collaborative Provision – Due Diligence including Authorisation to Proceed**).

The Partner will complete and submit the following documents for consideration by Teesside University. The Due Diligence process includes:

* Quality assurance approval including risk assessment, site visit and incorporating a discussion with current students (**E-Annex 4**, **Institutional Approval, Resources and Risk Assessment Statement for Partners**).
* Legal Due Diligence, (**E-Annex 6** **Collaborative Provision - Legal Due Diligence** should be completed by the Partner and provided to LGS who will consider and sign-off the legal status and background proforma).
* Financial Due Diligence, for full partner approval 2 years audited accounts or credit check for lower risk activity.
* School, IT & Digital Services (ITDS), and Student & Library Services (SLS) approval, and
* International Development and/or Enterprise & Business Engagement (EBE) approval (if appropriate).

Following completion of the **Collaborative Provision -** **Due Diligence Including Authorisation to Proceed** form (**E-Annex 3a**), the SLAR (QAV) will progress the form to the relevant Pro Vice-Chancellor, who will in turn present the case to the University Executive Team (UET) to formally agree and confirm Authorisation to Proceed (ATP).

Following confirmation and sign-off from relevant member of the Senior Executive team, SLAR (QAV) will progress with Institutional/organisational Approval.

## 2.3 Non-congruent Developments

 Where a proposal for collaboration is based on subject area the University has limited expertise, consideration must be given at all stages of development to how such a collaboration will be managed to minimise any risks to standards or the student experience. For further guidance on the development and operation of a short awards in ‘non-congruent’ provision see **Guidance in relation to the Development and Operation of Collaboration in “Non-Congruent” Courses** (see **E-Annex 15**).

## 2.4 Institutional Approval

SLAR (QAV) will prepare the Partner Approval/Review Agreement.

The purpose of the Institutional Approval Event is to evaluate the Partner Institutional structures with regard to the management of the academic quality and standards of HE delivery. It is not required to investigate course specific matters, such as course-level staffing or specific learning resources, which will be processed as part of the Course Validation or Location Approval Event.

## 2.5 Constitution of the Institutional Approval Panel

The membership of the Institutional Approval Panel will be approved by the Academic Registrar (or nominee) and will usually comprise of a minimum of:

* **Chair:** Academic Registrar (or Senior School representative independent to the proposal being presented)
* Representative from Student Learning & Academic Registry (QAV)
* Member of academic staff from the link School(s) independent of the Partnership under consideration
* An external panel member from another UK Higher Education Institute (HEI) with appropriate partnership expertise
* **Officer:** Student Learning & Academic Registry (QAV)

With further expert supplementation as required.

## 2.6 Organisation of the Institutional Approval Event

 The Institutional Approval Event may be held at the Partner site or at Teesside University. SLAR (QAV) in conjunction with the Partner, and relevant School(s), will organise and service the event.

 The Institutional Approval Event may involve the consideration of more than one delivery site, and any additional location visits should take place prior to the Approval event and evidence incorporated within the Resources Statement and Risk Assessment (**E-Annex 4**). Any subsequent changes to the location of delivery will be subject to additional location approval as detailed in **Section 8.20**.

 The Institutional Approval Event will incorporate, as appropriate, input from the following Partner stakeholders:

* Representatives from the senior management team responsible for the Institution’s organisational strategy and development, organisational structure, finance, learning resources, institutional oversight of academic standards, academic policy and associated quality assurance processes and quality of student learning opportunities.
* A representative selection of staff directly involved in academic delivery; learning resource services; and student support and guidance (academic and pastoral).

## 2.7 Documentary Requirements

Relevant colleagues from Academic Schools within the University will work with the Collaborative Partner to prepare documentation for consideration at the Institutional Approval Event.

The following documentation will be utilised as part of the approval process:

* Completed **Collaborative Provision - Due Diligence including Authorisation to Proceed** (**E-Annex 3a**)
* Completed **Institutional Approval, Resources and Risk Assessment Statement for Partners** (**E-Annex 4**), and supporting evidence file, including the relevant Operations Manual
* **Quality Mapping Exercise** (**E-Annex 5**), where the Partner is seeking approval to deliver a Dual or Joint Award with Teesside University
* Relevant generic **Operations Manual (TUCP, Employer, International, or Validated)**

Panel Members will also receive a copy of the **Areas for Consideration and Discussion at Partnership Events**. This document should be used as a guide to help frame questions at the event and consider whether the Partner is suitable for approval.

The Chair of the Institutional Approval Panel will have access to a copy of the completed **Collaborative Provision – Legal Due Diligence Form** (**E-Annex 6**).

## 2.8 Partner Staff and Students

Input from senior managers, academic tutors and student support staff at the Partner will cover the following topics as appropriate:

* Rationale for the Partnership, and strategy for present and future developments.
* Learning resources and student support available to students.
* Institutional responsibility for quality assurance, including discussion of relevant policies and processes. (In the case of Dual or Joint Awards, a quality mapping exercise would be completed to inform the Partnership arrangements).
* General awareness of the Office for Students Quality and Standards and the UK QAA Quality Code for Higher Education and relevant external indicators and University’s expectations of their responsibilities consistent with the type of Partnership arrangements.
* Specific issues relating to oversight of course management and delivery and management of assessment processes.

Input from students will include the following topics:

* The experience of studying their current course.
* Opportunities for student representation, and feedback and their perceived effectiveness.
* Arrangements for academic and pastoral support and their experience.
* Opportunities for participation in academic governance structures.

This input can be provided virtually during the meeting if the event is held at Teesside University, or via discussion with current students during a site visit at the Partner location. Feedback will be incorporated into the **Institutional Approval, Resources and Risk Assessment Statement for Partners** (**E-Annex 4**).

## 2.9 Outcome of the Institutional Approval Event

The Institutional Approval Panel is required to base its judgement on a review of the evidence. It makes a recommendation to the Student Learning & Experience Committee (SLEC) for approval.

The Panel’s recommendation may fall into one of the following categories:

* Conditional approval of the Partnership.
* Unconditional approval of the Partnership.
* Deferral of decision (if the Panel has identified significant concerns, which require developmental work prior to resubmission), or specific issues have arisen at the event requiring further investigation.
* Rejection of the Partnership (if the Panel has identified significant concerns, which are unlikely to be satisfactorily resolved).

At the end of the Institutional Approval Event, a verbal summary will be provided on the Panel’s conclusion, including good practice, conditions, and recommendations.

**Conditions of Institutional Approval**

A recommendation of approval may be subject to conditions specified in the Event report. These must be met in full before final approval can be authorised.

**Recommendations of Institutional Approval**

The Panel will identify any recommendations, which are intended to assist partnership/Institutional development, and these will be followed up as part of continuous monitoring and reporting.

Institutional Approval is normally granted for a six-year period in the first instance and is subject to Institutional Review thereafter (see **Section 3**).

### 2.9.1 Institutional Approval Report

The SLAR (QAV) Officer will compile the draft report for confirmation by the Chair before wider circulation to the rest of the Panel for comments. The potential Partner is also asked to check the report’s factual accuracy.

The Partner is required to submit their written response to each of the conditions of approval and recommendations by the specified deadline. This response must be sufficiently detailed to give the University confidence that they have been met. The Panel Chair has responsibility for determining whether the conditions have been met and subsequent reporting to SLEC**.**

## 2.10 Post Institutional Approval

Following SLEC approval, the Academic Registrar (or nominee) in conjunction with the LGS will forward a definitive CCP (or contractual agreement) for signature by the Vice-Chancellor (or nominee) and Principal/Head of the Partner Institution, together with the generic University Operations Manual, and/or quality mapping (**E-Annex 5**) documents.

LGS will retain the definitive versions of all documentation relating to contractual matters. Following completion of the Institutional Approval process the Partner has access to the use of the University logo and may use the following words in publicity material ‘is an approved Partner of Teesside University’. The logo and guidance on its use is available in the University Operations Manual.

Following notification from LGS to SLAR (QAV) that the CCP/contractual agreement has been signed, the Collaborative Partnership will be recorded in the Collaborative Provision Register (CPR).

***All Partners are advised that students must not be recruited, and course delivery must not commence, until Course Approval has been completed and subsequent CCP/contractual agreement has been signed.***

## 2.11 Teesside University Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement Processes

Following completion of the Institutional Approval Process, the University will follow formal mechanisms to monitor the progress of the Partnership and any future developments, see **Section 5 Partner Monitoring and Oversight** for further details.

# 3. INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW PROCESS

The University operates a process for Institutional Review normally every six years where the status and experience of a Partner is reviewed, with a view to re-affirming the good standing of the Partnership and, if appropriate, confirming its continued operation for a further period of normally up to six years.

Prior to progressing with the Institutional Review, the relevant Academic School must complete the **Request for Continued Authorisation of Partnership** (**E-Annex 3.1**) form and submit to the appropriate Pro-Vice Chancellor for consideration and approval. The approved document will be progressed to SLAR (QAV) who will co-ordinate the Due Diligence and Authorisation to Proceed (**E-Annex 3a**) through a risk-based approach.

This process includes a revised Due Diligence Report completed by the SLAR (QAV) in conjunction with the relevant Associate Dean and signed-off by the UET as outlined in **Section 2.2**. This will be followed by a Review Event, which will seek to:

* Provide an overview of the experience of the past Partnership working, including:
* Confirmation that the educational objectives and Organisational Structure continue to align with Teesside University Values and Mission.
* An evaluation and analysis of the Partnership enhancements, with reference to previous Partner Reports (PR) or Quality Enhancement Visit Statements (QEV).
* An evaluation of the Student Entry and Performance Data.
* Confirmation that both staff and physical resources remain appropriate and continues to provide a good student learning experience.
* Identify areas of transferable good practice and commendation.
* Identify areas for enhancement.
* Explore and plan developmental opportunities.
* A further opportunity to review and, if necessary, revise the CCP or similar.

The nature of the review process will reflect a variety of factors such as the type of Partner, the nature of the Partner’s range of provision, location, extent of ongoing contact, the University’s confidence in their ongoing quality assurance management, and judgements about the risk factor attached to any specific Partnership, allowing for the length and stability of the Partnership.

The responsibility for Institutional Review rests with the Academic Registrar (or nominee), in close collaboration with the Director of International Development and relevant School(s).

## 3.1 Constitution/Organisation of the Institutional Review Panel

The membership of the Institutional Review Panel is constituted as detailed in **Section 2.5**. The Institutional Review will be held at the Partner site or at Teesside University. The Institutional Review may involve the consideration of more than one delivery site, and any additional location visits will take place prior to the event. Any subsequent changes to the location of delivery will be subject to additional location approval. The Institutional Review Panel will incorporate input from Partner staff and students as detailed in **Section 2.8**.

## 3.2 Documentary Requirements

Relevant colleagues from Academic Schools within the University will work with the Partner to prepare documentation for consideration at the Institutional Review Event.

The following documentation will be utilised as part of the review process, specific requirements will be detailed by SLAR (QAV) on the Partner Validation Arrangements (**E-SAPs-Annex 1**):

* Revised and updated **Collaborative Provision - Due Diligence including Authorisation to Proceed** (**E-Annex 3a**)
* Revised and updated **Institutional Approval, Resources and Risk Assessment Statement for Partners** (**E-Annex 4**), and supporting evidence file, including the relevant Operations Manual
* Revised and updated **Quality Mapping Exercise** (**E-Annex 5**), where the Partner is seeking re-approval to deliver a Dual or Joint Award with Teesside University
* **Partner Evaluation Document (PED)** and supporting Institutional Review Evidence File (IREF)
* Relevant generic **Operations Manual (TUCP, Employer, International, or Validated)**

Panel Members will also receive a copy of the **Areas for Consideration and Discussion at Partnership Events**. This document should be used as a guide to help frame questions at the event and consider whether the Collaborative Partner is suitable for re-approval.

Where a Partner has sought approval to deliver an approved award at a new or additional location following the original proposal it is essential that all relevant Institutional documentation such as E-Annex 4 is updated through the mid-cycle and/or Institutional Review.

The Chair of the Institutional Review Panel will have access to a copy of the completed **Collaborative Provision – Legal Due Diligence Form** (**E-Annex 6**).

## 3.3 Representing the Student Voice

Feedback will be sought from both current and alumni students as part of the Institutional Review process. This input can be provided virtually during the meeting if the event is held at Teesside University, or via discussion with current students during a site visit at the Partner location. Feedback may be incorporated into the **Institutional Approval, Resources and Risk Assessment Statement for Partners** (**E-Annex 4**).

The following topics may be discussed:

* The experience of studying with the Partner on their current course.
* Opportunities for student representation, and feedback and their perceived effectiveness.
* Organisation and Management issues.
* Resources (both physical and virtual).
* Arrangements for academic and pastoral support and their experience.
* Opportunities for participation in academic governance structures.

## 3.4 Outcome of the Institutional Review Event and Period of Approval

The Institutional Review Panel is required to make a recommendation to SLEC on approval of the continuation of a Partnership. Outcomes of the event and the overview of post approval process is detailed in **Sections 2.9** and **2.10**.

## 3.5 Teesside University Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement Processes

Once the Institutional Review process has concluded and continuation of the Partnership has been confirmed, the University will follow formal mechanisms to monitor the progress of the Partnership and any future developments, see **Section 5 Partner Monitoring and Oversight** for further details.

# 4. University Approval for partners

## 4.1 Overview of the University Approval Process

Under the University approval processes, Partner provision is normally defined as a short award, in such cases the Partnership Approval/Review will be considered alongside the Course and/or Location Approval.

 The Partner will provide evidence that their ethos and environment for teaching, learning and skills development is appropriate to HE and that resources and operational arrangements are in place to support the HE provision to be delivered by the Partner.

 In summary, the University Approval process normally applies to undergraduate and postgraduate awards of up to and including 60 credits where Partners are actively involved in the administration, delivery and/or assessment of the award.

 It is applicable:

* Where an existing module/award already approved and delivered by the University is to be delivered by a Partner.

