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INTRODUCTION

1. The University’s strategic plan 2015-2020 and sub-strategies underpin key priorities many of which are reliant on sustainable strategic partnership working with communities of stakeholders on a local, national and international basis. Whilst the University will be engaged in a variety of partnership and development activities, this section of the Academic Handbook focuses solely on academic credit bearing collaborative provision.

2. The policy and underpinning procedures have been mapped against the QAA’s Advice and Guidance on ‘Partnerships’, and informed by the QAA’s Characteristics Statement ‘Qualifications involving more than one degree-awarding body’ and sector good practice.

3. Collaborative provision falls into a number of categories. A detailed description of each of these categories is provided in Annex 1.

GOVERNANCE

4. The University has been conferred the rights to award credit/Awards in partnership with other organisations, as confirmed by the Privy Council’s ‘Order of Council 25th October 2004 Power to Award Degrees”, the ‘Education Reform Act 1988’ and the ‘Further and Higher Education Act 1992 (extract), which can be found under the University’s Framework of Governance.

5. The management of the contractual arrangements for collaborative provision is the responsibility of Quality Management (supported by relevant services), on behalf of Academic Board. Academic Board has delegated authority for the processes of due diligence and the approval to deliver specified provision, including approval of partners, to the Student Recruitment and Partnerships Committee (SRPC). SRPC provide regular update reports to Management Board; Management Board provides an annual report to the Board of Governors. An annual review will also be submitted to the Learning, Teaching and Student Achievement Committee.

6. All collaborative partnerships will have a Partnership Management Group, which oversees the strategic management of the provision and Course Committee(s) which are responsible for the operational management of the courses. Across these groups there is a collaboration of University staff, partner staff, and students.

7. The University is responsible for the academic standards of all awards or credit granted in its name; added to this is that the quality of learning opportunities offered under the collaborative arrangement must be comparable with those offered across the University and enable students to achieve the appropriate academic standards for the award.

8. The University takes a risk management approach to each collaboration and both proposed and approved collaborations are managed in line with the assessed risk. To manage risk and secure quality and standards of collaborative provision a number of stages and governance control points are used.
DUE DILIGENCE PROCESS

9. The due diligence process is a two stage process, the first being a desk based research report, followed by the second stage visit to the proposed partner’s site(s). The second stage may be combined with the approval to deliver event.

10. The purpose of the due diligence process is to identify whether the proposed collaboration is in the University’s best interests, in line with the Strategic Plan 2015-20, to analyse the risk level and to approve the partner.

Notification of a proposed new collaborative partnership

11. Following the identification of a potential partner, initial discussion will normally take place at school level between the proposing team, the partner and relevant professional services. Preliminary checks will be completed to assess the strength of the associated benefits of the proposed partnership to the University and to identify risks that would need to be taken into consideration in the initial development and costing stage. This would culminate in a Business Proposal containing formal sign-off by the key stakeholders.

12. The coordination role will be undertaken by the Partnership Office, External Relations. In all cases a project team will be established to undertake and compile, in collaboration with the School(s), Finance and other relevant professional services, a business proposal and a desk based due diligence report.

13. The expectation is that the business proposals will contain:
   - Rationale for entering into the partnership including alignment with strategic priorities.
   - Detailed proposal of the type of partnership.
   - A full financial analysis of the proposed development including student numbers.
   - Market research identifying any reputational risk factors and also market demand.
   - Overarching risk assessment of the proposed partnership development.

14. Once the business proposal has been agreed by the Dean of School(s) this should be submitted to the Chief Marketing Officer for University approval.

15. Where approval is not given, because it is not considered to be in the best interest of the University to proceed with the proposed collaboration, the Dean of School(s) will inform the prospective partner of this decision.

Due diligence report

16. Where approval is given, the Chief Marketing Officer will instruct Quality Management to undertake due diligence.

17. The due diligence process will triangulate material from both desk based research and a visit undertaken by Quality Management, along with an updated risk assessment form. The purpose of the process is to outline to SRPC any perceived risks associated with the collaborative partnership and provide relevant recommendations.

18. The first stage will be a desk based report and will cover:
Section 2G: Collaborative Provision

a) Academic and/or professional reputation and approval to enter into the collaboration;
b) Existing collaborative agreements;
c) Scope and extent of collaboration;
d) Legal and financial standing with analysis provided by the Finance Service;
e) Compatibility of mission and aims with those of the University;
f) Strategic fit;
g) Existing QA systems and external QA and/or professional body reviews; and
h) A draft Heads Of Agreement.

