

Partnerships Protocols Collaborative Provision

Partnerships Protocol: Collaborative Provision

1. SCOPE AND PURPOSE

- 1.1 This protocol is for:
- staff at the University of Law and at existing or prospective partner organisations interested in developing an academic partnership for collaborative provision.
 - Funding and regulatory bodies, external accreditation agencies and professional bodies, in the UK and overseas, with an interest in the University's management of its collaborative partnerships.
- 1.2 This protocol covers the following procedures:
- The initial approval of new collaborative partnerships
 - The approval of specific programmes with new or existing partners, for delivery through collaborative arrangements;
 - Modification of existing collaborative arrangements;
 - Monitoring requirements;
 - Periodic review and renewal of existing partnerships and programmes delivered through collaborative arrangements;
 - Management of concerns and closure of collaborative arrangements.
- 1.3 The University defines collaborative provision as academic provision delivered through partnership models which typically falls within Category A of its Partnership Taxonomy. This includes Off Campus Delivery; Shared Delivery/Award; Franchise and Validation. Definition of these partnership models are provided in the University's Partnership Policy.

KEY RESPONSIBILITIES

- 1.4 **Academic Registry** will review and update the protocols to ensure practices for approving partner organisations, routine monitoring and management of concerns remain aligned to the University's Quality and Standards Code, sector benchmarks and reference points.
- 1.5 **Partnerships Committee** will, on behalf of Academic Board, have overarching responsibility for the application of this protocol and undertake review of its effectiveness. It will approve any updates and amendments to this protocol
- 1.6 **Programme Approval Committee** will have responsibility for the implementation of elements of the protocol relating to programme approval and curriculum management. It will contribute to the evaluation of this protocol's effectiveness.
- 1.7 **Academic Standards and Quality Committee** will have responsibility for ensuring appropriate oversight of regular monitoring and review of academic provision delivered through collaborative provision. It will contribute to the evaluation of this protocol's effectiveness.

2. PROTOCOLS

- 2.1 Approval of collaborative arrangements
- 2.1.2 Following approval of the due diligence report by Partnerships Committee, the University needs to satisfy itself of the partner organisation's suitability for delivering specific provision, in order to secure the quality of the academic experience for students and ensure that appropriate quality assurance procedures are in place to protect the academic standards of the University's awards. This level of scrutiny is normally overseen by the University's Programme Approval Committee (PAC).



2.1.3 The requirements of academic approval ensure the proposed partner organisation

- has in place an appropriate governance framework for maintaining academic standards and quality, with clearly defined roles and responsibilities to enable this;
- can provide the necessary resources and facilities to support the programme(s) to be delivered through the proposed collaborative arrangement;
- has in place a resource plan for ensuring the provision of a higher education learning environment consistent with the University’s expectations;
- has in place the ability to market the programme appropriately.

In addition, the requirements seek assurance that:

- staff at the partner organisation are appropriately qualified and have relevant subject expertise;
- proposed arrangement is appropriately aligned with the University’s academic regulations and quality assurance policies and procedures;
- appropriate measures are in place to align operational processes between the University and the partner organisation for key elements of the student journey;
- a robust development plan is in place to ensure the successful and sustainable delivery of the programmes; and arrangements are in place to support any planned training activities to which partner staff are entitled.
- There is clarity over the regulatory requirements in relation to the partnership, particularly on the gathering and sharing of relevant data.

2.1.4 The process for meeting these requirements for the different partnership models, as defined by the University’s Partnership Policy, may be summarised as follows:

Partnership Model	Site visit or equivalent	Panel event	Typical Document Requirements*	ULaw approving authority
Off Campus Delivery	✓	x	1. Summary of the proposed arrangement 2. Campus Resource document for the location of delivery	Programme Approval Committee Academic Board
Shared Delivery/Award	✓	✓	1. Summary of proposed arrangement 2. Campus Resource document for the location of delivery 3. Programme specification 4. Module specification 5. Students Handbook 6. Operations Manual	
Franchise				
Validation				

* Depending on the complexity of the partnership arrangement; nature of the academic provision and associated professional accreditation; and the location of delivery, additional evidential documents may be specified for submission.