**Or**

* Where a new award is approved to be delivered by a Partner organisation.

However, it may also apply where taught credit is delivered through a subcontracting arrangement with a new Partner as part of a Professional Apprenticeship.

The processes outlined are applicable to Partnership arrangements that typically fall under Typology 2 (Co-delivery) or Typology 7 (Placement & Workplace Learning) as defined in the list of typologies available in **Section 1.8** of this document.

 This type of provision is normally generated through Partnership working which is likely to be diverse. The University recognises that different Partnerships (differentiated firstly by the nature of the Partner and secondly by the nature of the provision) present differing levels of risk. Whilst all provision must adhere to the guiding principles of collaborative provision, the requirement for the management of these Partnerships must contain a degree of flexibility and interpretation according to risk associated with the Partnership and the size of the academic award.

Student Learning & Academic Registry will prepare the **Partner Validation Arrangements** (**E-SAPs-Annex 1**) prior to the Approval Event, which will set out the panel and documentation requirements.

## 4.2 Due Diligence & Authorisation to Proceed

Following the ‘in principle’ (**E-Annex 3**) confirmation that the Partnership may be considered or Continued Authorisation of Partnership (**E-Annex 3.1**) decision by the relevant member of the University Executive Team (as outlined in **Section 1.5**), SLAR (QAV), in conjunction with the relevant Associate Dean within the Academic School, will progress with University approval, via the most appropriate process.

As highlighted in **Section 2.2** Teesside University adopts a risk-based approach through its approval and review procedures to ensure potential risks are considered, managed, and mitigated, along with the level and profile of risk is evaluated through academic, business, and financial Due Diligence.

In the case of Quality Assurance Authorisation Panel (QAAP) activity, SLAR (QAV) will co-ordinate and progress, in partnership with relevant Associate Dean(s) within Schools, the Due Diligence with Partners who are proposing credit-bearing provision.

The Due Diligence process will be proportionate to the level of risk and will be managed alongside the development of courses leading to University academic credit. Due Diligence will be assessed through the completion of form **E-Annex 3a: Collaborative Provision – Due Diligence including Authorisation to Proceed,** which includes:

* Legal Due Diligence, (**E-Annex 6** **Collaborative Provision - Legal Due Diligence** should be completed by the Partner and provided to LGS who will consider and sign-off the legal status and background proforma)
* Financial Due Diligence, via a credit check report
* School, IT & Digital Services (ITDS), and Student and Library Services (SLS) consideration and approval
* International Development and/or Enterprise & Business Engagement (EBE) sign-off

A **Declaration of Interest for Partner Institutions** form (see **E-Annex 2**) must be completed alongside the Due Diligence processes and prior to continuing a contract with a Partner.

## 4.3 Constitution of University Approval Panel (Low Risk only)

The membership of the University Approval Panel is closely aligned to the Quality Assurance Authorisation Panel and considers Partnership arrangements normally aligned with Typology 2 (Co-delivery). The Panel will be convened by Student Learning and Academic Registry (QAV) in consultation with the school, and will normally comprise of:

* **Chair:** School Associate Dean (Learning & Teaching), or nominee, related to the link School (i.e., Head of Department)
* Representative from Student Learning & Academic Registry (QAV)
* **Officer:** Student Learning & Academic Registry (QAV)

Additional Panel members will normally comprise of a selection of colleagues with expertise aligned to the awards under consideration:

* School Principal Lecturer
* Academic colleagues from Teesside University independent of the course(s) under consideration
* Member of Academic Staff, external to the school, with recent Partner working experience
* Panel members external to the school with specific expertise including:
	+ Academic Librarian, with subject expertise
	+ Colleague with Professional Apprenticeship knowledge
	+ Student and Library Services (Student Futures)
	+ Head of Online Learning, or nominated Learning Designer

Normally for non-congruent awards, when it is advised that an External Academic should participate in the consideration of a University Partnership or course, it is recommended that Partnership consideration immediately precedes Course Approval on the QAAP agenda.

## 4.4 Partnership Approval/Review - Documentation

In preparation for QAAP, the Partner with support from the Academic School, will prepare the following documentation for discussion at the event:

* Collaborative Provision - Due Diligence including Authorisation to Proceed (**E-Annex 3a**)
* Collaborative Provision - Legal Due Diligence (**E-Annex 6**), (Chair only)
* Generic **Operations Manual, and agreed Addendum** incorporating the **Operational Statement**
* The **University Approval Statement** (**E-Annex 17**)

The purpose of the **University Approval Statement** (**E-Annex 17**) is to ensure the appropriateness of quality assurance, staffing and physical premises that will be used for delivery and availability of IT, learning and specialist resources. Issues identified during the location visit must be noted on this statement for further discussion during the Approval event. ***It is important to note that where a Partner intends to hire premises on an ad hoc basis, a location visit is not normally required but a minimum specification for selecting a venue should be provided along with a statement detailing how students will access resources.***

Either as part of the visit or during the event, it is essential that the student voice is considered. The focus of these discussions will be:

* The student experience of studying their current course of study.
* Opportunities for student representation, and feedback and their perceived effectiveness.
* Arrangements for academic and pastoral support and their experience.
* Availability of resources.

For Reviews only:

* + **Partner Evaluation Document** (PED).
	+ Partnership Evidence File - The Review event discussion should focus on the relationship between the Partner and the University, and confirm the activities identified in the generic Operations Manual, and addendum(s), have been managed appropriately between the University and the Partner across the range of activities.

The event discussion should focus on the information provided within the variety of documentation, with reference to the activities identified in the generic Operations Manual, and Addendum incorporating the Operational Statement whilst clarifying the role of the University and the Partner across the range of activities. The Panel should ensure that Partner staff involved in delivery have appropriate academic qualifications and/or experience to deliver at the required academic level and subject/professional expertise. Staff development activities should be discussed and agreed at the event.

The Quality Assurance Authorisation Panel (QAAP) will make a formal judgement regarding the proposed Partnership and confirm the relationship with the Partner is appropriate and robust, this judgement is based on a review of the evidence. Panel Members are required to review the evidence and ensure appropriate issues are considered utilising the relevant sections of **Areas for Consideration and Discussion at Partnership Events**

## 4.5 Outcome of the University Approval Event

The QAAP is required to base its judgement on a review of the evidence. It makes a recommendation to SLEC for approval.

The Panel’s recommendation may fall into one of the following categories:

* Conditional approval of the Partnership.
* Unconditional approval of the Partnership.
* Deferral of decision (if the Panel has identified significant concerns which require developmental work prior to resubmission), or specific issues have arisen at the event requiring further investigation.
* Rejection of the Partnership (if the Panel has identified significant concerns which are unlikely to be satisfactorily resolved).

At the end of the Event, a verbal summary will be provided on the Panel’s conclusion, including conditions and recommendations:

* **Good Practice –** It is appropriate to recognise any commendation and Good Practice highlighted throughout discussions during the event, or within the documentation presented for consideration.
* **Conditions -** A recommendation of approval may be subject to conditions specified in the Event report. These must be met in full before final approval can be confirmed.
* **Recommendations -** Any recommendations which are intended to assist the Partner’s development will be followed up as part of continuous monitoring and enhancement.

At the end of the QAAP event, a verbal summary will be provided on the Panel’s conclusion, including good practice, conditions, and recommendations.

Partnership Approval is normally granted for a six-year period in the first instance and is subject to Review thereafter.

## 4.6 Partnership and QAAP Report

As noted previously, University approval of a Partnership may be considered alongside the Course and Location Approval. The report covering both Partnership and Course approval should be made using the **University Approval Report**.

The SLAR (QAV) Officer will compile the draft report for confirmation by the Chair before wider circulation to the rest of the Panel for comments. The potential Partner is also asked to check the report’s factual accuracy.

The Partner is required to submit their written response to each of the conditions of approval and recommendations by the specified deadline. This response must be sufficiently detailed to give the University confidence that they have been met. The Panel Chair has responsibility for determining whether the conditions have been metand subsequent reporting to SLEC.

## 4.7 Post University Approval

In the case of University Approval, following SLEC the **Collaborative Provision - Due Diligence including Authorisation to Proceed** form (**E-Annex 3a**), will be progressed to the relevant Pro Vice-Chancellor, by SLAR (QAV) who will in turn present the case to UET and formally agree and confirm ATP.

The relevant Associate Dean in conjunction with LGS will co-ordinate the production and sign-off of the CCP/contractual agreement as outlined in **Section 2.10**.

In the case of subcontracted arrangements where taught credit is delivered by a new Partner as part of a Professional Apprenticeship, the Academic Registrar (or nominee) in conjunction with LGS, will forward a definitive CCP/contractual agreement for signature by the Vice-Chancellor (or nominee) and Principal/Head of the Partner Institution.

LGS will retain the definitive versions of all documentation relating to contractual matters. Following completion of the University Approval process the Partner has access to the use of the University logo and may use the following words in publicity material ‘is an approved Partner of Teesside University’. The logo and guidance on its use is available in the University Operations Manual.

Following notification from LGS to SLAR (QAV) that the CCP/contractual agreement has been signed, the Partnership will be recorded in the CPR.

***All Partners are advised that students must not be recruited, and course delivery must not commence delivery, until Course Approval has been completed and subsequent CCP/contractual agreement has been signed.***

## 4.8 Teesside University Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement Processes

Once the approval of the Partnership and Course/Award(s) has been confirmed, the University will follow formal mechanisms to monitor the progress of the Partnership and delivery of the awards(s), see **Section 5** Partner Monitoring and Oversight for further details.

# 5. Partner Monitoring and oversight

As noted in **Section 1.1** Teesside University is responsible for the assurance of the academic quality and standards of its courses, awards, and qualifications wherever they are delivered. There are a variety of ways this monitoring takes place.

## 5.1 Quality Mapping Annual Review

Where appropriate, normally with Dual or Joint Partnership agreements, the relevant Academic School will complete an annual review of the agreed Quality Mapping Document, in collaboration with the relevant Partner (**E-Annex 5** **Quality Mapping Exercise**) to reflect changes agreed within the annual review of the Addendum to the Operations Manual.

## 5.2 Mid-Point Review: Refreshing Due Diligence

Once the Partner has been granted approval or continuation of either Institutional or University Approval, Due Diligence will be refreshed at the mid-point of the approval period – i.e., three years (see **E-Annex 3b Collaborative Provision – Due Diligence Mid-Point Review**). The Due Diligence and Risk Assessment process will be undertaken by the Academic Registrar (or nominee).

SLAR (QAV) maintain a register confirming when the mid-point Due Diligence review is required. The mid-point Due Diligence (**E-Annex 3b**) will focus mainly on:

* Commentary from the Academic School which provide an overview of the past partnership working.
* The financial aspects of the relationship, considering the recent audited and published accounts, and the Partner’s payment history.
* An updated **Declaration of Interest for Partner Institutions** **(Mid-Point)** form (see **E-Annex 2b**), including a revised Partner Provision - Legal Due Diligence (**E-Annex 6**), if appropriate,
* Confirm that the standard CCP/contractual agreement remains appropriate.
* Confirm Professional Apprenticeship arrangements, if appropriate
* Confirm that satisfactory quality assurance processes are being followed and have been maintained, and
* An updated **Quality Mapping Exercise,** (**E-Annex 5**) where appropriate.

Where a Partner has sought approval to deliver an approved award at a new or additional location following the original proposal it is essential that all relevant Institutional documentation such as E-Annex 4 is updated through the mid-cycle and/or Institutional Review.

### 5.2.1 Institutional Approval Mid-Point Review

In addition, Partners approved through the Institutional Approval process must refresh their **Institutional Approval, Resources and Risk Assessment Statement for Partners** (**E-Annex 4**) to ensure that the risk level has not increased.

### 5.2.2 University Approval Mid-Point Review

In addition, Partners approved through the University Approval process must refresh their **University Approval Statement** (**E-Annex 17**) to ensure that the risk level has not increased.

### 5.2.3 Partner Mid-Point Recommendation to SLEC

Following completion of the Mid-Point Due Diligence review, Student Learning & Academic Registry will recommend an outcome which will be approved by SLEC.

## 5.3 Change of Ownership/Institutional Name

The Partner must immediately notify SLAR (QAV) of any changes to ownership or Institutional name. In consultation with SLAR (QAV), a revised Due Diligence assessment may be triggered, the outcome of which could initiate an Institutional/Organisational Review.

In cases where an Institutional Review is not initiated, normally the agreed Institutional Review date of the Partner will be maintained.

## 5.4 Indicators for an Early Review

Within the CCP there are a number of Key Performance Indicators (KPI) specified for each Partner that will be monitored through the Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement processes and these can also prompt an earlier Institutional Review of the Partner. These will focus on:

* Student performance compared to UK students.
* Punctual payments.
* Achievement of student number targets.
* Meeting expectations in relation to opportunities for student exchange and staff development.
* An unsuccessful outcome following a National Quality Audit.

Additionally, where a Partner undergoes significant change between review dates, for example relocation, it may be necessary to conduct an earlier Partner Review to offer assurance about the effect of such a change.

In all cases, the process should be sufficient to address the specific circumstances and be no more resource intensive than necessary.

## 5.5 Extension of a Partnership Approval Period

In some instances, Partnerships may be extended for an additional period for example, to manage contractual intakes and teach-out arrangements.

The extension of a Partnership approval period is subject to additional approval by SLEC. (**E-Annex 8**), **Request for an Extension of Approval Period for an Existing Partnership**).

## 5.6 Approving Additional Typologies Associated with Partners

The **Institutional Approval, Resources and Risk Assessment Statement for Partners** (**E-Annex 4**) or **University Approval Statement** (**E-Annex 17**) completed in preparation for Institutional/University Approval and considered during the formal Partnership Approval Event confirms the agreed typologies associated with individual Partner(s). On occasions, after formal approval of the Partnership, circumstances may require the University to consider and approve an additional or change to typology associated with an individual Partner.