19. Based on the above, the Chief Marketing Officer will:

a) Approve the report, agree the proposed due diligence budget and authorise the visit to proceed; or
b) Request additional information; or

19. c) decide that the proposed partnership should not proceed. In this case, the School(s) will inform the prospective partner.

20. The due diligence visit may be combined with the approval to deliver event. The purpose of the due diligence visit is to establish that the prospective partner has:

a) the academic standing to successfully deliver the proposed provision to the appropriate academic standards consistent with the QAA’s Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) as contained within Part A and in line with the Partnerships advice and guidance section of the UK Quality Code, relevant subject benchmarks and the requirements of professional and statuary bodies as appropriate;
b) the resources (staffing and facilities) to sustain the proposed provision;
c) appropriate systems and resources (both hard copy and online) to ensure a high and equitable level of student experience;
d) systems and processes sufficiently compatible with those of the University to allow the two institutions to exchange data and work well together;
e) senior management commitment to the proposed collaboration; and
f) to investigate any issues raised during the desk based stage.

Due diligence visit Panel

21. The Head of Quality Management, or nominee, will nominate a Panel to carry out the due diligence visit to the prospective partner’s premises. As a minimum, the panel should consist of:

a) a Chair from the University’s standing panel list;
b) an internal member of staff, independent from the subject area, from the University’s standing panel; and
c) a reporting officer appointed by the Head of Quality Management.

22. Where relevant, additional members may be co-opted.

Heads of Agreement (HOA)

23. A draft HOA should be prepared by Quality Management in liaison with School(s); agreed by the Dean of School(s) and approved on behalf of the University by the
Chief Marketing Officer or the Deputy Vice-Chancellor as part of the desk based due diligence stage.

24. The HOA confirms the intention of both parties to enter into a collaborative relationship, the nature of the University’s quality assurance requirements and the likely financial implications and requirements. It is supported by an outline of the proposed provision and the University award(s)/credit(s) involved.

25. The draft HOA should be sent to the partner prior to the visit and any negotiations need to be resolved before the visit. The Panel does not have the authority to renegotiate the HOA. The HOA should be signed during the visit.

SRPC consideration

26. The final due diligence report, which triangulates both the desk based and due diligence visit research, will be presented to SRPC and will include:

   a) a summary of the due diligence findings;
   b) a risk assessment;
   c) recommendations for SRPC to discuss and approve; and
   d) detail any action points which need to be finalised ahead of the approval event, with clear roles and responsibilities identified.

27. Upon review of the report, SRPC will take one of the actions below:

   a) approve the partnership and authorise the Head of Quality Management, or nominee, to progress to the next approval stage; or
   b) request more information; or
   c) advise the Dean of School(s) that it does not consider it to be in the best interest of the University to proceed with the proposed collaboration and request the Dean of School(s) to inform the prospective partner of this decision.

28. Relevant sections of the due diligence report will be shared with the panel as part of the next stage of the approval process.

Exemptions

29. Exceptionally, as part of the course development and design process, a perceived requirement for a course to be exempt from parts of the assessment policy, Academic Framework or other academic policies and regulations may emerge. In such circumstances the request for exemption, with supporting evidence, should be submitted by the Dean of School(s) or Head of Subject to the Head of Quality Management who will consider requests and take action on behalf of the LTSAC.

COLLABORATIVE PROVISION APPROVAL

30. Upon approval of the partnership from SRPC, the next stage is to approve the partner to deliver the proposed collaborative provision. The School(s), in liaison with Quality Management, will prepare for the approval event. The due diligence visit may take place alongside the approval to deliver event.
31. The type of approval event will depend on the collaborative provision category and whether the course has already been validated by the University.

32. Where a course has not been validated by the University, then the relevant parts of section 2D (Approval, monitoring and review of University provision) of the University’s Academic Handbook would be followed. Where a course has already been validated, the panel will only be approving the partner to manage the delivery of the existing provision.

33. Where there is a need to approve both a course and the partner to deliver the collaborative provision, then both section 2G (Collaborative Provision) and the relevant parts of section 2D (Approval, monitoring and review of University provision) shall be followed; however this can be completed as one event, with a rationalisation taking place to reduce repetition of processes, roles and documentation.

34. The approval event will normally be held at the partner’s site; however, at the discretion of the Head of Quality Management (or nominee) the event may take place at another location or via correspondence.