2.1.5 The site visit should be conducted by a senior member of staff from ULaw, typically the nominated academic lead for the proposed partnership. Their evaluation of the facilities in place at the site of delivery should be captured in the Campus Resource document. Normally, the review of facilities is expected to take place as part of a physical visit to the location of delivery. However, where this is not logistically possible (e.g. due to travel restrictions), the site visit may be conducted virtually with the permission from the Chair of Programme Approval Committee.

2.1.6 The Panel event should normally take place at the partner organisation’s premises where the proposed programmes will be delivered. If this is not logistically possible (e.g. due to travel restrictions), the

panel event may be conducted virtually with permission from the Chair of the Programme Approval Committee. Where the proposal involves delivery at more than one site, the location of the event will be agreed between the University and the partner organisation. Site visits to each delivery location must be undertaken to assess the learning resources; teaching accommodation and other relevant facilities at each site prior to the panel event. Reports from these site visits must be included in the submission for academic approval.

- 2.1.7 The process of assessing the partner organisation and the academic provision to be delivered will normally be undertaken at the same time. Where this is not possible, the panel event for evaluating the partner organisation's suitability to govern and manage delivery of the proposed academic provision must take place prior to the evaluation of the academic provision to be delivered.
- 2.1.8 The panel will be convened through the authority of Programme Approval Committee. Its membership will be as follows:
- A senior member of academic or academic related staff from the University who will serve as Chair;
 - At least one external expert from outside the University with relevant subject expertise and experience in managing academic quality assurance for collaborative arrangements;
 - A member of the University's Academic Quality and Standards Committee;
 - At least one University representative with no direct responsibility for the proposed partnership arrangement.
 - A member of the University's Registry who will serve as the panel secretary.
- 2.1.9 The panel must refer to the criteria set out in the University's protocols for the approval of new programmes and campuses. It must also satisfy itself that the partner organisation meets the requirements set out in 2.1.3 above.
- 2.1.10 Following its evaluation of the information presented in support of the proposal, the panel will make one of the following recommendations to Programme Approval Committee:
- **approval** of the partner organisation for the delivery of the proposed academic provision with or without recommendations for enhancement;
 - approval of the partner organisation for the delivery of the proposed academic provision, subject to the meeting of **pre-approval conditions**;
 - **referral** of the proposed collaborative arrangement for further refinement before it is considered by a re-convened panel;
 - **rejection** of the proposed collaborative arrangement.
- 2.1.11 A report of the Panel's discussions and conclusions will be prepared by the Panel Secretary for submission to the Programme Approval Committee for ratification.
- 2.2 Modification of existing programmes delivered through collaborative arrangements
- 2.2.1 Modifications to programmes delivered through collaborative arrangements may only be implemented on completion of the University's process for approval of modifications to existing programmes.
- 2.2.2 Typically, modifications to programmes leading to the same award but delivered by more than one partner (e.g. franchise) can only be permitted if they are approved for delivery by all parties and at all locations. Where the collaborative provision involves jointly provided programmes leading to dual or joint awards, the modification must be agreed by all partners involved.
- 2.2.3 For the approval of additional delivery locations for existing collaborative arrangements, a site visit will be undertaken by an appropriate member of University staff. This will inform a campus resources document for the new location of delivery for scrutiny and approval by Programme Approval Committee.

2.3 Monitoring and Review

2.3.1 All collaborative provision is subject to the University's Programme Monitoring and Review Policy.

2.3.2 Periodic review of collaborative provision (Partner Review) normally occurs on a five-yearly cycle or more frequently if the University specifies it as part of approval of the provision or due to concerns (please see 2.4 below). Either the University or the Partner may request an elective review of the relationship and its operation outside of the usual five-year review cycle, typically to align with other timelines for curriculum development or reviews by external agencies. Wherever possible, the Partner Review will precede contract renewal for the partnership arrangement and will be aligned with periodic review for the academic programmes.