Through negotiation with the relevant Academic School, consideration would be given to the appropriateness of the new or amended typology in line with the Course or Location Approval via completion of the **Partner Course(s) Location Visit Statement** (**E-Annex 14**).

In some circumstances, following this consultation it may be appropriate to refresh the Due Diligence and Authorisation to Proceed documentation and update the CCP/contractual agreement in partnership with LGS and Finance Department. (see **Section 5.2** for processes relating to refreshing Due Diligence).

The additional or change to typology is subject to approval by SLEC and will be managed in line with the approval of the new Course. Subsequently, SLAR (QAV) will update the CPR to ensure an accurate record is maintained.

## 5.7 Termination of Partnerships and Courses

The Contract for Collaborative Provision (CCP) is the contractual agreement with the University and the Partner, which includes clauses relating to termination and teach-out arrangements. These include both planned and agreed termination, and cases where the agreement may be terminated with immediate effect. The CCP also sets out consequences of termination, which include cessation of recruitment and (where applicable) the requirement of the Partner to continue to provide courses to existing enrolled students.

Teesside University will normally seek to continue a Partnership until enrolled students have completed their courses. Where this is not possible, the University will implement suitable mitigating actions contained within the Student Protection Plan, if appropriate.

At the point Teesside University formally writes to a Partner to end a Partnership, key activities and a timetable of meetings will be scheduled to ensure teach-out arrangements are in place.

### 5.7.1 Teach–out Process

Teesside University aligns to UK QAA Quality Code for Higher Education, Advice and Guidance for Partnerships, to ensure that there is appropriate oversight and processes in place for the closure of partnership arrangements.

The University has developed a rigorous student focused teach-out process to ensure that all enrolled students can finish their studies and receive the necessary support and resources. The **OM Annex 9: Teach-Out Process**, provides a step-by-step process which includes:

* Instigation of the teach-out process
* Notice of termination
* Announcements and communication
* Establishment of a teach-out team
* Student engagement and consultation
* Teach-Out Plan
* Student Transfer Options
* Quality Assurance and Validation
* Monitoring and Evaluation
* Certification and Graduation
* Formal Partnership and Course Closure Processes

The process for closing the associated award titles is detailed in [**Chapter B: Portfolio Development**](https://www.tees.ac.uk/docs/DocRepo/Quality%20framework/B%20-%20Portfolio%20Development.doc) of the Quality Framework*.*

# 6. Typology 1A & 1B: PROCESS OF APPROVAL, FORMAL RECOGNITION AND MONITORING OF THIRD-PARTY COURSES FOR DIRECT ADMISSION OR ADMISSION WITH ADVANCED STANDING TO TEESSIDE UNIVERSITY

## 6.1 Introduction

 This Chapter describes the process for the approval of third-party courses for admission (with or without Advanced Standing) to Teesside University awards and provides associated guidance including any relevant standard templates which are included as annexes. These courses may be from a Partner College (for example), or from an examination provider, e.g., Edexcel, Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA). This requires the mapping of an external course against one or more Teesside University award(s), to determine the extent to which the learning outcomes and level of the incoming award prepare the student to study, and succeed, at an appropriate level of a Teesside University award.

 The process applies to the following circumstances:

* Where the University wishes to establish a formal Institutional link.
* Where the University wishes to recognise an incoming award for Direct Admission or Admission with Advanced Standing.
* Where the University can identify specific courses appropriate for admission.

## 6.2 Definitions and Overview of Principles

The University defines these arrangements as Recognition.

There are two types of Recognition as defined in the University typologies for Collaborative Provision (see **Section 1.8**):

1. **Recognition – Advanced Standing (1a)**. This is where the University gives entry, with Advanced Standing, to one or more of its courses from a specified incoming award. The University awards credit on its courses from the incoming award (**E-Annex 10** and **E-Annex 11**).
2. **Recognition – Admissions (1b)**. This is where the University gives entry, without Advanced Standing, to the start of one or more of its courses from an incoming award. The University does not award credits on its courses from the incoming award (**E-Annex 10** and **E-Annex 11**).

These agreements enable the Partner to advertise the arrangement with the University and, in some circumstances, provide a guaranteed route for their students.

Partner Recognition enables individual applicants to be processed under this arrangement, rather than be dealt with individually via [**Recognition of Prior Learning**](https://www.tees.ac.uk/sections/fulltime/rpl.cfm) (RPL) process. The University is responsible for accounting and documenting all the credits for an award. The number of credits available via these Agreements will not exceed those permitted under the University RPL policy.

 The process is intended to be:

* Flexibly appropriate to allow for different circumstances to be considered.
* Allow for committee decision making.
* Sufficiently rigorous but timely operated at School level, (as the proper location for the exercise of academic judgement) with the Partner Institution being informed of the outcomes.

 If at any point during this process, the decision is taken not to proceed with the agreement, Schools will, on behalf of the University, notify the Partner, Department of International Development (DID), and LGS.

For an overview of the process see the **Flowchart for the Approval of a Recognition Arrangements** incorporated within **E-Annex 12**.

## 6.3 New Partner

### 6.3.1 First Contact

The School Associate Dean (International) would normally be the first point of contact with the International Partner. Contact should be reported as early as possible to the DID to discuss any issues arising, and to allow for identification of wider University interest in the potential Partner and/or a new agreement may arise from this contact. Similarly, if the enquiry comes through DID, the contact will be referred to the School(s) Associate Dean (International) for consideration.

### 6.3.2 Exploration and Preparation

The School will receive course information from the Partner. There will normally be a suggestion as to which level the students leaving the Partner’s course would enter Teesside University’s course. The School Associate Dean (International), in conjunction with input from the DID, will analyse the information from the Partner with a view to deciding:

* The level of the incoming award.
* Content and approximate volume of the incoming award.
* Proposed progression pathway for this award.

If the incoming award falls within the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales & Northern Ireland (FHEQ), the external award needs to be at the same FHEQ level as the entry point with Advanced Standing and there should be evidence of achievement at previous levels (e.g., Level 4 and 5 if seeking Advanced Standing to Level 6), through equivalence of learning outcomes at the relevant level. Schools will also need to assess whether there is an adequate fit of subject and learning outcomes with the equivalent prior knowledge levels and/or exempted modules from the incoming award.

The arrangement and process leading to approval should be fully documented and approved by the relevant School Student Learning & Experience Sub-Committee (SSLESC) or School International Committee (SIC) as set out below and utilising the further guidance notes and relevant forms as detailed in the **Guidance Process for the Approval of Recognition and Monitoring of Partner Courses** (see **E-Annex 12**).

 If the proposal does not fall within the FHEQ (e.g., the awarding body is not UK based), the full level mapping process must be adopted. In cases where further advice and guidance is required, a representative from the DID or the Associate Dean (International) may take part in these discussions.

 To test the outcome of the resulting arrangement, the School will monitor the achievements of students entering the University, as a result of the arrangement, against the results of the rest of the cohort as part of the Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement process. It may be necessary to make adjustments to the arrangement over time on the basis of this analysis.

## 6.4 Partner Operating within Established Quality Systems

Many Institutions/providers operate within an established quality assurance regime, and it would be inappropriate for the University to require any further imposition into their processes. Examples of this would include:

* Public or Private Sector Institutions operating within a national quality assurance system.
* Private Sector Institutions subject to external accreditation.
* Externally moderated awards (e.g., Pearson, SQA, Association of Business Executives (ABE), Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA), etc.).
* Institutions which have a strong and documented internally operated quality assurance system.

SSLESC or SIC will consider a proposal based on the information contained in the **Recognition Arrangement (Typology 1a - 1b)** (see form **E-Annex 10**), which includes the following:

* Recognition (Advanced Standing/Admissions) Arrangement agreed Mapping and Other Entry Requirements.
* Advanced Standing or Admissions Arrangement Mapping.
* Demonstrate Pre-requisites have been met for Progression to Next Stage.

SSLESC will need to consider the relevance of the following range of alternatives to any specific case.

**For Agreements where existing processes and operating regimes are deemed to be adequate and no moderation is needed:**

* Confirmation is required that all components of the proposed mapping have been completed satisfactorily and the above documentation is complete and accurate.
* The overriding purpose of the arrangement is to ensure that students will succeed at the level proposed – the SSLESC will need to be assured of this.
* All academic credits can be accounted for and the overall learning is coherent.

 **In addition, for Agreements where moderation is being undertaken by Teesside University:**

* The proposed moderation regime has been clearly defined and approved by SSLESC as part of the Recognition approval process.

 After endorsement by SSLESC, the following documentation in the **Recognition Arrangement (Typology 1a - 1b)** (see **E-Annex 10**)will be forwarded to DID along with a copy of the relevant SSLESC minute reference where the arrangement was discussed and approved.

### 6.4.1 Non-Standard Articulation Agreement

 If a non-standard agreement is required, then a nominated member of the School will liaise with the DID to draw-up the Agreement **Recognition Arrangement (Typology 1a - 1b)** (see **E-Annex 10**)which is subject to approval by SSLESC. These agreements will not cover financial matters, as these will be dealt with via (e.g.) Agency Agreements drawn up by the LGS.

 Schools will be responsible for approving Recognition Agreements (Advanced Standing or Admissions) and reporting this approval to SSLESC / SIC. The School will retain a copy for their records and send a copy to:

* Legal and Governance Services.
* Department of International Development.
* The Partner.

If the Partner does not operate within such regimes, the University may choose to moderate the award. The requirements for this are detailed in **Section 6.5** below.

## 6.5 Partner Operating without Established Quality Assurance Systems

 The Recognition Agreement (Advanced Standing or Admissions) may be supported by a Moderation Arrangement, where this is appropriate. The Moderation Arrangement is made solely to enable the monitoring of the quality of the incoming award, and the Partner award student’s certificate or transcript is **NOT** endorsed as having been moderated by Teesside University. The Partner must never describe it as such. The relevant SSLESC/SIC will receive and approve details of the moderation arrangement as part of the Recognition approval process and within regular monitoring reports from the University Moderator appointed by the School.

## 6.6 Presentation/Endorsement at SSLESC / SIC

 The proposed arrangement is presented for consideration at the relevant SSLESC or SIC. The SSLESC/SIC will confirm that the mapping has been carried out correctly and endorse the pathways proposed.

 Schools will submit the **Recognition Arrangement** (**E-Annex 10**) and the **Formal Recognition Agreement** (**E-Annex 11**) to the DID who will arrange for the Partner signature as described in the **Guidance Process for the Approval of Recognition and Monitoring of Partner Courses** (**E-Annex 12**).

 In all cases, School administrative teams will update the Admissions Arrangement Database as Recognition Arrangement (Advanced Standing or Admissions), as appropriate.

### 6.6.1 Outcomes

* All arrangements will be valid for a specified period, normally six years, and will be reviewed annually by the SSLESC/SIC via the **Articulation Agreement - Annual Review** (see **E-Annex 13**) a copy of which will be retained by the School and uploaded to the Articulation Agreement Database.
* Schools will record when a Recognition Arrangement or Agreement has been used for entry on the students’ profiles on SITS to enable subsequent analysis of performance to take place.
* When a School revises its course as a result of the approval of changes to courses, the implications on Recognition Arrangements should be determined and updated where necessary (and recorded on **Articulation Agreement - Annual Review** (see **E-Annex 13**)).

# 7. TYPOLOGY 2: PROCESS FOR APPROVING COURSES INVOLVING CO-DELIVERY WITH A PARTNER

 Co-delivery is used to describe an arrangement whereby the University and a Partner both participate in the curriculum design, assessment, and delivery of a course while the University retains ultimate responsibility for the academic standards, oversight, and monitoring quality assurance arrangements of the award.

The contribution of the respective parties will vary depending on the nature of the course and the range of expertise. Where a course involves co-delivery with a Partner the approval processes will normally follow the standard procedures detailed in **Sections 2 or 4** (for Institutional Approval if this is a new Partner) and **Section 8** (Approval of a New Course).

Further details relating to the level of support provided by Teesside University through the Course First approach process, please refer to the **Course Design and Development - Support for Partner** (**E-Annex 16**).

All such proposals are subject to completion of the Due Diligence and Risk Assessment, Institutional and Course Approval as appropriate. A decision on the level and status of the Due Diligence and Risk Assessment process is undertaken by SLAR (QAV), in consultation with the Academic School(s) and will reflect the value of credit and level of risk delivered within the overall award by the Partner.

The type of Course Approval Event will be dependent on the nature of the academic award being approved. The following will follow the University process for the approval of short awards:

* Undergraduate awards of 60 credits or less
* Postgraduate awards of 60 credits or less

 The approval and development process incorporates the following stages:

* Completion of a Title Approval form, and Course Costing Template.
* Following title approval, the development is included on the Institutional Approval and Periodic Review schedule following liaison between the relevant School and SLAR (QAV).
* The School and Partner undertake the relevant curriculum development process, as outlined in **Chapter C** through the use of virtual toolkits.
* The process will include, as appropriate, any Location Approval of specialist resources/equipment connected with the Course Approval (Quality Framework, **Chapter E**, and **E-Annex 14**) and evidence file, as appropriate.
* The proposal is considered by a QAAP administered by SLAR (QAV) in conjunction with the relevant School as outlined in **Section 8**.
* The Panel either recommends approval with or without conditions or recommendations or declines the proposal. The process as stipulated in **Section 8.16** and **8.17**).
* SLAR (QAV) will ensure definitive approval documentation is uploaded onto the Course Documentation Central Repository.
* SLAR Officers will check the report for completeness and facilitate final sign-off by the University Academic Registrar or nominee.
* The University SLEC will receive a list of course approval(s), additional or new locations for information.

As part of the approval or any subsequent Periodic Review process, the Partner should participate in the process as members of the University Course Team as appropriate.

## 7.1 Formal Approval / Review of University Short Award Course(s) / Module(s)

This stage in the approval process includes detailed negotiation between the relevant academic colleagues in the School and Partner to establish the academic provision required.

## 7.2 Constitution of University Approval Panel

To consider course approval/review, through Quality Assurance Authorisation Panel (Low Risk only).