Partner approval to deliver - development team

35. The purpose of the development team is to manage the on-going development of the proposed provision for delivery by the partner and required documentation, and that any recommendations from SRPC and the due diligence report are taken into account. This may be in combination with relevant parts of section 2D (Approval, monitoring and review of University provision).

36. The membership of the team, including a nominated academic team leader, is agreed by Dean of School(s) and supported by Quality Management. It should consist of teaching staff (SU and partner), relevant professional services staff, an external expert and student(s). The external expert and student input can be undertaken via correspondence.

37. For an event where approval of a new course is required, the materials to be produced by the development team for the approval panel are listed within the relevant parts of section 2D (Approval, monitoring and review of University provision).

38. For an event where the partner needs approval to deliver a course the materials to be produced for the approval Panel, will include:

a) a project plan with clearly set out milestones and responsibilities;

b) evidence that the proposed provision is informed by the relevant internal and external reference points including SU Academic Handbook policies, PSRB requirements where relevant, good practice in collaborative working and delivery of provision and stakeholder input;

c) confirmed delivery and implementation plan for the course;

d) evidence of a clear strategy for communication and delivery of roles and responsibilities between the University and the partner organisation and that the MoA obligations are fully understood by both parties;

e) a staff development plan to ensure partner organisation teaching staff received appropriate training around University policies and working practices; and
f) marketing materials, where relevant, for the effective marketing of the course where relevant.

Partner Approval to deliver - documentation

39. The nominated team leader, in liaison with Quality Management, has overall responsibility of ensuring that the following documentation is produced:

   a) Course specification;
   b) All module descriptors;
   c) Brief outline of the rationale for the collaborative provision (one page maximum);
   d) Draft course handbook;
   e) Draft Academic Partnership Handbook;
   f) Draft staff development plan;
   g) Course mapping documentation, where appropriate;
   h) Mapping against the Partnership section of the QAA UK Quality Code
   i) Partner staff CVs;
   j) Draft of the Operations Schedule from the MoA; and
   k) Copy of the non-confidential due diligence report.

40. Where there is the need to validate a new course, the relevant parts of section 2D (Approval, monitoring and review of University provision) should be adhered to. It may be necessary to rationalise the processes/documentation, where there is a duplication.

41. The Dean of School(s) must be satisfied that:

   a) the proposed partnership provision meets all internal and external requirements;
   b) the required resources are in place or have been committed;
   c) students have been involved in the design of the provision, where this is possible; and
   d) the approval documentation has been fully and appropriately documented, before it is presented to the approval panel.

Partner Approval to deliver - event

42. The focus of the approval event will determine if the proposed partner and School(s) course team can:

   a) collaboratively deliver the course in such a way as to achieve the intended learning outcomes of the course;
   b) ensure that staff from both parties have the appropriate experience and expertise;
   c) confirmation that equipment and other learning resources are committed to the course by both parties, where relevant;
   d) evidence that the respective responsibilities outlined in the MoA, specifically the Operational Management Schedule, are understood and can be satisfactorily discharged by staff from both parties;
   e) show that there are clear communication channels established between the University and the partner and identified strategic leads and link tutors from both parties;
f) illustrate that there is a staff development plan in place; and

g) where relevant produce an action plan to minimise any identified risks.

Partner Approval to deliver - panel membership and remit

43. The Panel will be arranged and managed by Quality Management, in liaison with the School(s), using the University standing panel members.

44. The Panel should consist of, as a minimum:

   a) a Chair from outside the School(s) from the chair’s standing panel;
   b) one staff member from outside the proposing School(s) from the staff standing panel;
   c) one student representative from the student standing panel and from outside the proposing School(s) (where applicable);
   d) one, or more, independent external representative, with subject/industry expertise from the University’s standing panel. This external’s input may be undertaken via Correspondence;
   e) one, or more, independent external representative with experience of collaborative Provision (with international experience for international provision) from the University’s external standing panel; This external input may be undertaken via correspondence;
   f) a reporting officer from Quality Management; and
   g) other members may be co-opted where deemed appropriate

45. The key members of the Partner responsible for managing and delivering the provision are integral to the approval process and will be expected to attend the event in support of the proposal, together with supporting members from the School(s) including the Link tutor(s).

46. The remit of the Panel is to:

   a) review the documentation;
   b) check that the criteria required have been met;
   c) reach a conclusion and determine any conditions and recommendations; and
   d) provide a report to the LTSAC with recommendations for approval.