2.3.3 The Partner Review seeks to:

- reaffirm the relationship between the University and the Partner, taking into account the evolution of that relationship, institutional developments and changes to the HE landscape;
- provide an opportunity for both organisations, at institutional level, to reflect on and evaluate the experience of academic collaboration;
- take into account students' views and experiences of the partnership;
- identify aspects of partnership activity which would benefit from further development and enhancement;
- produce an Action Plan designed to deliver identified development and enhancement outcomes whose implementation is regularly monitored through Partnerships Committee;
- review the appropriateness of the resources available to support a portfolio of programmes delivered at the Partner and to ensure alignment of programmes with current University strategy.

2.3.4 The Head of Academic Partnership Governance will facilitate initial discussion between the Partner and representatives from ULaw academic teams to identify the timetable for review and key personnel who will contribute to the preparation of review documents and collation of evidence. The University's academic lead for the partnership will work with the Partner to complete a Partner Review Due Diligence Form (Appendix 1) and compile any supporting evidence. Wherever possible, the review process should draw on existing documentation produced as part of routine mechanisms for quality assurance, including audit reports from external agencies.

2.3.5 Drawing on the Partner Review Due Diligence Forms and supporting evidence, the Head of Academic Partnership Governance will work with senior members of University staff, typically drawn from the membership of Partnerships Committee and Programme Approval Committee, to prepare a Partner Review Initial Report (Appendix 2) for submission to Partnerships Committee in the first instance. The purpose of the report is to enable the Partnership Committee to assess whether the general conditions for the partnership arrangement are still being met and to take note of any changes to circumstances of the partner in the last five years. The report may highlight recommended actions and stipulate how these may be addressed by named stakeholders so that progress against these can help inform the Committee's consideration and decision making.

2.3.6 Following consideration of the Partner Review Initial Report, the Partnerships Committee could:

- confirm that the Partner be re-approved for a further period (normally five years);
- request that a Partner Review event be held. As part of this decision, Partnerships Committee will determine the format of the review; membership of the review panel; and key themes to be explored as part of the review event;
- recommend to Academic Board that the partnership arrangement be phased out and initiate discussions for any teach out arrangements.

Partner Review Event

2.3.7 Where Partnerships Committee has determined that a Partner Review event be held, it may specify whether the review event is conducted by correspondence or as a one day visit to the partner organisation. Guidance on review documentation is provided in Appendix 3. Procedures for staging a review visit are provided in Appendix 4.

- 2.3.8 A Partner Review Panel will be convened through the authority of Partnerships Committee. The membership of this panel will be informed by the perceived level of risk to academic standards and key themes identified for exploration. It will typically comprise:
- A senior member of academic or academic related staff from the University who will serve as Chair;
 - Director of Academic Registry (or their nominee);
 - A senior member from another UK Higher Education Institute with substantial and appropriate experience of academic audits and/or collaborative provision;
 - At least one University representative with no direct responsibility for the proposed partnership arrangement.
 - A member of the University's Registry who will serve as the panel secretary.
- 2.3.9 A written report of the Partner Review event will be prepared for submission to Partnerships Committee. The report will contain a judgement as to whether or not the Panel has confidence in the continuation of the partnership and confirm the date for the next Partner Review (a maximum of five years from the date of the event). Conditions and/or recommendations may be specified by the panel and the timescale and process for ensuring these are resolved will also be outlined.
- 2.3.10 Wherever possible, the Partner Review will precede the production of an updated Partnership Agreement. In this case, following confirmation that any conditions have been resolved, the academic link tutor will work with the appropriate professional services to prepare a new Partnership Agreement.
- 2.4 Management of concerns and closure of collaborative arrangements
- 2.4.1 Where the quality of collaborative provision falls significantly below the expectations set out in the Partnership Agreement and/or the Operations Manual, the University may opt to initiate its process for Improvement Planning. This process provides an opportunity to resolve any concerns in a collaborative way before formal steps are taken to suspend recruitment and/or terminate the partnership. The intention is to enable dialogue between the University and the partner organisation so that an appropriate and timely course of action can be agreed to protect the interests of students on the programmes concerned. The initiation of this process will be authorised by Partnerships Committee.
- 2.4.2 A working group of the University and the partner organisation should be convened to draw up the improvement action plan. The group will be chaired by a senior member of the University appointed by the Chair of Partnerships Committee. Typically, the working group will include:
- academic link tutor(s) for the partnership (ULaw);
 - programme manager for the programme under consideration (partner organisation);
 - a member of the Partnerships Committee or Academic Standards and Quality Committee with no active involvement in the partnership (ULaw);
 - quality officer or equivalent (partner organisation)
 - a nominee from the executive team (partner organisation)
 - a representative from the Student Association (ULaw)
 - A member of the University's Registry who will serve as the secretary.
- 2.4.3 The working group will produce an action plan to address the issues within an agreed timescale for approval by the Partnerships Committee. If it is the recommendation of the working group that it is not possible to achieve the required quality of delivery within a reasonable timescale, a decision may be made to suspend recruitment to the programme until identified concerns have been addressed. Partnerships Committee may seek input from other authorities of the University (e.g. Executive Board) before endorsing a decision of this kind.
- 2.4.4 Progress with the Improvement Action Plan will be monitored by the working group for the duration of the plan, with regular reporting to Partnerships Committee.