Panel Constitution for an Abridged Course Approval Panel, the Quality Assurance Authorisation Panel (Low risk only)

The Panel will be convened by Student Learning & Academic Registry (QAV), in consultation with the Chair of the event, and will always include:

* **Chair**: School Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) or nominee related to the link School (i.e., Head of Department (see **Section 2.5**)
* **Officer**: Student Learning & Academic Registry (QAV)

Additional Panel members will normally comprise of a selection of colleagues with expertise aligned to the awards under consideration:

* External Subject Expert identified from a Higher Education Institution (HEI) or written comments normally from the existing Award External Examiner.
* An independent Employer
* At least one member of Academic staff from the relevant School, independent of the course(s) under consideration
* School Principal Lecturer(s)
* Academic Librarian, with subject expertise
* Representative from Student Learning & Academic Registry (QAV)
* Member of Academic Staff, external to the school, with recent Partner working experience or where appropriate written comments normally from the existing Award External Examiner
* Panel members external to the school with specific expertise including:
	+ Representative from Student Learning & Academic Registry (QAV)
	+ Head of Online Learning or nominated Learning Designer for OL provision.
	+ Colleague with Professional Apprenticeship knowledge
	+ Student and Library Services (Student Futures)

## 7.3 Title Approval Process

 Prior to consideration by QAAP, the School and Partner must submit the Title Approval form (PD3) and Course Costing Template to SLAR (QAV) for consideration and processing.

## 7.4 Documentation Requirements for University Approval of Short Awards

 In preparation for the approval, Schools will support Partner(s) in preparing the following documentation for consideration:

* Portfolio Development form (PD3)
* Module Specification(s)
* Partner Curriculum Vitae’s for staff involved with delivering the content of the course/module
* Course Specification (for named University Certificates of 60 credits or greater)
* Course Handbook
* University Approval Statement (**E-Annex 17**)

In addition, when the Partner is seeking approval of awards greater than or equal to 60 credits a Route B Proforma should be presented for consideration by the Panel.

For further support and guidance the **Credit Accumulation and Modular Scheme** identifies the requirements for University Certificate (UC) Awards and [**Chapter B: Portfolio Development**](https://www.tees.ac.uk/docs/DocRepo/Quality%20framework/B%20-%20Portfolio%20Development.doc) gives details for approval of titles.

## 7.5 Outcome of the Quality Assurance & Authorisation Panel

The QAAP Panel is required to base its judgement on a review of the evidence presented and reports the decision to SLEC for information via the School Standing Report:

**Conclusion – Quality and Standards**

This relates to the Course Team’s approach to setting, maintaining, and enhancing academic standards, and the likelihood that the students will be able to achieve those standards through the learning opportunities and support provided to them by the proposed course.

|  |
| --- |
| **The judgement will be either:****Approved** - the course(s) can be recommended for approval. The normal approval period would be 6 years (indicating the mode of attendance and method of delivery).**or****Not Approved** – the course(s) cannot be recommended for approval. |

At the end of the Event, a verbal summary will be provided on the Panel’s conclusion, including conditions and recommendations:

* **Good Practice –** It is appropriate to recognise any commendation and Good Practice highlighted throughout discussions during the event, or within the documentation presented for consideration.
* **Conditions -** A recommendation of approval may be subject to conditions specified in the Event report. These must be met in full before final approval can be confirmed.
* **Recommendations -** Any recommendations which are intended to assist the Partner’s development will be followed up as part of continuous monitoring and enhancement.

Approval of the Partners award is normally granted for a six-year period in the first instance and is subject to Review thereafter.

## 7.6 Partnership and Short Award Approval Report

 The record of the approval meeting, covering both partnership and award approval aspects, should be made using the **University Approval Report** templates.

The Officer will compile the report, incorporating discussion from both the Partnership and Course Approval. The written report of the event and its outcomes will be prepared in draft and agreed by the Chair before circulation to appropriate parties, including the Partner.

The Partner is also asked to check the report’s factual accuracy.

The Partner is required to submit their written response to each of the conditions of approval and recommendations by the specified deadline. This response must be sufficiently detailed to give the University confidence that the conditions have been met.

The Panel Chair has responsibility for determining the final outcome and reporting of the Partnership recommendation for approval to SLEC.

Subsequent notification to SLEC of the approval of additional award(s)/module(s) would normally be included within the School Standing Report following final approval of documentation within the School.

## 7.7 Post Approval of Short Awards

Following the Short Award Validation Event, the Partner, with support from the relevant School, will amend documentation for resubmission. It is essential that responses to conditions are contained within the Event report outlining where and how the conditions and recommendations have been addressed, quoting documentation titles and page numbers.

The Partner, with support from the academic School, will submit the report electronically, with appropriate signatures, to SLAR (QAV). SLAR Officers will check the report for completeness and facilitate final sign-off by the University Academic Registrar or nominee.

SLAR (QAV) will notify the School and central departments and the ‘subject to approval’ flag can be removed from marketing material following this final stage of the process.

The University SLEC will receive a list of short award approval(s) for information.

Following Officer led sign-off of the short award and Title Approval, the relevant Associate Dean in conjunction with LGS will forward a definitive CCP/contractual agreement for signature by the Vice-Chancellor (or nominee) and Principal/Head of the Partner Institution together with the generic University Operations Manual, and where appropriate, any relevant addendum(s) (**OM-Annex 1**). The processes detailed in **Section 2.10** must be followed to manage the post approval processes.

***All Partners are advised that students must not be recruited, and course delivery must not take place, until the CCP/contractual agreement has been signed.***

## 7.8 Assessment and Award Process

The performance of students will be considered by the relevant School Module Assessment and Award Board. All self-contained UC Awards have at least one External Examiner assigned for moderation in accordance with the University’s existing requirements.

## 7.9 Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement

Course Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement will follow the University processes as detailed in [**Chapter D1: Continuous Monitoring & Enhancement**](https://www.tees.ac.uk/docs/DocRepo/Quality%20framework/D1%20-%20Continuous%20Monitoring%20Enhancement.doc) of the Quality Framework and the relevant Operations Manual.

## 7.10 Additional Portfolio Development with an Approved Partner

A process for Partnership Extension is required where an approved Partner wishes to deliver additional award(s) not considered as part of the original proposal.

Where this involves the addition of a short award(s), the process and documentation will normally mirror that identified in the QAAP approval process, in **Section 4**. The Partner is not required to update the **University Approval Statement** (**E-Annex 17**). However, in place of this document, the Collaborative Partner must complete the **Partner Course(s) Location Visit Statement** (**E-Annex 14**) which outlines relevant information relating to the new award and the physical resources and facilities required for delivery.

In addition, the title approval form (**B-Annex 3 - PD3: New Named University Certificate Award Title**) will require consideration and approval through QAAP.

Following final approval of documentation by QAAP, notification of the new award, delivered with the approved partner, would normally be included within the School Standing Report to SLEC.

It is essential that the relevant Associate Dean within the School, in partnership with LGS, include the newly approved provision on the existing CCP/contractual agreement.

## 7.11 Additional or Changed Delivery Location for an Approved Short Award with an Approved Partner

In the case where an approved Partner wishes to deliver an approved award at a new location that was not considered as part of the original proposal or change the delivery location, the modification process, as outlined within **Chapter C: Course and Module Modifications**, should be completed.

This process requires completion of a **Partner Course(s) Location Visit Statement** (**E-Annex 14**) to ensure the new location meets the minimum requirements for delivery and the revised title approval form (**B-Annex 3 – PD2**) which will require consideration and approval.

In cases where a Partner wishes to deliver an approved Short Award at an International location, the School must in the first instance, seek further advice from both the International Development and Legal and Governance Services prior to progressing the additional approval arrangements.

Notification to SLEC would normally be included within the School Standing Report to SLEC following final approval of documentation within the School.

Once approval has been granted for the new location, SLAR (QAV) will inform the Finance Department, and Student Recruitment and Marketing (SRM), and LGS of the new approved location.

It is essential that the relevant Associate Dean within the School, in partnership with LGS, include the newly approved location on the existing CCP/contractual agreement.

## 7.12 Periodic Review of Course(s) Involving Co-delivery with a Partner

 Courses are normally granted the University’s standard approval period of six years. A Panel has discretion to recommend a shorter or longer approval period depending on individual circumstances, and this may be exercised. In addition, a Professional Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) may stipulate a maximum approval period.

## 7.13 Changes between Scheduled Reviews

 For further details relating to changes between scheduled reviews, please refer to **Section 8.21**.

# 8. TYPOLOGY 3 & 4: course VALIDATION of Teesside University FRANCHISED (Typology 3), AND VALIDATED (Typology 4) AWARDS, WHERE THE PARTNER IS INVOLVED IN DEVELOPING THE COURSE AND ITS CONSTITUENT MODULES

The purpose of the Course Design, Development and Approval (validation) process is to establish that all new taught courses are academically sustainable, that academic standards are clearly defined to ensure courses deliver a high-quality student experience and offer students the best opportunity to learn, develop and succeed regardless of the delivery location.

The University adheres to the guiding principles for [**Course Design and Development from the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education (November 2018)**](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/course-design-and-development). They provide a concise expression of the fundamental practices of the higher education sector, based on the experience of a wide range of providers.

## 8.1 Overview of Process

The approval and development involves the following stages:

* Title Approval form and Course Costing Template
* Following liaison between SLAR (QAV), the Partner and the relevant School(s), the course/award (the proposal) is included on the Teesside University Course Approval and Periodic Review schedule
* A series of critical deadlines and work schedules is established
* SLAR (QAV) prepare the Preliminary Meeting: Validation Arrangements form, as outlined in **Chapter C**, and would normally follow the guidance relating to **Route A** approval processes
* An academic subject specialist from the relevant School (Link Tutor) will be assigned to support the Partner in the development of the proposal, or in the case of franchised delivery, understand how the course is delivered and managed
* The Course Team at the Partner Institution, with the support of the Link Tutor and SLAR (QAV), will prepare the required documentation for the Course Validation or Location Approval Event (see **Section 8.6**)
* The documentation is scrutinised by the Partner to ensure it is fit for purpose. This review includes appropriate scrutiny of the proposed modules. The Link Tutor must be provided with a complete set of documentation to feed into the Partner discussion and where possible will attend the Event
* Course First Critical Read Event will be undertaken at Teesside University, this Event will seek to assure the academic quality and standards of the modules and award(s) under consideration. In addition, the Event will provisionally approve the diet of modules associated with the award(s). The Link Tutor will support the Partner through the Course First Critical Read process. Depending on circumstances, such as Location Approval, the Course First Critical Read may not be appropriate
* The proposal is considered by a Course Validation Panel which is Chaired by the relevant School, and organised and serviced by SLAR (QAV)
* The process will include, as appropriate, consideration of any location approval of specialist resources/equipment connected with the Course Approval. (**E-Annex 14**)
* The Validation Panel recommends the approval/non-approval of course(s) or continuation of approval
* Subject to any conditions of approval being addressed satisfactorily, SLAR (QAV) will facilitate final sign-off by the University Academic Registrar or nominee
* The University SLEC will receive a list of course approval(s) for information

Further details relating to the level of support provided by Teesside University through the Course First approach processes, please refer to the **Course Design and Development Support for Partner** (**E-Annex 16**).

The location of the Course Approval/Periodic Review Event will be determined by the SLAR (QAV), in conjunction with the relevant School(s).

## **8.2 New Course Proposals – Initial Stages**

The initial stages of a proposal for a new course are managed between SLAR (QAV) and the relevant University School(s). All requests for new course development, whether they originate in the International Development Department, a School or Partner should be communicated to SLAR (QAV) in the first instance. SLAR (QAV) will facilitate the progression of the course development up to and including the final approval stage including liaison with the relevant School(s).

Where there are potential issues – for example a ‘non-congruent subject development’, the School may wish to explore the proposal in more detail before progressing to title approval. In such cases, SLAR (QAV) will communicate the outcome of these discussions to the Partner and facilitate discussions as appropriate (see **E-Annex 15, Guidance in relation to the Development and Operation of Collaboration in “Non-Congruent” Courses**).

## 8.3 New Title Approval

 The Partner will complete the relevant Title Approval form (accessible via[**Chapter B: Portfolio Development**](https://www.tees.ac.uk/docs/DocRepo/Quality%20framework/B%20-%20Portfolio%20Development.doc)) and Course Costing Template and submit electronically, along with the CV’s of the proposed teaching team, to SLAR (QAV) for consideration by the School. Having determined that the staff CV’s demonstrate appropriate expertise and relevant qualifications, the School will submit the completed title approval form to SLAR (QAV) to seek formal approval for the proposed development(s) from the Academic Registrar. Approved proposals are submitted to SLEC for information.

Where the Partner is part of the TUCP, Schools are required to respond to the College, copying in SLAR (QAV), to provide confirmation that they either agree or not with the proposal. If the School does not support the proposal, an accompanying statement should be provided to explain the rationale behind this decision. After which, the PD form will be submitted to TUCP Board who will consider the proposal along with the School response and make a final recommendation. Approved proposals are then checked and signed-off by the Academic Registrar or nominee and submitted to SLEC for information.

Following approval, the School will assign members of academic staff to support the Collaborative Partner in the development process. SLAR (QAV) is responsible for co-ordinating the Course Validation Event and will liaise with the Collaborative Partner and the School, as appropriate.

## 8.4 Preparation of Course Validation or Location Approval Documentation

 SLAR (QAV) and the relevant Link Tutor within School(s) will support the Collaborative Partner in preparing the appropriate documentation in accordance with the requirements set out in [**Guidance for Course Teams for the Validation of**](https://www.tees.ac.uk/docs/DocRepo/Quality%20framework/C-Appendix%202%20-%20Guidance%20for%20Course%20Teams%20Validation%20of%20New%20and%20Existing%20Uni%20Progs.doc) **Courses** (see **Chapter C**, **C-Appendix 2**). In addition, Partners will be provided access to Teesside University online resources to support the development of the Course First approach documentation (see **E-Annex 16**).