47. The Chair is responsible for overseeing and engaging the Panel in conducting a thorough review of the submitted materials and discussions, to enable the Panel to make a recommendation to the LTSAC; and of ensuring that the final report is produced in line with University requirements.

Outcome of partner approval event

48. The Panel may recommend to the LTSAC:

   a) approval with no conditions or recommendations;
   b) approval with conditions and/or recommendations to be met within a specified time limit;
   c) suspension of the process with conditions for recommencement; or
   d) non-approval with feedback.
Conditions and recommendations

49. Where a Panel identifies conditions, they must be met and approved before final approval of the conditions will be given. The School(s) is responsible for providing sufficient evidence to the Chair to satisfy the conditions. The Chair will sign off the conditions, or request further evidence/work, on behalf of the Panel. Exceptionally, if the Chair is unavailable then the Head of Quality Management (or nominee), will sign off the response. This process can be completed via correspondence.

50. If recommendations are set by the Panel then the course team will report actions around these as part of Course Review.

LTSAC approval

51. The LTSAC will receive confirmation from the Chair of the Panel, or exceptionally the Head of Quality Management (or nominee), that all conditions have been met. If the committee is satisfied with the outcome they will formally approve the partner to deliver the validated course and agree the proposed start date.

52. Quality Management will hold all partner approval to deliver reports and will report annually to the LTSAC.

Period of partnership approval

53. For new collaborative provision the maximum period of approval would normally be five years, following which the partnership will be subject to a partnership review, which will be conducted at least 12 months ahead of the end of the approval period.

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT (MoA)

54. A draft MoA should be prepared by Quality Management in conjunction with the Dean of School(s), Director of Finance, the partner and other relevant stakeholders.

55. This is a legally binding document, signed by the Partner and the Vice-Chancellor (or nominee) on behalf of the University. This confirms the respective rights and obligations of the University and the collaborative partner for the delivery and quality assurance of the agreed provision. A University template will be used for all collaborative activities detailing these responsibilities and agreed terms.

56. An MoA will remain valid for a period normally not exceeding five years, and its contractual obligations will be subject to annual monitoring by the School(s) and Quality Management.

57. As part of the University’s ongoing registration with The Office for Students the Quality Management team will arrange for The Office for Students to be notified, as per the definition of a ‘reportable event’ in Regulatory Notice 2, when an MoA is signed by all parties.
REGISTER OF COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

58. Quality Management will maintain an up-to-date ‘Register of Collaborative Provision’. This Register forms part of the University's publicly available information.

APPROVAL OF A PROPOSED ADDITION TO PROVISION WITHIN AN ESTABLISHED COLLABORATION

59. All proposed additions will require a business proposal, which will be submitted to a SRPC for approval.

60. For the due diligence report, where a partnership already exists, if a due diligence process has been undertaken within the last 2 years and the resourcing requirements are not significantly different then no further due diligence reports need to be completed. If this criteria has not been met, a desk based and/or due diligence visit will need to be undertaken and submitted to the Chief Marketing Officer who will then:

   a) re-approve the partnership and authorise the Head of Quality Management, or nominee, to progress to the next approval stage as outlined within this policy and the relevant part of section 2D (Approval, monitoring and review of University provision); or
   b) request more information from the School(s) and a further report; or
   c) advise the Dean of School(s) that it does not consider it to be in the best interest of the University to proceed with the proposed addition to provision and request the Dean of School(s) to inform the prospective partner of this decision.

DELIVERY AND ASSESSMENT OF COURSES IN LANGUAGES OTHER THAN ENGLISH

61. Where the University validates or franchises courses that are delivered in languages other than English the following principles should be followed:

   a) A risk assessment associated with each proposal is undertaken, taking into account the staff subject and language expertise at Solent and the history of previous work with the partner involved in the proposal. The development should only proceed where there are steps in place to manage the course effectively to ensure the student experience and standards are comparable to those of students undertaking their studies at Solent University.
   b) A fully bilingual Solent University link tutor with the relevant subject expertise shall be appointed by the School to oversee the provision in line with the role of the link tutor.
   c) The link tutor or other fully bilingual subject tutors will undertake moderation of all assessed student work and must have the necessary subject expertise to fulfil this role across the areas of study within the course and at the appropriate level of the award being made.
   d) A fully bilingual external examiner with appropriate competence should be appointed to oversee the provision.
   e) The administrative staff at the partner must have sufficiently high levels of English to communicate effectively with the University.
AWARD OF UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC CREDIT AND/OR AWARD

62. Where the University awards academic credit and/or award to an approved partner organisation’s own provision, the due diligence and approval process will be individually tailored depending on the provision and the University’s analysis of risk.