- 2.4.5 The termination of a partnership or closure of a programme delivered through collaborative arrangements may arise in a number of ways. Irrespective of circumstances, safeguarding the interests of any students remaining on the programme(s) is the main guiding principle for the development of an exit strategy. Exit strategies must also be informed by considerations about minimising reputational damage to the University.
- 2.4.6 Proposals to terminate a partnership agreement shall be authorised by the University's Executive Board based on recommendations from the Academic Standards and Quality Committee and/or Partnerships Committee. Following a decision to terminate a more detailed plan for withdrawal must be drawn up, typically this will be negotiated with the partner organisation. All staff involved with supporting the operation of the collaborative arrangement must be made aware of the decision to terminate the arrangement.
- 2.4.7 The University retains overall responsibility for the remaining students on programmes delivered through collaborative arrangements, and for enabling them to complete their studies, regardless of the willingness of the partner organisation to work with the University to protect the interests of students. Where there is a significant teach out period, a review for closure will be conducted under the authority of the Programme Approval Committee.

3. REFERENCE POINTS AND FURTHER INFORMATION

3.1 Internal Reference Points

- [Q1 Programme and Campus Design, Development and Approval Policy](#)
- [Q2 Recruitment, Selection and Admissions Policy](#)
- [Q3 Learning and Teaching Policy](#)
- [Q4 Enabling Student Development and Achievement Policy \(including Safeguarding and Prevent\)](#)
- [Q6 Assessment Policy](#)
- [Q7 External Examiners Policy](#)
- [Q8 Programme Monitoring and Review Policy](#)
- [Q10 Partnerships Policy](#)
- [G3 Public Information Policy](#)

3.2 External Reference Points

- [Securing Student Success; regulatory framework for higher education in England](#), Office for Students (OfS) 2017
- [UK Quality Code for Higher Education Advice and Guidance – Partnerships](#), Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) 2018
- [UK Quality Code for Higher Education Advice and Guidance – Work Based Learning](#), Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) 2018
- [The Quality Evaluation and Enhancement of UK Transnational Higher Education \(TNE\) Provision 2021-22 to 2025-26](#), Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) 2021
- [The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree Awarding Bodies](#), Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) 2014

4. APPENDICES

Appendix 1	Partner Review Due Diligence Form
Appendix 2	Partner Review Initial Report Template
Appendix 3	Guidance on Partner Review documents
Appendix 4	Timeline for staging a Partner Review visit
Appendix 5	Partner Review Process

Version history

Version	Amended by	Revision summary	Date
V1.4	Senior Quality Officer	Recoding of policy documents	August 2020
V2.0	Head of Academic Partnership Governance	Alignment with revised Partnership Policy V2.1 and renamed for Collaborative Provision	20/07/2021