 Specific documentation requirements will be detailed via the Preliminary Meeting: Validation Arrangements form, prepared by SLAR (QAV), which will be shared with the School Link Tutor and Partner.

The Event will normally be held at the Partner’s premises if assessment of any specialist teaching resources is required. Alternatively, any specialist resources will be assessed separately through the completion of a **Partner** **Course(s) Location Visit Statement** (see **E-Annex 14**). A decision on the location of the Approval or Periodic Review Event, will be made by the SLAR (QAV) in conjunction with the Chair of the Course Validation Event.

### 8.4.1 Course Approval

A **Course Validation Event** will focus discussion on the new course proposal using the **‘Themes for Discussion and Conclusion’** pages, which aim to ensure the academic provision is robust, coherent and offers high quality student learning experience. The Panel will discuss the documented commentary and evidence provided, areas of strength and perceived areas for enhancement with members of the Course Team, and reach judgements as identified in **Section 8.16**.

### 8.4.2 Location Approval

A **Location Approval** **Event** will focus discussion on the new location proposal using the **‘Themes for Discussion and Conclusion – Location Approval’** pages, which aim to ensure the location offers high quality student learning experience. The Panel will discuss the documented commentary and evidence provided, areas of strength and perceived areas for enhancement with members of the Course Team, and reach judgements as identified in **Section 8.16**.

### 8.4.3 Periodic Review

Courses are normally granted the University’s standard approval period of six years. Approval periods identified greater than six years must, in the first instance, be discussed with SLAR (QAV). In addition, a PSRB may stipulate an approval period for a shorter period of time. SLAR (QAV) will manage the review schedule in conjunction with the relevant School and Partner(s).

Partner course reviews, where the course is also delivered as Teesside University home-based provision, will be scheduled appropriately in conjunction with the relevant Teesside University School, and co-ordinated by SLAR (QAV). In this case, standard processes for Periodic Review as detailed in [**Chapter C:**](https://www.tees.ac.uk/docs/DocRepo/Quality%20framework/C-Course%20Periodic%20Review.doc) **Course Design, Development and Validation** of the Quality Framework will apply.

Where a course and its modules have been developed by a Partner, the arrangements for the organisation and management of the Periodic Review Event will be undertaken by SLAR (QAV) with support from the relevant School(s).

The **Periodic Review Process** is designed to build explicitly on the Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement Process and to draw conclusions from existing sources of information about the current provision. Therefore, the Panel will focus discussion on the evaluation process undertaken by the Course Team and the action plan, in addition to consideration of any new developments.

The Panel will also discuss the documenting commentary, evidence provided, areas of strength, and perceived areas for enhancement with members of the Course Team, and reach judgements as identified in **Section 8.16**.

SLAR (QAV) will co-ordinate final completion of the report and course documentation with the relevant School(s). SLAR Officers will check the report for completeness and facilitate final sign-off via the Officer-led process.

## 8.5 Variance from University Regulations

The University operates institution-wide assessment regulations to ensure professional academic judgements about standards and performance are exercised in such a way, that all students are treated fairly, comparatively and with consistency regardless of School, Institution, subject or course.

However, it is recognised that occasionally, and under specific conditions, some variance to the Regulations may be necessary. Any such variance will be exceptional and must be fully justified to, and approved by, SLEC. Variance to the Regulations will normally only be approved to meet the specified requirements or expectations of PSRBs or other such external bodies that accredit awards of the University. In such cases, the Collaborative Partner, through the relevant School, will be required to apply to the SLEC for approval, giving the rationale underpinning the need for variance.

Approved variances are time limited and normally linked to the approval period of the course. Where a course is due for review and the team wish to retain an existing variance(s) and/or add variances, new applications will need to be made using the appropriate proforma.

Further guidance can be found on the [**Variance Procedure for Assessment**](https://unity3.tees.ac.uk/departments/058/AS2017/SitePages/Variance%20Procedure%20for%20Assessment%20Regulations.aspx) website.

## 8.6 Documentary Requirements

All Course Validation proposals will normally include the following documentation for consideration by the Panel, and would normally be received electronically a **minimum** of two weeks prior to the scheduled date of the event:

* Title Approval Form
* Briefing Note
* Course Handbook
* Course Specification for all recruiting awards, using Teesside University Course Specification template – including Stage Outcomes, Map of Modules to Outcomes and Assessment Chart or in the case of Location Approval, the current Course Specification approved by Teesside University
* Course Approval Document (CAD), Course Evaluation Narrative (CEN) or Location Approval Document (LAD) including Library Statement, Assessment Chart, Map of Outcomes to Modules and Stage Learning Outcomes, where applicable
* Module Specifications – using Teesside University template or in the case of Location Approval, the current Module Specification approved by Teesside University
* Completed **E-Annex 14** **Partner Course(s) Location Visit Statement** outlining specialist resources and associated evidence file
* Generic Operations Manual with completed Addendum (incorporating the operational statement), where relevant to the course(s) under consideration
* Critical Read Actions and outcomes
* Staff CVs
* Other documentation as appropriate that supports course delivery, e.g., Placement/Mentor Handbooks or specific additional documentation required by the PSRB
* Additional mapping exercise such as Apprenticeship Standard/Mapping document where applicable. Where a progression arrangement has been identified (e.g., a Level 6 progression route) a course learning outcomes mapping exercise should be carried out to document the advanced standing arrangements
* Supporting File of Evidence (for Periodic Reviews only)

### 8.6.1 Course(s) to be delivered by Online Learning

This will include the relationships of the proposed module or course to the Future Facing Learning (FFL) Strategy and the OL Strategic Transformation and Change Project. The Panel will seek to:

* Assure the viability around a proposed structure for the course, and associated modules, in line with collaborative pedagogic and design thinking.
* The skills and the expertise of the staff delivering the course via these methods, and
* The alignment of the proposed provision with the University’s strategic approach to design, development, systems and processes of online learning.

Advice and Guidance for Course Teams on preparing for Online Learning course delivery and approval can be found in **Chapter C**, **Appendix 4:** [**Guidance for Course Teams on the Design and Development of Teesside University Online Provision**](https://www.tees.ac.uk/docs/DocRepo/Quality%20framework/C-Appendix%204%20-%20Guidance%20for%20Course%20Teams%20for%20Online%20Learning%20Delivery.doc).

## 8.7 Development and Review of the Curriculum

The curriculum roadmap is designed to facilitate and support a course-focused approach to curriculum design and development, refer to **Chapter C**, **Appendix 2:** [**Guidance for Course Teams for the Validation of**](https://www.tees.ac.uk/docs/DocRepo/Quality%20framework/C-Appendix%202%20-%20Guidance%20for%20Course%20Teams%20Validation%20of%20New%20and%20Existing%20Uni%20Progs.doc) **Courses**.

The course-focused approach places emphasis on the overall coherence and connectedness of learning outcomes and learning, teaching and assessment practices at the scale of the course. It requires a strategic, collaborative, and planned approach by Course Teams to ‘design in’ how the elements that make up the student learning and assessment experience support each other and are structured to help guide students’ progression towards attainment of course learning outcomes.

 The development and review process for new and revised modules is managed by the Partner with input from the relevant Link Tutor within the School. The subsequent approval process is designed to ensure that all course documentation is current and appropriate to the learning outcomes.

**Module Guidance** is available to support the initial design, approval, and ongoing review. This includes specific guidance in relation to the Assessment Regulations (2022), and implications for learning and teaching, and assessment design. This guidance is contained with the respective [**Good Practice Guide for Module Leaders on Module Design and Development**](https://www.tees.ac.uk/docs/DocRepo/Quality%20framework/C-Appendix%203%20-%20Good%20Practice%20Guide%20for%20Module%20Leaders%20on%20Module%20Design%20and%20Development.doc) (see **C-Appendix 3**).

### 8.7.1 Location Approval Contextualisation of Course/Modules

 Local contextualisation of course delivery and/or adaptation of existing modules under a franchised model is managed by the Partner with input from the Link Tutor within the relevant School. The subsequent approval process is designed to ensure that all modules remain current, are appropriate to the course(s) and its associated learning outcomes and delivery consistent with the original Teesside University approved course. Any information concerning local contextualisation of the course or modules should be contained in the LAD.

**Note:** SLS provide input on learning resources, as required, at the Course First Critical Read Event.

## 8.8 Partner Event Documentation Review

The Partner must undertake its own preliminary review of all course documentation prior to formal submission to the University. This takes the form of a Partner Event and must be scheduled within an appropriate time frame to meet the deadlines for the University Course First Critical Read. The Partner’s review must include detailed scrutiny of the course, its constituent modules and resourcing, and where relevant any specific PSRB requirements.

The Link Tutor from the University will be invited to participate in the meeting either through attendance at the Partner Event or via written comments on the course or proposed modules, where applicable, prior to this event taking place. All members of the Partner’s course delivery team are required to participate in the event. It is expected that the meeting will include a searching examination of all course and module documentation.

 The Partner may wish to use the [**Guidance for Panel Members for the Validation of**](https://www.tees.ac.uk/docs/DocRepo/Quality%20framework/C-Appendix%201%20-%20Guidance%20for%20Panel%20Members%20Validation%20%20%26%20PR%20of%20Existing%20Uni%20Progs.doc) **Courses** (see **Chapter C**, **C-Appendix 1**) as a basis for the agenda.

 The authorised senior Quality Manager with responsibility for Higher Education at the Collaborative Partner Institution, must ensure that the documentation submitted for consideration by the Teesside University panel addresses the conclusions from its internal process. The Quality Manager must confirm in writing to SLAR (QAV) before the University processes can progress.

## 8.9 Course First Critical Read Event of the Course Approval Process

 In conjunction with the School/Partner, SLAR (QAV) will agree the operation and organisation of the Course First Critical Read stage.

 The purpose of the Course First Critical Read Event is to undertake a rehearsal in preparation for the formal Validation Event. It will seek to assure the academic quality and standards of the modules and award(s), and to ensure the documentation produced meets the requirements for the formal Course Validation Event such as clarity, accuracy, and comprehensiveness.

 The members of the Panel will act as a critical friend, providing supportive and collegiate advice and guidance on strengthening the documentation to ensure it provides a robust academic rationale and complies as follows, where appropriate:

* Has been informed by University strategic priorities, underpinned by Future Facing Learning and the Academic Enhancement Framework (AEF).
* Proposed assessment activities have been considered against the Assessment and Feedback Policy (AFP).
* The course(s) delivers an outstanding student learning experience.

## 8.10 Provisional Approval of Module Diet

The Course First Critical Read Event Panel will **provisionally approve the diet of modules** according to institutionally agreed requirements through the Credit Accumulation & Modular Scheme (CAMS), Assessment and Feedback Policy (AFP), Assessment Regulations). A hard copy of the Teesside University Module specification [UTREG] is available in **C-Appendix 3**: [**Good Practice Guide: For Module Leaders on Module Design and Development**](https://www.tees.ac.uk/docs/DocRepo/Quality%20framework/C-Appendix%203%20-%20Good%20Practice%20Guide%20for%20Module%20Leaders%20on%20Module%20Design%20and%20Development.doc), and must be completed in preparation for Course First Critical Read Event.

Therefore, the Course First Critical Read Event Panel will seek to ensure the:

* Academic standards (level) and sustainability of modules.
* Coherence (vertical and horizontal structure) and subject specificity.
* The nature and inclusivity of assessments in the overall design, and assessment tariffs, and
* Confirm module tutors have drawn on all appropriate external references i.e., FHEQ, QAA Subject Benchmarks etc. internal University strategic agenda, academic regulations and guidance surrounding the design and delivery of modules.

## 8.11 Constitution of the Course First Critical Read Event Panel

The relevant Teesside University School has oversight of the approval and review of modules developed by a Collaborative Partner. The location of the Module Approval/Review Event will be decided by SLAR (QAV) in conjunction with the relevant School. SLAR (QAV) organise and service the Course First Critical Read Event through a Panel normally comprising of members as follows:

* **Chair** – Independent Head of Department (or nominee)
* Academic Librarian with subject expertise
* **Officer:** Student Learning & Academic Registry (QAV)

Additional Panel members will normally comprise of a selection of colleagues from the school and across the University with expertise aligned to the awards under consideration:

* School Learning and Teaching representative, normally a learning and teaching fellow
* Member(s) of academic staff from different subject areas within the School
* Panel members external to the school with specific expertise including:
	+ Student Learning & Academic Registry (QAV)
	+ Independent Learning Designer from SLAR (DX) or nominee
	+ Colleague with Professional Apprenticeship knowledge
	+ Student & Library Services (Student Futures)

**Partners**

For Partner events, the associated Link Tutor will support the Course Team through the Course First Critical Read Event.

## 8.12 Formal Validation Event

 The purpose of the Formal Validation Event is to assure the academic quality and standards of the modules and award(s), and to ensure the documentation provides an accurate and comprehensive reflection based on the seven guiding principles set out in the [**QAA Quality Code for Higher Education (Nov 2018) for Course Design and Development**](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/course-design-and-development).

During the Formal Validation event, consideration is given to the following themes:

* The **rationale/consultation** for the course(s), including the **distinctive features**.
* The course **curriculum**, its design, content, delivery, and assessment.
* The appropriateness of the **standards** set for the level of the award.
* The suitability of human, physical and other learning **resources** to support the course(s).
* The **student experience** offered by the course including opportunities for employment and further study for its graduates.
* The way in which the course facilitates the **widest possible access** to ensure that all students can maximise their potential.

## 8.13 Organisation and Constitution of the Standard Course Approval Panel

The location of the Formal Validation or Location event will be determined by SLAR (QAV), in consultation with the Chair of the event and the relevant University School(s).