63. However, as a minimum the following shall be undertaken:

   a) discussion and approval by the Dean of School(s) to go ahead with the collaborative arrangement and for a strategic lead and link tutor to be identified within both parties;
   b) Quality Management, in liaison with the School(s) to undertake a due diligence of the partner organisation, which may include a due diligence visit;
   c) Link tutor to work with the collaborative partner in mapping the provision against the University’s standards and produce a recommendation of the level and amount of credit;
   d) Quality Management to liaise with an independent external with expertise in the subject and/or collaborative area to verify the standards of the course materials and the level and credit which have been recommended;
   e) Link tutor to evidence a response to the external’s comments;
   f) for an MoA to be drafted by Quality Management and signed by both parties ahead of the commencement of the course; and
   g) Quality Management will manage the communication across the University’s internal stakeholders with regards to internal processes and role and responsibilities.

MONITORING AND REVIEW

64. Quality Management, on behalf of the University, will monitor the quality assurance and systematic review of the contractual requirements of collaborative provision during the period of approval, in liaison with the School(s). Quality Management will also manage the full review of the provision before the end period of the agreement, in consultation with the School(s), partner organisation and relevant internal stakeholders.

Course Review

65. As part of its procedures for Course Review (see section 2D: Approval, monitoring and review of University provision), the School(s) or Quality Management (in cases of cross School collaborative arrangements), should on an annual basis evaluate, in a self-critical and developmental manner, the performance and effectiveness of a course and to determine actions for further enhancement of the provision, whilst ensuring that the provision is of an equitable standard for students.

66. A separate section on the collaborative arrangement should be included within the School’s report to the LTSAC, as part of its reporting arrangements. The report should comment on the robustness and effectiveness of the arrangement.
Annual review of MoA

67. The MoA will be reviewed annually by Quality Management in conjunction with the Dean of School(s), School(s) course team, Chief Finance Officer, relevant internal stakeholders and the partner.

Collaborative Partnership Review

68. Collaborative provision will be reviewed at the end of the contractual term in the form of a Partnership Review at which point the existing MoA will be subject to renegotiation. This review will be conducted at least 12 months before the MoA is due to be renegotiated. SRPC will be informed that the partnership review is to be initiated and for validated provision, SRPC will be asked to approve the revalidation process to begin from Stage 2 of the course approval process (section 2D: Approval, monitoring and review of University provision).

69. A holistic and strategic view will be taken of the partnership provision based on the associated risks. A review will include:

a) A new desk based due diligence and business case report, including;
b) An updated risk assessment.
c) A full course and partnership costing; and
d) A draft MoA.

70. A Self-evaluation document (SED) will be compiled by the School(s) and partners which as a minimum shall include:

a) A report (maximum 2 pages) providing a reflection on the partnership, areas for improvement and the rationale for continuing with the collaborative provision;
b) Course Review reports and action plans from the past 3 years;
c) Observations from the partner about the provision and rationale for the continuation of the partnership;
d) Student data including numbers and analysis of retention and any identified issues; and
e) Where relevant, reports and/or action plans from PRSB/Funding Bodies.

71. It will be the responsibility of Quality Management to manage the Partnership Review process in collaboration with the School(s). A review group, Chaired by the Head of Quality Management (or nominee), the Dean of School (or nominee) and an Academic Partnership Officer will review the documentation and make a recommendation on the continued suitability of the partnership to SRPC.

Collaborative provision review

72. Where the partner has been approved to deliver franchised provision, which is approved and delivered within the University, then review of the course(s) could be undertaken via the normal University procedures of revalidation on a rolling 6 year cycle and Course/module modification as detailed below.

73. Where these are validated courses, revalidation will assess the currency and academic coherence of the course to ensure it continues to reflect relevant internal and external reference points and that the staffing, resources and other aspects of the partnership provision continues to meet the University’s expectations. The event
will be managed by Quality Management in liaison with other internal stakeholders and will follow the course approval process from Stage 2 as detailed in section 2D (Approval, monitoring and review of University provision). Revalidation outcomes will be reported to LTSAC. The timing of the validated provision review process will align to the collaborative partnership and contractual review to maximise the efficiency of the processes.