PARTNER REVIEW DUE DILIGENCE REPORT

Name of Partner	
Location of Partner	
ULaw Lead Academic	
Partnership Model	Choose an item.
Type of Partner Organisation	Choose an item.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – To be completed by ULaw

OUTCOME OF REVIEW BY REGISTRY			
Date of Review		Reviewer	
Reviewer Comment	Issues/Risks:		
Will Further Information be required?			
(please give details)			
Recommendations			
OUTCOME OF REVIEW BY FINANCE			
Date of Review		Reviewer	
Reviewer Comment	Issues/Risks		
Recommendations			
OUTCOME OF REVIEW BY LEGAL			
Date of Review		Reviewer	
Reviewer Comment	Issues/Risks:		
Recommendations			

Partnership Protocols

Section 1 – ABOUT THE PARTNER – To be completed by the Partner

1.1 Registered Name of Partner Organisation	
1.2 Registered Address of Partner Organisation	
1.3 Date Partner Organisation was established	
1.4 Number of students	
1.5 Types of programme awards	
1.6 Does the partner have other UK HE partnerships?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes – please give details below <input type="checkbox"/> No
1.7 Does the partner have existing HE partnerships overseas?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes – please give details below <input type="checkbox"/> No
1.8 Has the partner been subject to reviews or inspections by an external body (i.e. OFSTED, QAA, PSRB) in the last 3 years?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes – please give details below <input type="checkbox"/> No
1.9 Has the partner provided evidence of secure financial standing?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes – please give details below <input type="checkbox"/> No
1.10 Has the partner provided evidence that it has legal authority to enter in partnership arrangements with the University of Law?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes – please give details below <input type="checkbox"/> No
1.11 Has the partner provided evidence that it holds Highly Trusted Sponsor Status? (only applicable where the collaborative provision recruits international students to the UK)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes – please give details below <input type="checkbox"/> No
1.12 Have details been provided of any legal disputes (as claimant or defendant) which are current or known to be pending in relation to the partner?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes – please give details below <input type="checkbox"/> No
1.13 Partner Mission Statement	
1.14 Partner Strategic Plan or equivalent	
1.15 Organisational/Staffing Structure and Physical Resources of the institution	
1.16 Partner's policy and procedure documents for academic quality assurance	
1.17 Partner's policy for compliance with UK statutory requirements (where applicable), including anti bribery, counter terrorism, equality and diversity, consumer protection, data protection, modern slavery	
1.18 Reputational Standing of the Partner from desk-based investigations	To be completed by ULaw

Partnership Protocols



1.19 Institutional Standing of the Partner, based on advice from NARIC/British Council/OfS/QAA (if available)	To be completed by ULaw
1.20 Details of any external regulatory bodies for the partner	

Partnership Protocols



Section 2 – ABOUT THE PARTNERSHIP WITH ULaw -

2.1 ULaw programmes delivered at the Partner Organisation	
2.2 Feeder routes for ULaw programmes	
2.3 Status of ULaw Partnership Agreement with this partner	<input type="checkbox"/> Archived – please give details below <input type="checkbox"/> Current
2.4 Original Partnership start date	
2.4 Date of previous Partner Review	
2.5 Outcomes from previous Partner Review	

SECTION 3 – OVERSEAS PARTNERS ONLY - - To be completed by the Partner

3.1 Has there been any changes to the regulatory or statutory requirements of central or regional authorities in the country of delivery? How does this impact on any authorisations or licenses which the Partner or ULaw need to obtain to continue with the collaboration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes – please give details below <input type="checkbox"/> No
3.2 Note any travel issues from the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO) . Please describe proposed mitigations, as appropriate	
Travel/safety issues flagged by FCDO or other sources	Please provide details
Only general issues noted	
Specific local advice (e.g. crime, safety, weather)	
Specific risk of natural disaster or disease	
Specific risk of civil unrest or security incident	
Serious risk of terrorism including kidnapping	
Advice against all travel/all be but essential travel	

Appendix 2

PARTNER REVIEW – INITIAL REPORT

Section 1: About the partnership

Name of Partner	
Institution Address	
Partnership Model	Choose an item.
Institution Type	Choose an item.
Programmes delivered currently and ULaw's Academic Lead	
Original Partnership start date	
Key changes to the Partnership since the last Partner Review	