The Panel membership of the validation event will be approved by SLAR (QAV), in consultation with the Chair of the event, and will comprise of as a minimum:

* **Chair:** normally, an internal Chair from the related School (approved by Dean, e.g., AD, HOD, PL) - (see **Section 5.5** – Criteria for External Chairing)
* Representative from Student Learning & Academic Registry
* **Officer:** Student Learning & Academic Registry (QAV)

Additional Panel members will normally comprise of a selection of colleagues with expertise aligned to the awards under consideration:

* + External Subject Expert:
		- Formal Validation – identified from a Higher Education Institution (HEI)
		- **Externality** (peer consultation and feedback from external academics/practitioners) **remains a key feature of the process**, however there may be occasions where it is deemed more appropriate to seek written comments, normally from the existing Award External Examiner, specifically related to the appropriateness of the approved award to be delivered in the new location or mode of delivery, highlighting any recommendations for contextualisation of course content
* An independent employer/practitioner
* Service user/carers representative, where appropriate
* PSRB Representative (refer to **Section 5.3**)
* At least one member of Academic Staff from within the school, independent of the course(s) under consideration
* At least one member of Academic Staff external to the school
* Academic Librarian with subject expertise
* Student Panel Member
* Panel members external to the school with specific expertise including:
* Head of Online Learning, or nominee for OL provision
* Colleague with Professional Apprenticeship knowledge
* Student and Library Services (Student Futures)

Where a member of staff has supported the proposing team in the development of the course(s), these individuals are precluded from Panel membership at the event.

In the case of Location Approval Event, it is deemed good practice that a member of academic staff from the approved Course Team (preferably the Course Leader) will participate in the event alongside, and in support of, the Collaborative Partner Course Team.

For all Partner Validation events, the associated Link Tutor will participate alongside Partner Course Team.

The selection of the external colleague(s) from practice or industry **must** be made with full regard to impartiality and should not be connected directly with the Course Team or have a particular interest in the approval of the award(s) ([**Chapter C, Course Design, Development and**](https://www.tees.ac.uk/docs/DocRepo/Quality%20framework/C-Course%20Design%2C%20Development%20and%20Approval.doc) **Validation Section 5.7** of the Quality Framework provides further guidance on the suitability of external panel members).

|  |
| --- |
| The External Academic Panel Member and independent employer/practitioner nominee CVs **must** be submitted by the School/Collaborative Partner to SLAR (QAV) ***prior*** to the Validation Event for confirmation of their suitability\*. |

### 8.13.1 UK Home Office Visas & Immigration (UKVI) Requirements for External Panel Members

In addition to their academic/practice-based suitability, proposed External Panel Members must also be eligible to work in the UK in accordance with United Kingdom Home Office Visas & Immigration (UKVI) requirements.

### 8.13.2 Role of Students in the Periodic Review Event

The QAA Quality Code for Higher Education describes the importance of meaningful participation of students in quality assurance and enhancement processes, which results in the improvement in their educational experience, as well as benefiting the wider student body, institution, and sector. An expectation of the Quality Code is that courses are well-designed, provide a high-quality academic experience for all students and enable student achievement to be reliably assessed. To support this expectation, it is essential to recognise that learning is a partnership and that students provide an invaluable perspective on conditions needed for high-quality academic experience and how this can be continuously improved.

Student feedback should be captured at an early stage of the Periodic Review process through a group meeting with students. The Student Consultation Meeting Form provide a series of themed questions and a response section that can be used to facilitate discussion and gather feedback from students on the quality of their academic experience and how this can be improved. The responses to these questions can then be incorporate within the CEN.

The Periodic Review Event may include a private meeting between the Panel and students, which will focus on their views of the course and how these have been incorporated into the ongoing monitoring and enhancement of the course. In such cases the course will be notified in advance.

## 8.14 Main Focus for the Discussion for Location Approval Events

The focus of the Location Event will be to provide confirmation that the teaching staff and facilities at the Partner are appropriate for the delivery of the course(s), and whether there is sufficient infrastructure in terms of the overall learning environment and student experience. It is expected that the LAD will include a resource statement detailing the learning resources available at the site, including specialist equipment, and IT equipment. This will also require liaison with the appropriate Teesside University Subject Librarian with regard to appropriate learning resources and any licencing issues and arrangements for the induction of staff.

## 8.15 Outcomes of Course Periodic Review

The Panel will consider whether or not the Course Team has undertaken a sufficiently robust and rigorous critical evaluation of the course and has ensured that it remains current and valid in the light of developing knowledge in the discipline, practice in its application, and developments in teaching and learning.

Based on the above, the Panel will come to an overall judgement regarding the team’s capacity to set, maintain and enhance academic standards and the quality of the learning opportunities for students based on the review undertaken. The Panel will make one of the following recommendations:

|  |
| --- |
| **The judgement on the review evaluation process will be either:****No further action** required to enhance the review process**or****Further action** required to enhance the review process |

The latter judgement would be appropriate if, following a review of the documentation and discussion with the Course Team, there is insufficient detail provided or evidence of rigour in the course review process. If further action is required to enhance the review process, the course may still continue in approval but would require a further full or Interim Review in the short to medium term. Alternatively, the Panel may recommend that enhanced Continuous Monitoring is undertaken in which case the rationale and scope should be described clearly in the Panel’s report.

In the case that the course cannot continue in approval, no further student intakes will be recruited, and the University will determine how to ensure the quality of the learning experience for students remaining on the course (see **Section 5.7** for processes related to termination of courses and Partnerships).

## 8.16 Outcomes of Course Approval/Review and Location Event

**Conclusion – Quality and Standards**

This relates to the Course Team’s approach to setting, maintaining, and enhancing academic standards, and the likelihood that the students will be able to achieve those standards through the learning opportunities and support provided to them by the proposed course.

|  |
| --- |
| **The judgement for Course Approval / Review Events will be either:****Approved** - the course(s) can be recommended for approval. The normal approval period would be 6 years (indicating the mode of attendance and method of delivery).**or****Not Approved** – the course(s) cannot be recommended for approval.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **The judgement for Location Events will be either:****Approved** - the new location can be recommended for approval. The normal approval period would be in line with the current period of approval for the course (indicating the mode of attendance and method of delivery).**or****Not Approved** – the new location cannot be recommended for approval.  |

**Conclusions – Commendation(s)**

The Panel may wish to highlight areas for commendation(s). Commendations would be identified where the Panel consider the actions of the Course Team, in preparation for the Course Approval/Periodic Review Event, have been exceptional and above those expected. Commendations could be acknowledged for any aspect of the approval process.

**Conclusions – Transferable Good Practice**

The Panel will identify the aspects of the course, which represent Transferable Good Practice based on demonstrable evidence which can be applied, or undertaken, in other Schools or adopted by subject disciplines. For example, inclusive teaching and learning interventions which both increase participation from students with protected characteristics, mechanisms which increase attainment of higher award classifications, demonstrable positive impacts on employability (Graduate Outcomes), Longitudinal Education Outcomes (LEO)), and quality and standards of teaching and learning i.e., increased National Student Survey (NSS) scores etc. These aspects are noted by SLAR (QAV) and disseminated by Student Learning & Academic Registry (Academic Development) (SLAR (AD)) to support enhancement.

**Conclusions – Conditions and Recommendations**

The Panel may set conditions (which must be addressed prior to the commencement of the revised/reviewed course, or exceptionally, by the specified date after the commencement of the next intake), and recommendations for further enhancement (which may be directed to the School or University to consider/address).

If the discussion at the Event provided sufficient clarity regarding an issue, the Panel will not normally require the supporting course documentation to be updated, unless such a record is viewed as essential.

## 8.17 Recommendation of an Interim Review of the Course(s)

 In recommending approval, the Panel may stipulate an Interim Review during the period of course approval, normally following the completion of the first cohort of students.

 In the case of an Interim Review, the rationale and focus of the review should be made explicit in the Course Approval or Periodic Review Event Report, and an **Interim Review Event: Summary of Requirements** form must be completed by the Panel Chair.

## 8.18 Post Approval/Periodic Review Event Process

 A report of the Course Validation or Location Event will be produced by the Officer from SLAR (QAV) and approved by the Chair. The report is circulated to all Panel Members for a factual accuracy check and final approval.

Following the Event, the Course Team at the Partner Institution will amend the course documentation for resubmission. Support will be available from the Teesside University Link Tutor to complete the response to conditions and recommendations showing that the conditions have been met, outlining where and how they have been addressed, quoting documentation titles and page numbers.

The documents and report will be forwarded for approval to:

* The relevant authorised senior HE Quality Manager at the Partner Institution will approve the amended documentation by signing the Event Report as the Partner confirming the conditions and recommendations have been met to their satisfaction.
* The Chair of the Event will approve the amended documentation by signing the Event Report as the Panel Chair confirming conditions have been met by the Course Team, and that the Course Specification is accurate, complete, and fit for publication.

SLAR (QAV) will co-ordinate final completion of the report and course documentation with the relevant School(s). SLAR Officers will check the report for completeness and facilitate final sign-off via the Officer-led process.

Once approved SLAR (QAV) will facilitate the new course being added to the relevant schedule in the Partnership CCP/contractual agreement and the ‘subject to approval’ flag removed from marketing material following this stage of the process.

The University SLEC will receive notification of course approval(s) for information.

***All Partners are advised that students must not be recruited, and course delivery must not take place, until the CCP/contractual agreement has been signed.***

## 8.19 New or Additional Pathway(s)

Where the Panel are consideringnew pathway(s) particular attention should be given to:

* The distinctive nature of the new pathway, including course structures and learning and teaching strategy.
* Specific requirements relating to assessment and progression.
* Availability of relevant resources (physical and staffing).

A process for Partnership Extension is required where an approved Partner wishes to deliver additional award(s) not considered as part of the original proposal.

Where this involves the addition of a new or additional pathway, the process and documentation will normally mirror that identified in **Chapter C**, **Route B** approval process. The Collaborative Partner is not required to update the **Institutional Approval, Resources and Risk Assessment Statement for Partners** (**E-Annex 4**). However, in place of this document, the Collaborative Partner must complete the **Partner Course(s) Location Visit Statement** (**E-Annex 14**) which outlines relevant information relating to the new award and the physical resources and facilities required for delivery.

In addition, the title approval form (**B-Annex 2 – PD2: New or Existing Award Title to be Approved/Delivered by a New or Existing Partner**) will require consideration and approval through QAAP.

Following final approval of documentation and report, SLAR Officers will check the report for completeness and facilitate final sign-off by the University Academic Registrar or nominee.

It is essential that the relevant Associate Dean within the School, in partnership with LGS, include the newly approved provision on the existing CCP/contractual agreement.

## 8.20 Approval of an Additional or New Location for an Existing Course with an Approved Partner

In the case where an approved Partner wishes to deliver an approved award at a new location that was not considered as part of the original proposal or change the delivery location, the modification process, as outlined within **Chapter C: Course and Module Modifications**, should be completed and the following processes will normally apply:

* A senior member of a School will normally conduct a visit to the new location to prepare a new or revised **Partner Course(s) Location Visit Statement** (**E-Annex 14**) for consideration by QAAP, together with the following evidence and supporting documentation:
* Confirmation that the teaching staff and facilities are appropriate for the delivery of the course(s) and whether there is sufficient infrastructure in terms of the overall learning environment and student experience at the new location.
* A specific statement on any requirements for induction and staff development for those delivering the course who are situated at the new location.
* A resources statement detailing the learning resources available at the new location, including specialist equipment, IT equipment, texts, and electronic resources.
* CVs of the staff delivering the course(s) at the new location.
* PSRB status (where this applies): information regarding the course’s status in terms of any exemption with written confirmation of how such accreditation may apply in relation to the proposed new location and country of delivery.
* An assurance that the Partner understands any implications associated with its PSRB status, and the arrangements undertaken to ensure students have been correctly briefed and that any publicity material describes the course in a way that is not potentially or actually misleading.

**Note:** for international delivery specific considerations may apply in relation to recognition.

* Where appropriate, in conjunction with the Subject Librarian confirm appropriate learning resources and induction of students at the new location.
* Requests from TUCP will initially be submitted to TUCP Board who will consider the proposal along with the School response to the request and make a final recommendation.
* Once title approval has been granted for the new location, SLAR (QAV) will inform Finance Department, SRM, and LGS of the new approved location ratified by QAAP, with the CCP/contractual agreement being updated as appropriate.
* SLAR (QAV) will ensure definitive approval documentation is uploaded onto the Course Documentation Central Repository.
* SLAR Officers will check the report for completeness and facilitate final sign-off by the University Academic Registrar or nominee.
* The University SLEC will receive a list of course approval(s), additional or new locations for information.

Further details relating to the level of support provided by Teesside University through the Course First approach processes, please refer to the **Course Design and Development Support for Partner** (**E-Annex 16**).

### 8.20.1 Location Periodic Review

 As noted in **Section 7.12**, the period of approval normally granted for a new Location would be aligned to the existing course approval. Periodic Reviews of the location would be considered alongside the course review.

## 8.21 Course and Module Changes between Scheduled Reviews (MODIFICATIONS)

Collaborative Partners, in discussion with SLAR (QAV) and the School may wish to propose changes to existing courses between scheduled reviews. The scale of the change proposed determines the process and Partners should seek advice from SLAR (QAV).

The procedures for changes between scheduled reviews are designed to ensure that modifications to courses are undertaken with due regard to externality and ensure that regular minor changes do not result in ‘curriculum drift’.

The decision regarding the status of amendments is made following discussion between the Partner, SLAR (QAV) and the relevant School.

An audit trail of approved changes should be maintained and reported annually to the University on the Partner Report (PR) as part of Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement (see Quality Framework **Chapter D1**).

It is important when considering modifications to modules and courses that students are consulted, and a record is maintained. Deviation from the information published could result in the breach of the Consumer Rights Act unless students are notified or consulted.

To determine the level of modification and process the Partner must complete the appropriate modification form and submit to SLAR (QAV) who will advise on the agreed level and status of the change. Partners should refer to the [**Course and Module Modifications**](https://www.tees.ac.uk/docs/DocRepo/Quality%20framework/C-Course%20and%20Module%20Modifications.docx)document for further guidance (see **Chapter C** of the Quality Framework).