**Collaborative Partnership/Provision Review outcome**

74. SRPC will take one of the actions below:

   a) authorise the renewal of partner approval and existing provision/course(s) with no changes; or
   b) authorise the renewal of partner approval with modifications to the provision/course(s); or
   c) sanction the termination of the partner and provision/course(s) approval.

75. Where authorisation is granted, the revised MoA would then be signed by both parties. This would be reported to SRPC as part of the annual report.

76. Where changes to the course(s) are required, the approval procedure within the relevant part of section 2D (Approval, monitoring and review of University provision) or section 2F (Module approval and course modification) should be adhered to.

**Audit and Quality Assurance**

77. Quality Management will undertake reviews and audits and where necessary any additional investigations of the collaborative provision throughout the term of the provision which may be requested by the Vice-Chancellors Group, the LTSAC, the Head of Quality Management or the revalidation panel.

78. Quality Management will co-ordinate the preparations for any collaborative provision audits carried out by the QAA.

**Course/module Modification**

79. The expectation is that the course team, in conjunction with the Link Tutor, will seek to continually enhance the curriculum, course design and learning experience for students in the light of course review, professional body or other stakeholders’ requirements or changes in discipline or pedagogic practice.

80. Module and course modifications to franchised or validated provision will be processed in line with section 2F (Module approval and course modification).

81. Where major changes are required the revalidation process and/or Partner approval to deliver a course process should be followed.

**OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

**Suspension of recruitment**

82. As a result of low demand, short-term operational issues, adverse course review or revalidation or Partnership Review outcomes, a Dean of School(s) or Head of Quality
Management may request permission from the Chair of SRPC to suspend recruitment to a course.

83. If approved, Quality Management will inform relevant professional service departments and the partner so that University systems can be updated to reflect the suspension and relevant external bodies can be informed. The suspension will be reported to the next meeting of SRPC.

84. Any students who have been offered a place must be informed and where possible offered a suitable alternative course. Where a suitable alternative does not exist or the student declines the alternative offer, the student should be refunded any deposits where relevant.

85. Courses which have failed to recruit students must be officially suspended for that academic year.

86. Courses can only be suspended for a maximum of two years, after which time they will be withdrawn.

Withdrawal of a course

87. When a School(s)/Service/partner or SRPC believes a course has come to the end of its life, it should be formally closed and recruitment stopped. In the majority of cases, this will coincide with the end date in the MoA. The proposal to withdraw the course should be reported to SRPC for approval.

88. It may be necessary to close a course prior to the end date and in this case, the process will be defined by the MoA.

Withdrawal of a partner

89. When a School(s)/Service/partner or SRPC believe that a partnership has come to an end, it should be formally dissolved. In the majority of cases, this will coincide with the end date in the MoA. The proposal to dissolve the partnership will be reported to SRPC for approval.

90. It may be necessary to terminate a partnership prior to the end date of the MoA and in this case, the process will be defined in the terms and conditions of the MoA.

Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB)

91. The School(s), in consultation with Quality Management, will inform any PSRB which has approved or recognised a course that it is the subject of a possible or actual collaborative arrangement, of its proposal and of any final agreements, which involve the course. The status of the course in relation to PSRB recognition will be made clear to prospective students.

External Examiners

92. The University is responsible for the appointment and functions of External Examiners, which will be co-ordinated by Quality Management.
Certificate and Diploma Supplement

93. The University will have sole authority for awarding certificates and diploma supplements relating to courses delivered through collaborative arrangements.

94. The certificate and/or diploma supplement will record the principal language of instruction and assessment, only where this is not English. Where this information is recorded on the diploma supplement only, the certificate should refer to the existence of the diploma supplement.

Marketing and Publicity

95. The Chief Marketing Officer or nominee will be responsible for the approval and accuracy of all public information, including publicity and marketing materials, published by the partner.

96. External Relations, in collaboration with Quality Management, will be responsible for monitoring on a regular basis the accuracy of information published by partners and potential partners.

97. A new course/partnership may be publicised following SRPC’s approval of the due diligence report and signature of the Heads of Agreement by both parties.

Information for students

98. The University will seek to ensure that students are given accurate and comprehensive information about all collaborative provision, and that such information is comparable to information given to students studying similar provision at the University.