Section 2: Summary of Outcomes

Issues raised by ULaw for consideration	
Issues raised by the Partner for consideration	
Recommendation to Partnerships Committee	<input type="checkbox"/> Partner be re-approved for a further period <input type="checkbox"/> a Partner Review event be held <input type="checkbox"/> initiate action to close the Partnership
Recommended Further Actions	
Additional Comments	

Section 3: Outcomes of due diligence checks

Due diligence evidence	Document/evidence received from partner	Comments and Recommendations	Comments/Recommendation provided by
Copies of most recent quality / inspection reports (i.e. OfS, Ofsted, awarding bodies, professional and statutory bodies)			Academic Registry
<p>Details of existing or historic partnerships with other HEI's (UK and international).</p> <p>Where these collaborative partners have been subject to QAA Institutional Review / Higher Education Review / Ofsted please include the sections of the report relating to collaborative provision with the institution</p>			Academic Registry
Evidence of the secure financial standing of the partner institution (the audited accounts or equivalent records for the last 3 years)			Finance
Evidence that the Institution holds Highly Trusted Sponsor Status (HTS) – Immigration Tier 4 Licence (required for admitting international students)			Academic Registry

Due diligence evidence	Document/evidence received from partner	Comments and Recommendations	Comments/Recommendation provided by
<p>Evidence of the legal status of the institution IF THERE HAVE BEEN ANY CHANGES SINCE INITIAL APPROVAL.</p> <p>This should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Name, trade name (if different) and principal address; □ A copy of the constitutional documents for the Institution; □ Evidence that the Institution has power to enter into the proposed collaboration 			<p style="text-align: center;">Legal</p>

Due diligence evidence	Document/evidence received from partner	Comments and Recommendations	Comments/Recommendation provided by
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Description of the ownership and governance structure of the Institution □ Details about how the Institution is funded 			
<p>Details of any of the following disputes which are current, known to be pending, in relation to the Institution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Any litigation or arbitration proceedings (claimant or defendant) □ Any prosecution □ Any investigation or inquiry by a governmental or official body 			Legal

Section 4: Evaluation of the partnership arrangements

Outcomes of Annual Monitoring Reports since previous Partner Review
<p><i>Head of Quality Assurance to confirm whether annual monitoring reports over the period have been satisfactory. In particular:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ <i>Have issues been actioned year on year?</i> □ <i>Are there any recurring issues?</i> □ <i>Comment on student satisfaction data as detailed in the annual monitoring reports</i>

For International Partners - Have there been any changes to the regulatory or statutory requirements of central or regional authorities in the country regarding any authorisations or licenses which the Institution and/or ULaw needs to obtain in order to continue with the collaboration?

Any other issues (are there any other developments since the previous Partner Review which might affect the partner's relationship with the University?)

Academic Registry, in conjunction with the National Programme Director, to complete this section. Consideration should be given as to whether there any issues of a political or ethical nature in relation to the partnership which might have arisen since the last Partner Review. In particular:

- ▯ *Has the Partner's adherence to ULaw's quality assurance processes been satisfactory?*
- ▯ *Does the Partner's mission statement and institutional strategic plan remain appropriately aligned with ULaw's?*
- ▯ *Are there aspects of the partnership which would benefit from further development and enhancement?*

Annex 1: Evidence reviewed for the Partner Review Initial Report

Typically, these will include:

From the Partner

- *Mission Statement*
- *Articles of Governance*
- *HE Strategy or equivalent*
- *Annual Accounts*
- *Relevant policies for statutory duties and management of HE provision*
- *Reports from engagements with external agencies for academic quality assurance*
- *Reports from accreditation reviews for HE provision*

From ULaw

- *Annual monitoring summaries, action Plans and supporting documents*
- *External Examiner Reports for academic provision leading to ULaw awards and responses to these*
- *Link Tutor Reports*
- *Programme Approval and Review Reports*

APPENDIX 3

PARTNER REVIEW EVENT: GUIDANCE ON DOCUMENTATION

1. Documentation for the Partner Review event will typically comprise:
 - A briefing paper produced the Head of Academic Partnership Governance, based on the Partner Review Initial Report and updates arising from consideration by Partnerships Committee
 - A briefing paper produced by the partner on the themes identified for consideration at the Review event
 - An optional student written submission (where appropriate) produced by the ULaw's Student Association with input from the student body at the Partner.