### 8.21.1 Changes to Module Leader/Teaching Team

Any change to Module Leader/Teaching Team on a module is reported via the **Notification of Course Delivery Team** form (see **OM-Annex 8**) and follow the procedure outlined in the relevant Operations Manual.

## 8.22 Course Continuous Monitoring & Enhancement Processes

An overview is provided in [**Chapter D1: Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement**](https://www.tees.ac.uk/docs/DocRepo/Quality%20framework/D1%20-%20Continuous%20Monitoring%20Enhancement.doc) of the Quality Framework.Collaborative Partners should follow guidelines in their Operations Manual and Addendum, which will give details on the process for submission of Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement and module evaluation processes.

* **Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement at Institutional Level**

([**Chapter D1**](https://www.tees.ac.uk/docs/DocRepo/Quality%20framework/D1%20-%20Continuous%20Monitoring%20Enhancement.doc)of the Quality Framework)

All Collaborative Partners must use the University’s Partner Report (PR) templates (see **Chapter D1,** Forms, **D1-Annex 4**). The purpose of the report is to provide an overview of all courses delivered in Partnership with the University at each Institution. These Partner-level overview reports are required where the Institution is responsible for delivering one or more awards.

All Partners are required to complete evaluations for modules. In addition, Partners delivering awards of 60 credits or more are required to complete continuous monitoring and enhancement processes for each award. The outcomes will then be incorporated within the School Monitoring & Enhancement Report.

The report is intended to:

* Confirm the overall health of the collaborative provision by each Partner.
* Confirm that issues in the previous year’s action plan have been appropriately addressed.
* Identify any positive or negative substantive issues at module, course, Partner Institution and University level.
* Specify action plans for the next academic year.
* Summarise developments relating to quality and enhancement and sharing good practice.
* Require the Partner to provide reassurance in relation to public information.

### 8.22.1 Quality Enhancement Visits

Schools will organise annual QEVs with the Partner, normally in the first semester of the academic year. Guidelines for the Quality Enhancement Visit – Collaborative Provision are included within **Chapter D1** of the Quality Framework.

The purpose of the visits is to explore, and agree actions relating to the following:

* The academic standards of the course.
* The quality of the learning opportunities offered and whether any improvements or enhancements are required.
* Any changes to learning resources (staffing or specialist facilities).
* The overall student experience.
* The completeness and accuracy of public information.
* The effectiveness of communications between the Partner and University.

The key discussion points and actions are recorded on the QEV report, for consideration by the relevant SSLESC, to feed into Schools’ Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement processes. The reports are also forwarded to the SLAR (QAV)/International Development for inclusion of the key points in their oversight reports as part of the Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement process.

# 9. TYPOLOGY 5: STUDY ABROAD AND EXCHANGE

## 9.1 Scope

Study Abroad and Exchange activities can be defined as mobility of University students as part of their studies to a Collaborative Partner for an agreed period leading to the award of credit as part of a students’ course of study. It does not allow dual qualifications to be obtained – i.e., the student is only entitled to the award of their home institution. Students are issued with an official transcript by their host institution (University or Collaborative Partner).

Study Abroad Agreements provide a framework for student exchange activities (incoming and outgoing) and partnerships management including but not limited to balance of numbers, before, during and after mobility arrangements, as well as termination of partnerships.

The approval, extension and termination of Study Abroad Agreements and the process and criteria for approval of a new agreement is managed by the DID, in conjunction with relevant School(s).

A Study Abroad Agreement must be in place for the University to receive or send students to a Collaborative Partner under a Study Abroad programme.

## 9.2 Study Abroad Agreements

All Study Abroad Agreement templates are provided by LGS. If a non-standard Agreement is requested, (for example, the Collaborative Partner has their own standard agreement), the need for it must be identified, discussed, and confirmed with LGS.

### 9.2.1 Bilateral Student Exchange Agreement (Typology 5a)

A Bilateral Student Exchange Agreement is defined as a reciprocal agreement between the University and a Partner which allows a set number of University students to study at the Partner Institution for an agreed period (e.g., one semester or one year) leading to the award of credit as part of each student’s course of study, and for a set number of students of the Partner Institution to study at the University and receive University credits for that period of study.

The agreement also includes a fee-waiving clause allowing students from the University not to pay tuition fees at the Partner and for Partner students to not pay tuition fees at the University.

The agreement includes a clause about the number of students allowed to take part in the programme per year. The University and the Partner work together to ensure a balance of numbers every year or across the duration of the agreement.

For outgoing mobility (Bilateral or Outgoing Study Abroad Agreements), Schools must be satisfied that the course of study proposed satisfies the TU programme undertaken by the student. Students will have to obtain approval from their relevant school for the modules they will be following abroad prior to their departure. The University policy is that students may only bring credits from Partners into their University award.

### 9.2.2 Incoming Student Study Abroad Agreement (Typology 5b)

An Incoming Study Abroad Agreement is defined as an agreement between the University and a Partner which allows a set number of Partner students to study at the University for an agreed period (e.g., one semester or one year) leading to the award of credit as part of each student’s course of study at the Partner.

The agreement includes a fee-waiving clause allowing students from the Partner not to pay tuition fees at the University.

An Incoming Study Abroad Agreement does not involve either the recognition of credit or the achievement of a Teesside University award.

### 9.2.3 Incoming Student Study Abroad Fee-Paying Agreement (Typology 5c)

An Incoming Study Abroad Agreement is defined as an agreement between the University and a Partner which allows a set number of Partner students to study at the University for an agreed period (e.g., one semester or one year) leading to the award of credit as part of each student’s course of study at the Partner.

The University charges tuition fees to the student or to the Partner, as defined in the agreement.

An Incoming Study Abroad Agreement does not involve either the recognition of credit or the achievement of a Teesside University award.

### 9.2.4 Outgoing Student Study Abroad Agreement (Typology 5d)

An Outgoing Study Abroad Agreement is defined as an agreement between the University and a Partner which allows a set number of University students to study at the Partner for an agreed period (e.g., one semester or one year) leading to the award of credit as part of each student’s course of study at the University.

The agreement should include a fee-waiving clause allowing students from the University not to pay tuition fees at the Partner. If not, tuition fees will be paid by the University or the student to the Partner as defined in the agreement.

## 9.3 New Partner Approval Process

Formal approval must be sought for any arrangement whereby the University students are likely to spend some of their course studying at a Partner in another country, even if it is possible that only a few students will take up the opportunity or if the University already has a separate agreement with the Partner. The University has a responsibility to satisfy itself about the good standing of a prospective Partner, and of their and our capacity to fulfil the designated roles in the proposed arrangement before any study abroad agreement will be initiated, and any student mobility can take place.

New study abroad partner proposals are subject to the completion of a **TU Global Study Abroad Partnership Proposal Form** (**E-Annex 18a**). Information requested are related to the nature of the agreement, rationale, partner details, academic information, international student support at partner and facilities. The proposal should be submitted by a University academic staff member (the Proposal Lead) from a School and sent to DID. Each section is carefully reviewed by the DID and the TU Proposal Lead.

The proposal will need to be reviewed by the relevant School International Committee. If the proposal covers more than one school, each relevant School International Committee will have to approve the partnership.

Overall Process:

1. Proposal from TU Lead.
2. Send Proposal to DID, TU Global E: **TUGlobal@tees.ac.uk**.
3. Proposal reviewed by DID including comments from Associate Dean (International), if any questions DID will send the proposal back to TU Lead.
4. Proposal reviewed by the relevant School International Committee. If the proposal covers more than one school, each relevant School International Committee will have to approve the partnership.
5. DID to negotiate the Study Abroad Agreement with Partner.
6. Agreement reviewed by LGS (if needed).
7. Agreement signed by Pro Vice-Chancellor (International).

Proposal can be:

* Approved
* Identification of areas requiring attention, amendment, or further exploration and/or information – applicants will have the opportunity to address any concerns raised and should resubmit the proposal.
* Rejected

Approval to enter into any new study abroad agreement is dependent on the applicant successfully demonstrating set criteria including but not limited to:

* The proposed partner institution offers suitable and appropriate academic provision.
* The proposed partner institution offers suitable and appropriate support facilities.
* The partner will be an attractive opportunity to students (cost, accessibility etc).
* The subject area will be able to find sufficient outgoing students to participate thereby ensuring balanced levels of mobility.

For Incoming Study Abroad Agreement, the process excludes information about academic information, international student support at partner and facilities.

Agreements are valid for 5 years, unless otherwise stated and are signed by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (International).

Approval to enter into any new reciprocal exchange agreement is dependent on the applicant successfully demonstrating that:

* The proposed partner institution offers suitable and appropriate academic/social provision.
* The proposed partner institution offers suitable and appropriate support facilities.
* The partner will be an attractive opportunity to students (cost, accessibility, learning outcomes, location etc).

## 9.4 Review of Agreements

DID in partnerships with the relevant School(s) will review all agreements annually.

## 9.5 Adding New Courses to Existing Agreements

Adding new course proposals are subject to the completion of the **TU Global Study Abroad Partnership – Update an Existing Partnership** form (**E-Annex 18b**). Information requested include rationale for adding new courses and academic information about the new courses to be added.

The proposal is then reviewed by the relevant School International Committee.

If the proposal is accepted, DID will contact the Partner and update the existing agreement.

Updated agreements are signed by Pro Vice-Chancellor (International).

## 9.6 Extension of Agreements

Partnerships can be extended under certain circumstances (see **Section 5.5**).

## 9.7 Termination of Agreements

Study Abroad Agreements may terminate through the natural completion of the agreed partnership or by either party initiating the termination of the partnership within the terms of the agreement.

## 9.8 Student Exchange Agreements Database

The agreements are stored on the DID departmental SharePoint site, and a copy is sent to the School(s).

## 9.9 Approval of Modules

### 9.9.1 Outgoing Students

Teesside University students who wish to take part in the Study Abroad programme and study for a semester or a year at a partner university will submit their module selection prior to their departure.

Students will submit a Learning Agreement with a selection of modules at their host university, the list of modules will be reviewed to meet the Learning Outcomes of the student’s course at TU and to have the required number of credits. The Learning Agreement will be reviewed by the Study Abroad coordinator in each school. Any changes of the Learning Agreement will have to be approved prior to the student changing their modules at their host university.

A full policy is available in the ‘Study Abroad and Exchange Policy’.

### 9.9.2 Incoming Student

Incoming students and their home university is in charge of the approval of modules in term of transfer of credits and compatibility with their Learning Outcomes.

# 10. TYPOLOGY 7: COLLABORATIVE WORKPLACE LEARNING AND PLACEMENTS

Definition:

The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) UK Quality Code defines work-based learning as:

*“Work-based learning for higher education courses describes courses that bring together higher education providers and work organisations to create learning opportunities.”*

Where work-based learning counts towards credit and credit bearing awards, Teesside University retains the responsibility for setting and maintaining oversight of quality and standards. With this in mind, when considering potential opportunities for the approval of work-based learning, consideration must be given to the UK QAA Quality Code for Higher Education, (in particular Advice and Guidance to [**Work-based Learning**](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/work-based-learning)), in conjunction with other regulatory requirements including providers’ academic regulations, funding body requirements, PSRB rules and regulations and Apprenticeship Standards.

The University and its Partners offer courses with a range of different types of learning in the workplace, including placements organised by the University or Partner. Learning opportunities in the workplace may be sourced and organised by the student, as part of a course of study (sandwich course), as well as other types of learning experiences such as those connected with Professional Apprenticeship Schemes.

Processes to support learning in the workplace are proportionate to the risks relating to the type of activity.

## 10.1 Placements

Where collaborative workplace learning is involved, the approval or review event will focus on preparation and support for placement providers/

supervisors, appropriate formalised arrangements (e.g., via a placement agreement) where necessary, and mechanisms for review and evaluation of placements. Schools and Partners are required to make available appropriate and full information to both providers and students. The Schools and Partners are also required to develop explicit criteria for use by staff in determining whether or not a proposed student activity in the workplace offers appropriate learning opportunities, e.g., an audit tool or similar.

The majority of mandatory credit bearing placements take place in the School of Health & Life Sciences (SHLS) and Partners connected with that School. The SHLS and relevant Partners have well developed administrative and review processes, databases, and staff to support placement learning. Academic Schools offering ‘sandwich’ placements have well defined processes for finding and recording placement details, providing detailed information to employers, students and visiting tutors and processes for reviewing and auditing placements.

Academic Schools are responsible for working directly with Legal and Governance Services (LGS) on contractual matters related to placements.

## 10.2 Professional Apprenticeships

Professional Apprenticeships continue to be an area of development for Teesside University and are now delivered across the majority of the University’s academic Schools. The key to a successful apprenticeship is the relationship between the University, the apprentice and the apprentice’s employer.

The provision of Professional Apprenticeships is governed by defined Apprenticeship Standards ([see **IfATE list of Apprenticeship Standards**](https://www.instituteforapprenticeships.org/)), with accompanying funding rules set out by the [**Education & Skills Funding Agency**](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/apprenticeship-funding-rules).

All Apprenticeship Standards define Knowledge, Skills, and Behaviours (KSBs) required in order to successfully complete the apprenticeship. The clarity of the relationship between KSBs and the course/module learning outcomes is a key consideration of the University’s validation process.

Guidance on processes to be followed in relation to apprenticeship design and approval are outlined in the Quality Framework, [**Chapter C**](https://www.tees.ac.uk/sections/about/public_information/quality_framework.cfm)and supporting documentation. Further information on apprenticeship approvals aligned with Partners is outlined below.