99. The information made available to prospective students and those registered on a collaborative course will include information about the appropriate channels for particular concerns, complaints and appeals, making clear the channels through which they can contact the University directly.
ANNEXES

Annex 1: Categories of Collaborative provision

**Teaching - undergraduate, postgraduate and postgraduate research**

**Validated partnership provision**
A course validated by Solent University, leading to a Solent University academic credit and/or a Solent University award, which has been wholly or partially designed and developed by the partner. The partner recruits their own students who must meet the University’s admission and language requirements. The course is delivered mainly or in full by the partner including responsibility for assessments. Solent remain responsible for the standards of awards and quality assurance (including moderation of assessments) of the approved provision. Students will receive an award from Solent University.

**Franchised provision**
The delivery of all or part of a Solent University award or a Solent University award developed for a partner institution which is delivered at and by the staff of the partner institution. Delivery and assessment plans are set by Solent University. The partner institution recruit their own students who must meet the University’s admission and language requirements. Solent retains overall responsibility for the content, delivery and quality assurance arrangements in collaboration with the partner institution.

**Award of University academic credit and/or award**
The partner organisation together with the proposed course is approved against University criteria for FHEQ levels and credits. The approved partner organisation delivers the course, recruits students against their own admissions agreements and provides all facilities and resources for the provision. Solent is responsible for the standards of awards and quality assurance of the approved provision. Students may receive a certificate of credit from Solent University.

**Flying Faculty**
The delivery of a Solent course or credit bearing module at a partner institution by Solent staff. This may include some input from the partner institution, e.g. tutorial support or delivery of specialist material.

**Qualifications awarded with one or more degree awarding bodies:**
Qualifications involving more than one degree awarding body are distinctive as they involve the University working with at least one other degree awarding body (in the UK or Internationally) in a way that requires some pooling of those awarding powers and that the outcome of the partnership is a distinct educational programme that none of the partners can offer, in that form, independently of the others. This is different from other collaborative arrangements where the University works with a delivery organisation that does not have degree awarding powers or is not exercising them in the award of the provision. The qualifications awarded with one or more degree awarding bodies can be characterised as:

**Joint Awards:** provision is joint in all aspects of course design, development, delivery, assessment, and management and decision-making on student achievement. Students successfully completing the course gain a single certificate bearing the signatures of the competent authorities of all degree-awarding bodies involved. Commonly, receipt of the final award is dependent on students achieving a single, shared set of criteria (which will be learning outcomes and other requirements).
Dual Awards: provision is jointly conceived but designed so that interconnected components of the course are separately awarded by the collaborating degree awarding bodies on successful completion against individual awarding body criteria (which will be learning outcomes and other requirements). The awards would typically have between 60 and 80 credits of common core at each level and additional separate study to make up the required credit for the award of each partner. Each degree awarding body is responsible for its own award, typically meaning that the regulations of both institutions need to be met, at least on the common core aspects of the course, but the components form a single package and the overall collaborative partnership is a joint enterprise that requires elements of joint management and oversight.

Double Degree
Interlinked award offered by Solent and a partner organisation(s) leading to separate awards from each institution. Arrangements involving more than two partners would lead to multiple awards in the same way. Solent and a partner institution collaborate to develop and deliver a single programme leading to separate awards from each institution. The awards are interdependent and it is not usually possible for a student to obtain an award from only one partner. These awards are not currently offered by Solent University.

Award of a local degree in addition to a Solent University award.
It is understood that international strategic partners, as identified by the University, may wish to recognise students’ learning at Solent by awarding their own local degree within their own jurisdiction. The course documentation and any publicity materials must make it clear that such an award is made solely under the authority of the partner institution.

Joint Venture Company
A legal entity set up by Solent University and one or more partners to provide services to the partners involved.

Branch Campus
A campus of the university that is at a distance from the main university premises. The branch campus would be staffed by employees of Solent University and may or may not be under the same management of the main campus. There may be shared administration and other facilities.

Specialist modules
Solent modules which are taught by professionals from and usually at partner institutions.

Bespoke Delivery
An academic course that is developed by the university for a specialist provider

Mobility

Study Abroad
This arrangement offers an ‘incoming’ route whereby students can study at Solent University for a Semester or a full year. This arrangement attracts a fee which differs based on fee status, either EU or International. Students can take up to 60 CATS per semester. This programme attracts credits only and there is no formal award. There is no agreement needed for this type of study and unless stated, the modules that we offer have no pre-requisites. Some University Partners have specific modules identified for their students to come to Solent that are outlined in their Study Abroad agreement.
Erasmus
An arrangement whereby students may study at a partner institution within the participating countries of the Erasmus programme for a minimum of one semester and a maximum of one academic year. The period of time spent overseas has credit awarded. For outgoing students, the curriculum to be studied must be mapped against the student’s course at Solent and the course leader must approve the placement, the credit achieved counts towards the student’s award, but the marks are not considered in the calculation of an award classification. This arrangement offers an ‘incoming’ route whereby students can study at Solent under the same rules. This arrangement does not attract a fee. Staff can undertake a teaching placement abroad, or undertake training, job shadowing or observation. For both students and staff there is an Erasmus grant available. This must be checked and approved with the Strategic Partnerships Manager who manages the fund that is awarded by the European Commission. This grant has conditions and limitations attached.