2. It is anticipated that a planning meeting will be held between ULaw and the Partner's HE Manager (or equivalent) to agree the documents for the Partner Review Event and the timescales for their submission. Examples of the types of documents include:
 - the University's Strategic Plan and the Partner's current Strategic Plan and HE Strategy
 - the current Partnership Agreement
 - relevant sections of the Academic Regulations, Policies and Protocols pertaining to partnership provision
 - diagrams outlining the relevant management and committee structures of the Partner (if not already part of the Briefing Paper).
 - the most recent QAA and Ofsted reports since the Partner Approval Event or the last Partner Review meeting
 - Reports from engagements with PSRBs in the last two years
 - report of the Partner Approval Event or the latest Partner Review report
 - where appropriate minutes of the Partner internal HE committee or equivalent, for the past two years
 - statistical data on student recruitment, progression and achievement for the last three years;
 - Reports from Programme approval/review events for the last two years
 - External Examiner reports for the last two years
 - Annual Monitoring documents for the last two years
 - the partner's quality assurance documentation, where appropriate, e.g. Quality Handbook/peer observation information
 - staff development and appraisal policies and procedures
 - other documentation referred to in the two briefing papers

Briefing Papers

3. Briefing papers should be evaluative and concise (not exceeding 3,000 words) and should be evidenced by reference to existing documentation which will be made available to the Partner and the University. The briefing papers should provide an evaluative, evidence-based commentary on the themes identified for consideration by the Partner Review Event. The document should be frank, balanced and developmental to include ideas and recommendations for improvement.

4. Both briefing papers will be provided to the Partner Review Panel and shared between the relevant Faculties, Professional Services and the Partner before the review takes place.

Student Written Submission

5. A student written submission is optional and may not be appropriate depending on the themes under consideration. The student body should decide whether it is desirable or feasible to produce a submission for a Partner Review Event. The guiding principle should be that the submission should provide the Panel with an overview of the experience of being a student at the Partner within the context of the themes under consideration e.g. work based learning; access and participation; assessment and feedback.

APPENDIX 4

INDICATIVE TIMELINE FOR STAGING A PARTNER REVIEW VISIT (PRV)

- 3 months before PRV** Academic Registry sets date for the Partner Review visit with the Partner and the internal Panel and informs relevant stakeholders.
Academic Registry makes arrangements for an external Panel Member to join the Panel as appropriate
- 12 weeks before PRV** Planning meeting between Academic Registry and key staff at the Partner, to plan the visit, its timetable and to give guidance on preparation of briefing paper and other documentation to be provided
- 8 weeks before PRV** Academic Registry co-ordinates the collation of existing supporting evidence and provides the relevant University and Partner review members with access to the documentation
- 6 weeks before PRV** Academic teams/Professional Services submit contributions to briefing paper prepared by Academic Registry, as appropriate
- 3 weeks before PRV** Deadline for Briefing Papers. All documentation received by Academic Registry for distribution to Partner Review Panel and exchange of briefing papers between the Partner and relevant Faculties and Professional Services
- 2 weeks before PRV** Partner to provide details of staff and students attending meetings
- Partner Review Visit**
- PRV + 2 weeks** Draft report sent to Partner, relevant ULaw academic and professional services teams for comments on matters of accuracy
- PRV + 3 weeks** Draft report, taking into account any comments received, sent to Panel for comment and confirmation
- PRV + 4 weeks** Confirmed report circulated
- PRV + 6 weeks** Partner to prepare response and action plan with support from Academic Registry
- PRV + 8 weeks** Response and action plan sent to Academic Registry for submission to Partnerships Committee

Appendix 5