### 10.2.1 Processes Aligned with Professional Apprenticeships Proposals

The approval and development of courses involving Professional Apprenticeships and delivered within a Partnership will normally involve the following stages:

* Title Approval form and Course Costing Template.
* Following liaison between SLAR (QAV), the Partner and the relevant School(s), the course/award (the proposal) is included on the Teesside University Course Approval and Periodic Review schedule.
* SLAR (QAV) prepare the Preliminary Meeting: Validation Arrangements form, as outlined in **Chapter C**, and would normally follow the guidance relating to **Route A** approval processes for new Awards, and **Route B** when realigning an existing course to an Apprenticeship Standard.
* A series of critical deadlines and work schedules is established.
* An academic subject specialist from the relevant School (Link Tutor), will be assigned to support the Partner in the development of the proposal, or in the case of franchised delivery, understand how the course is delivered and managed.
* The Course Team at the Partner Institution, with the support of the Link Tutor and SLAR (QAV), will prepare the required documentation for the Course Validation or Location Approval Event (see **Section 8.6**).
* The documentation is scrutinised by the Partner to ensure it is fit for purpose. This review includes appropriate scrutiny of the proposed modules. The Link Tutor must be provided with a complete set of documentation to feed into the Partner discussion and will attend the event where possible (see **Section 8.8**).
* The Course First Critical Read Event will be undertaken at Teesside University, this event will seek to assure the academic quality and standards of the modules and award(s) under consideration. In addition, the event will provisionally approve the diet of modules associated with the award(s), where applicable.
* The proposal is considered by a Course Validation Panel which is Chaired by the relevant School and organised and serviced by SLAR (QAV).
* The process will include, as appropriate, consideration of any location approval and specialist resources/equipment connected with the Course Approval, using **Partner Course(s) Location Visit Statement** (**E-Annex 14**).
* The Validation Panel recommends the approval/non-approval of course(s) or continuation of approval.
* Subject to any conditions of approval being addressed satisfactorily, SLAR (QAV) will facilitate final sign-off by the University Academic Registrar or nominee.
* The University SLEC will receive a list of course approval(s) for information.

Further details relating to the level of support provided by Teesside University through the Course First approach processes, please refer to the **Course Design and Development Support for Partner** (**E-Annex 16**).

The location of the Course Approval or Periodic Review Event will be determined by the SLAR (QAV), in conjunction with the relevant School(s).

### 10.2.2 Course Approval processes aligned with Apprenticeship Standards within Typology 7

After initial enquires and discussion between the relevant School and Partner to assess the level of risk and value of the award to be considered for approval, in conjunction with SLAR (QAV), an agreement will be made to confirm appropriate course approval processes. Whilst the approval processes will normally be aligned with those outlined in **Section 8**, the following **Diagram 1** supports the decision-making process and appropriate course approval route.

## Diagram 1: Typology 7 – Design, Development and Delivery of Courses, which incorporate Professional Apprenticeship Standards

|  |
| --- |
|  |

## 10.3 Documentation Requirements, Panel Memberships Guidelines and Approval/Periodic Review Outcomes

For detailed guidance on documentation requirements, Panel Membership and Panel Outcomes for the Approval or Periodic Review Event, please refer to **Section 8**. In addition, further information is also available in the **Guidance for Panel Members for the Validation of Courses** document (see **C-Appendix 1**).

## 10.4 Course Modifications between Scheduled Periodic Reviews

Whilst each Institution is responsible for the content, delivery, quality and standards of its own provision, all course modifications between scheduled reviews must be considered through the modification process outlined in the Quality Framework, **Chapter C**, **Course and Module Modifications** document.

# 11. TYPOLOGY 8A & 8B: PROCESS FOR APPROVING COURSES INVOLVING DUAL AND/OR JOINT AWARDS WITH A PARTNER

## 11.1 Teesside University Position Statement on Joint and Dual Awards

 Teesside University derives its power to award degrees by virtue of the Further & Higher Education Act 1992. Section 76 (5) (b) of the Act specifically states that “the power conferred on an Institution to grant awards includes the power to do so jointly with another Institution”. The provision within the Act does not limit the activity to within the UK. The University has the legal power to grant Joint and Dual Awards.

## 11.2 Typology 8A: Dual Award Definition and Characteristics

 Dual Awards are used to describe a qualification given as two awards, each from a different organisation with degree-awarding powers, for the same course of study. Each participating Institution must have degree-awarding powers in its own country and the award must meet all the UK Higher Education (HE) descriptors and benchmarks.

 The UK Quality Code for Higher Education describes Dual Awards as a jointly delivered course and this, together with the fact that both Partners are making an award, distinguishes them from other types of collaboration.

 Under the QAA Quality Code, Teesside University has responsibility for maintaining an overview of the standards for every element of the course at all participating Institutions, as every element of a student’s course may contribute to a Teesside University award.

## 11.3 Typology 8B: Joint Award Definition and Characteristics

 Joint Awards are used to describe a qualification given as a single award made jointly by two or more Institutions, for the same course of study. Each participating Institution must have degree-awarding powers in its own country and the award must meet all the UK Higher Education (HE) descriptors and benchmarks.

 To successfully complete the course, students must fulfil the requirements of all degree-awarding bodies involved and will gain a single certificate bearing the signatures of Institutions involved in the arrangement.

 The UK QAA Quality Code for Higher Education describes Joint Awards as involving Partners, in roughly equal proportions in all aspects of course design, development, delivery, assessment, management and decision-making on student achievement.

 Under the QAA Quality Code, Teesside University retains full responsibility for the award issued in its name and must therefore maintain an overview of the standards of every element of the course.

## 11.4 Principles of Dual and Joint Awards

 A Dual and Joint Award may be based on the Partner’s and Teesside University’s course and should normally be characterised by joint development and delivery. Students studying on Dual or Joint Awards will engage with both the Partner and Teesside University, and the level of this engagement will be confirmed through the Course Approval processes. Normally, a minimum of a third (1/3) of the credit contribution must be provided by each Institution across the length of the course. Any variations to this principle must have a strong rationale and thoroughly considered and approved during the Course Approval process.

 A number of course delivery methods may be considered as part of the course approval process, including remote delivery, distance learning or through the student exchange process. It is anticipated that students studying for a Dual or Joint Award may attend course delivery in both locations, although this is not a requirement.

 Dual and Joint Awards should only be considered in a subject area in which Teesside University has appropriate subject expertise to carry out joint delivery, moderation of assessment and other responsibilities required.

The contribution of respective parties will vary depending on the nature of the course and the range of expertise. Where a course involves a Joint Award with a Partner, it is essential that confirmation is acquired during the Institutional Approval stage that the Partner is legally empowered to grant jointly approved awards. The approval processes will follow the standard procedures detailed in **Section 2** (Institutional Approval for new Partners) and **Section 8** (Validation of a Course). Where the Partner is already an established Partner, an updated Due Diligence and Risk Assessment will be required.

## 11.5 Overview of the Course Approval and Periodic Review Process

Following the Institutional Approval stage, the University will have judged the Partner to be a suitable Institution, holding degree-awarding powers, with which to form a collaborative relationship in line with the principles set out in **Section 1.1**.

As part of the approval or any subsequent Periodic Review process, the Partner should participate in the Approval and Periodic Review process as members of the University Course Team as appropriate.

* Completion of a Title Approval form and Course Costing Template.
* Following course/award (the proposal) Approval and or Periodic Review is included on the Teesside University Course Approval and Periodic Review Schedule following liaison between SLAR (QAV), the Partner and the relevant School(s).
* The Partner with support from the School will undertake the relevant curriculum development process, and a series of critical deadlines and work schedules are established.
* SLAR (QAV) prepare the Preliminary Meeting: Validation Arrangements form, as outlined in [**Chapter C**](https://www.tees.ac.uk/sections/about/public_information/quality_framework.cfm).
* An academic subject specialist from the relevant School (Link Tutor), will be assigned to support the Partner in the development of the Dual Award proposal.
* The Course Team at the Partner Institution and the Link Tutor will prepare the required documentation for the full Approval/Periodic Review Event (see **Section 8.6**).
* Student Learning & Academic Registry (Academic Policy and Regulations) (SLAR (APR)) will work with Schools to align institutional Regulatory Frameworks, highlighting areas of misalignment for consideration either by the approval panel or relevant University deliberative committee.
* The event will normally be held at the Partner’s premises if assessment of any specialist teaching resources is required. Alternatively, resources can be assessed separately by a **Partner** **Course(s) Location Visit Statement** (see **E-Annex 14**). A decision on the location of the Approval or Periodic Review Event will be made by the Academic Registrar (or nominee) in conjunction with the Chair of the Course Approval Event.
* The documentation is scrutinised by the Partner to ensure it is fit for purpose. This review includes appropriate scrutiny of the proposed modules. The Link Tutor must be provided with a complete set of documentation to feed into the Partner discussion and will attend the event where possible.
* Course First Critical Read Event will be undertaken at Teesside University, this event will seek to assure the academic quality and standards of the modules and award(s) under consideration. In addition, will provisionally approve the diet of modules associated with the award(s).
* The proposal is considered by a Course Validation Panel which is Chaired by the relevant School and organised and serviced by SLAR (QAV).
* The Approval Panel recommends the approval/non-approval of course(s) or continuation of approval.
* Subject to any conditions and recommendations being addressed satisfactorily, SLAR (QAV) will facilitate final sign-off by the University Academic Registrar or nominee
* The University SLEC will receive a list of course approval(s) for information.

The location of the Course Approval/Periodic Review Event will be determined by the Academic Registrar (or nominee) in conjunction with the relevant School(s).

Further details relating to the level of support provided by Teesside University through the Course First approach process, please refer to the **Course Design and Development Support for Partner** (**E-Annex 16**).

## 11.6 Approval Protocol for a Dual and Joint Award Approval/Periodic Review Event

The purpose of the Dual and Joint Award(s) Approval/Periodic Review Event is to give due regard to:

* Ensuring that academic standards are maintained when making an award with the Partner Institutions in the same subject area.
* Confirm alignment of Academic Standards through a process of cross marking a sample of scripts/assignments from each partner securing the standards of modules delivered in its name by the Partner Institutions wherever it is delivered, confirming joint delivery and moderation of assessment.
* Credits awarded are consistent with the University’s policies on the assignment of credit level and volume (CAMS), or approval sought for variance.
* Confirming the total amount of credit required to obtain both awards at each Institution.
* Admissions including entry criteria, English language requirements, and where appropriate accreditation meet University requirements, ensuring they are clear and transparent.
* Have effective oversight of the Partner Institutions procedures for RPL leading to admission to later stages of an approved Dual or Joint Award.
* Avoidance of double credit accumulation/transfer.
* Arrangements for the effective operation of External Examining, marking and moderation of Dual and Joint Award(s) meet University requirements.
* Postgraduate dissertations within Dual or Joint Award(s) meet the requirements for the Teesside University award but may be marked and accredited by Teesside University and the Partner Institution.

Further advice and guidance on the development of Dual Awards with Partners can be found in the Teesside University Dual Awards Framework document.

## 11.7 Documentation Requirements, Panel Memberships Guidelines and Approval/Periodic Review Outcomes

For detailed guidance on documentation requirements, Panel Membership and Panel Outcomes for the Approval/Periodic Review Event, please refer to **Section 8**. In addition, further information is also available in the **Guidance for Panel Members for the Validation of Courses** document (see **C-Appendix 1**).

## 11.8 Course Modifications between Scheduled Periodic Reviews

Whilst each Institution is responsible for the content, delivery, quality and standards of its own provision, all course modifications between scheduled reviews must be considered through the modification process outlined in the Quality Framework, **Chapter C**, **Course and Module Modifications** document.

# 12. TYPOLOGY 9: APPROVAL OF EXISTING COURSE TO BE TAUGHT REMOTELY BY UNIVERSITY STAFF

## 12.1 Partnership Arrangements

In the case of new Partnership arrangements, involving remote delivery or a ‘flying faculty’ model (Typology 9), where the course is taught entirely or in part by the University’s Course Team, the Partnership arrangements will be assessed according to the level of risk, in conjunction with SLAR (QAV). An agreement will be made to confirm whether approval of the partnership would be considered via either:

* The Institutional Approval process as outlined in **Section 2.4**, or
* Through the University Approval method described in **Section 4**.

In this case, the role of the Partner will normally be to provide a specified physical infrastructure and/or specific services such as administrative functions or student support and would have involvement in the Institutional or University Approval Event.

## 12.2 Course Validation Arrangements

Where an approved Partnership involves remote delivery or a ‘flying faculty’ model (Typology 9), and the course is taught entirely or in part by the University’s Course Team, the approval will be achieved by the Location Approval process focusing on the mode of delivery for courses. Alternatively, in cases where a new course is being developed and approved for delivery at a remote location the approval process will follow the Course Approval process. Further guidance is available in **Section 8**.

Further details relating to the level of support provided by Teesside University through the Course First approach process, please refer to the **Course Design and Development Support for Partner** (**E-Annex 16**).

The approval and development process will incorporate the following stages:

* Title Approval form and Course Costing template.
* Institutional Approval and Review schedule following liaison between the SLAR (QAV) the relevant School.
* The proposal is considered by a University Location Approval Panel or Course Approval Panel, as described in **Section 8.13**.
* The Panel either recommends approval with or without conditions or recommendations or declines the proposal, as detailed in **Sections 8.16/8.17**.

The following information will form part of the submission:

* Location Approval Document (LAD), with existing course documentation including Course and Module specifications (for information), or
* Course Approval Document (CAD), including new Course and Module specifications (for approval).
* Completed **Partner Course(s) Location Visit Statement** (**E-Annex 14**).
* Staff Curriculum Vitae’s.
* Contextualised Course Handbook.

Additional documentation requirements and event support detail are provided in Location/Course Approval documentation.

## 12.3 Documentation Requirements, Panel Memberships Guidelines and Approval/Periodic Review Outcomes

For detailed guidance on documentation requirements, Panel Membership and Panel Outcomes following the Location/Course Approval Event, please refer to **Section 8**.

## 12.4 Periodic Review of Existing Course Taught Remotely by University Staff

 Courses are normally granted the University’s standard approval period of six years, although in the case of a remote course delivery approval the period would normally be granted for the remaining period of time for the existing course approval. A Panel has discretion to recommend a shorter approval period, and this may be exercised. (see **Section 7.12**).