

Amendments to UPR AS17 (Academic Quality) for 2013/14

This paper summarises the approved amendments to UPR AS17 for the 2013/14 academic year.

1. Approval of additional delivery locations for validated programmes

The 27 February 2013 meeting of ADC and the 19 March 2013 meeting of ASAC both approved a process for the approval of an additional delivery location of an already-approved programme. As a consequence, the following amendments have been approved to UPR AS17, AQPR 8.2:

DEVELOPMENT AND APPROVAL PROCEDURES FOR NEW PROGRAMMES OF STUDY (AQPR.8.2)

Validation and Periodic Review (AQPR 8.2.1)

1 Validation of new programmes

2 Periodic review of programmes

3. Approval of additional delivery locations for validated programmes

3.1 The intention to deliver a validated University-delivered programme at an additional location should be noted and endorsed at ADC, or in the case of collaborative programmes requires the approval of ADC using form AQ2b (for the approval of a new campus of an existing partner, see also AQPR 8.5.8). All proposals for new delivery locations must be supported, in principle, by the relevant Dean of School as part of future academic provision. There is an expectation that the same staff are involved in delivery at all approved locations.

3.2 The School is required to undertake a visit to the new location, to review the physical resources, staffing arrangements, student support and programme management arrangements. The visit report should clearly indicate whether approval of the new location is recommended or not. However, where approval is being sought to deliver the programme at a location where there are no learning resource requirements, this visit may not be required. AS must be consulted in every case.

3.3 External Examiners may also need to be consulted about their duties being extended to include the new location.

3.4 The School's visit report and any other relevant evidence are considered by a School panel consisting of the School's Associate Dean (AQA) plus the relevant Associate Director of AQA. At the conclusion of the approval process, the panel must provide:

- i written confirmation of whether or not the panel is recommending approval of the new provision. Any conditions of approval must be clearly identified, along with confirmation that conditions of approval have been met;*
- ii where approval is recommended, the report should be accompanied by a completed form AQ3 (or form AQ4 for collaborative programmes) and a revised PS and location-specific DMDs.*

A recommendation for approval will not be ratified until all of this documentation can be passed, together, to Academic Services.

3.4 Approval will be noted at the School Academic Committee.

3.5 At the following periodic review of the programme (or revalidation in the case of collaborative programmes), all delivery locations should be reviewed and re-approved together.

2. Re-approval of collaborative partnerships

The role of various units within the University in the re-approval of collaborative partnerships has changed over the past few years. In recognition of these developments, the following amendments have been approved to UPR AS17, AQPR 8.5.3, section 3:

Approval of a New Partner Organisation as a Collaborative Partner of the University (AQPR 8.5.3)

3 Re-approval of a Partnership

3.1 Approval of a Partner Organisation will be for a maximum period of six (6) years. After this period the partnership must be re-approved. Towards the end of this period AS (*in consultation with the School, UH Global or Academic Partnership Office, as appropriate, and with Legal Services and the Director of Academic Quality Assurance*) will ~~initiate~~ *organise* a formal review ~~and revalidation~~, including the option of a new Financial and Institutional Audit (*see* section 3.2, ii, ~~a, refers~~). The aim will be to re-confirm that the Partner Organisation continues to meet the criteria for partnership. The review and re-approval of a Partner Organisation may take place alongside validation or revalidation of one or more programmes. ~~AS will make all arrangements for review and revalidation.~~

3.2 The process of re-approval is as follows.

- i *The Vice-Chancellor (or nominee)* GEG will be invited to confirm in principle that the partnership should continue, through submission of a form AQ2a (for guidance on the submission please refer to the Academic Quality StudyNet pages).
- ii The ~~Partner will be informed of the University's intention to review the partnership, the extent of the review which~~ could include:
 - a an Institutional Audit, undertaken with the validation;
 - b a Financial Audit through the scrutiny of the most recent set of audited accounts of the Partner Organisation, initiated by AS and conducted by the University's Finance Department;
 - c a review of the MoA (or other Agreement, as described in 1.4, above), with a new document to be signed by both parties in the event of re-approval;
 - d for partners with large and cross-School provision, the most recent Quality Liaison Manager's Annual Report.
- iii The identified information will then be considered by ADC where re-approval will be formally granted, subject to any conditions that must be met. *Any associated* ~~The~~ re-validation of the programme will be conditional upon the conditions for partner re-approval being met.

3.3 The validation status of

3. Link Tutor core terms of reference

Schools have reported some confusion over the role of the Link Tutor in (i) reporting to SAC and (ii) the preparation and presentation of AMERs for collaborative programmes. In response, the following amendments have been approved to UPR AS17, AQPR 8.5.7, section 2:

Link Tutor (AQPR 8.5.7)

2 Core Terms of Reference

- 1 To monitor the health of a collaborative programme (for example, through visits or other communications) and to report to the Dean of School (or nominee) any actions that need to be taken to support the collaboration or on any other matters relevant to the partnership.
- 2 To be the main academic point of contact for communications between the School and the collaborative Partner.
- 3 *To report to SAC on the outcomes of visits to the partner.*
- 4 To *support the partner in their preparation of the Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Report (including the preparation by the Link Tutor of one section of the report), and to present it* to the SAC or appropriate Sub-Group (or, in the case of Academic Support Partnerships, to prepare an annual report for each partner to be appended to the AMER).
- 5 To act as an ex officio member of

4. Approval of a new campus of an existing partner

UPR AS17 does not currently reflect the practice agreed at ADC for the approval of new campuses of a partner organisation. These practices were agreed at the 27 March 2012 meeting of ASAC, but not incorporated into the 2012/13 regulations. As a consequence, the following amendments have been approved to UPR AS17, AQPR 8.5.8:

Approval for a New Campus of an Existing, Approved Partner Organisation to Deliver a Collaborative Programme (AQPR 8.5.8)

1 General

Wherever an approved partner of the University has proposed to either transfer the delivery of a University-validated programme to a new campus, or deliver at an additional new campus, then ADC approval of that campus is required.