Bilateral Exchange
This is an exchange of students for study from one institution to Solent. This is with a partner university and there is an agreement in place for this type of exchange. There are a number of defined exchange places for students to study in another university for a semester or full year. These places have to be mapped to ensure their learning outcomes are similar for the period they are missing in order to allow them to proceed back to their next level of study providing they pass the course in the partner university. The Course Leader must approve this student to undertake this exchange and ensure that the mapping for their programme is complete. The credit achieved counts towards the student’s award, but the marks are not considered in the calculation of an award classification.

Access and Recruitment

Admissions Agreement
An arrangement whereby Solent recognises named qualifications or part qualifications from a partner institution for entry onto nominated programmes at Solent.

Articulation arrangement
A process whereby all students who satisfy academic criteria on one programme are automatically entitled (on academic grounds) to be admitted with advanced standing to a subsequent stage of a programme of a degree-awarding body. These arrangements, which are subject to formal agreements between the parties, normally involve credit accumulation and transfer, so that credit achieved for the approved study at the first provider is transferred to contribute to the programme and award completed at the second (the degree-awarding body). The two separate components are the responsibility of the respective organisations delivering them but, together, contribute to a single award (of the degree-awarding body).

Higher and Degree Apprenticeship
Degree apprenticeships combine practical training in a job with studying part-time at Solent University. Apprentices are employed throughout the programme, and spend part of their time at studying which can be on a day-to-day basis or in blocks of time or online, depending on the programme and requirements of the employer/apprentice.

Professional Development
An arrangement whereby Solent works with a partner institution to deliver bespoke courses. Courses may be credit bearing or non-credit bearing. The courses could be professional body recognised and may result in a certification.
Research

Knowledge Transfer Partnership (KTP)
A KTP helps businesses in the UK to innovate and grow. It links businesses with an academic member of staff at the university and a Solent graduate.
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Annex 2: Collaborative Provision Due Diligence

QM organises and undertakes DD visit. This can be done alongside Approval to Deliver Event. QM requests HOA signed by partner.

- Project team, led by Quality Managements to complete the Business Proposal and initial risk assessment. Approval required by DOS.
- Project team, led by International Development Office (IDO) to complete the Business Proposal and initial risk assessment. Approval required by DOS.

Heads of agreement approved and signed by Pro Vice Chancellor.

Pro Vice Chancellor approval required by DOS.

Process suspended until risk suitably mitigated.

QM to complete the Heads of Agreement and circulate to key internal stakeholders.

QM to complete desk-based due diligence (DD) report. (can be done alongside Business Proposal)

Input from project team as required.

SRPC approval of partner.

SRPC consideration.

QM organises and undertakes DD visit. This can be done alongside Approval to Deliver Event. QM requests HOA signed by partner.

Schools/IDO to inform partner of outcome.

Not approved.

Partner approved and proceed to panel for the approval of the partner to deliver the collaborative provision.
Annex 3: Collaborative Provision Approval

**Approval preparation**

- Partner approved by SRPC
- Partner approval to deliver event (2G)
- Can be an integrated event. Can be undertaken at the same time as due diligence visit.
- Course approval event (2D)
- Documentation drafted by School, QM, internal stakeholders and partner. School to seek approval of the documentation from Dean of School ahead of validation event.

**Approval event**

- Validation conditions approved by the Chair of the panel
- Partner approval to deliver event. Due diligence visit can be undertaken at this event.
- Course approval event (2D)
- QM to organise approval event and draft MOA
- LTSAC to consider panel recommendation
- MOA to be signed by both parties
- MOA to be incorporated into Course Review and Revalidations
- Validation recommendations to be incorporated into Course Review and Revalidations
- QM to update Register of Collaborative Provision
- Start delivery

**Post validation**

- Approved
- Not approved
- Schools/ IDO to inform partner of outcome
- Panel report to LTSAC

---

Solent University Academic Handbook
Section 2G: Collaborative Provision