In addition to campus approval:

- i where there is a proposal from a partner to deliver an already-approved collaborative programme at an additional campus and it is intended that the same staff should deliver at both the existing and proposed new locations, the process described in AQPR 8.2.1, section 3 also applies.*
- ii where there is a proposal from a partner to deliver an already-approved collaborative programme at an additional campus and it is intended to be delivered by different staff to those delivering the programme at the existing location, ADC initial approval and a University-level validation event is also required.*
- iii where there is a proposal from a partner to deliver an already-approved collaborative programme at a new campus and it is intended that delivery is transferred from the*

existing to the new location, then only campus approval is required (using the process described in AQPR 8.5.8, section 2).

~~2 Submission document~~

~~The Partner provides to the School a proposal submission document containing the following information, normally in the form of a development plan:~~

- ~~i the location of the new campus;~~
- ~~ii detail of the learning resources available to students to support delivery of the programme;~~
- ~~iii curricula vitae of the staff who will deliver the programme in the new location and identification of the academic manager who will have oversight of the programme at the new location;~~
- ~~iv arrangements for co-ordinating the management of the programme across sites, both academic and administrative;~~
- ~~v arrangements for moderation and monitoring of standards and student achievement across sites;~~
- ~~vi arrangements for assuring the security of the assessment process across sites;~~
- ~~vii confirmation of any requisite Government approval. N.B. If this cannot be provided in advance of validation it must be a condition of approval.~~

2 Campus Approval process

- 2.1 The Partner initiates the process by providing the School with a proposal, identifying the location of the new campus. The University expects to receive adequate notice of a partner's proposal to deliver the programme at a new location, to facilitate a visit by the School and the approval of ADC ~~a University Panel~~ before delivery commences.
- 2.2 Once informed of the proposal, AS will write to the partner with a questionnaire, in order to determine the remit of the School approval visit. However, where the existing collaboration is in any way problematic, AS may insist upon a visit to the new location before approval can be considered.
- 2.3 The School should then conduct a subject-level academic resource visit of the new campus and report on the outcome, clearly indicating whether or not the School is recommending to ADC the approval of the new campus.
- 2.4 ADC approval of the proposal requires consideration of an AQ2a form plus the School's visit report. ~~Consideration of the information outlined in 1 above should take place at ADC, for institutional approval 'in principle'. To support ADC in making its decision, AS (or the School) should normally visit the new campus. The purpose of the visit is to inspect facilities and meet teaching staff to discuss delivery of the programme.~~
- ~~3.2 In exceptional circumstances, and only where the proposal is to extend delivery of an already approved programme to another already approved campus, a recommendation for approval may be based on consideration of this material by correspondence. Where there is any doubt about the advisability of approving an additional campus by correspondence or where, for example, the existing collaboration is in any way problematic, the AS may insist upon a visit to the new campus before approval can be considered.~~
- 2.5 Upon final ADC approval, the School is required to revise the PS, as appropriate. Approval of the new or additional campus is acknowledged as a schedule in the MoA.
- ~~3.3 AS must be consulted in every case.~~
- ~~3.4 At the conclusion of the approval process, AS (or, where nominated by AS, the School) must provide:~~

~~i — a brief report of the means by which it has considered the proposal. The report should indicate clearly whether or not AS is recommending to the Academic Board approval of the new campus. Conditions of approval must be clearly identified in the report;~~

~~ii — confirmation that conditions of approval have been met;~~

~~iii — where approval is recommended, the report should be accompanied by an AQ4 and a revised PS.~~

~~— A recommendation for approval will not be ratified until all of this documentation can be passed, together, to the Vice-Chancellor. The report will form a new schedule to the MoA.~~

3 External Examiners

The School should ensure that External Examiners are notified and that *any revised* arrangements for Examination Boards are clear and appropriate.

5. Terminating a collaborative arrangement

The 27 February meeting of ADC approved a revised process for the termination of a collaborative arrangement. The following amendments to UPR AS17, AQPR 8.5.11 have therefore been approved:

Terminating a Collaborative Agreement

(AQPR 8.5.11)

- 4 Termination of either an individual programme or of the approval for the Partner Organisation can be proposed, mainly on the grounds outlined above. Where the University or a School reaches a decision to terminate a collaborative arrangement, usually following consultation with the Partner Organisation and with the *relevant PVC (or nominee) – DAQA and UH Global*, a *proposal for paper proposing* termination should be put to ADC (*using form AQ2c*). The paper should outline, in summary:
 - i the reason(s) for proposing termination;
 - ii transitional arrangements for students already registered with the University;
 - iii the timescale by which the last students registered with the University will complete study for their awards.
- 5 If ADC agrees to termination, the