Higher Education Collaborative Procedure

1. Statement of Intent

1.1 This procedure governs the operational process of entering into a collaborative agreement with another provider, ensuring effective regulatory and quality oversite that aims to protect the interests and reputation of USP College.

2. Linked Policies

2.1 The procedure for entering into a collaborative academic partnership has links to the following policies;
a.   Higher Education Student Protection Plan
b.   Admissions Policy
c.   Higher Education Review and Enhance Process

3. Introduction and Purpose

3.1 This document aims to inform the operational procedure for entering into an academic partnership with a new collaborative partner.

3.2 The procedure for the approval of new partnerships is informed by the Quality Assurance Agencies Revised UK Quality Code (2019). The code is based on the concept of expectations for standard and quality, with associated core practices for providers of higher education.

3.3 The code has the following expectations for standards;
a.   The academic standards of courses meet the requirements of the relevant national qualifications framework. When working in partnership, the awarding organisation retains responsibility for the academic standards of its awards, ensuring that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualification frameworks.
b.   The value of qualifications awarded to students at the point of qualification and over time is in line with sector-recognised standards. When working in partnership, the awarding organisation retains responsibility for ensuring that academic standards at, and beyond, the threshold level are reasonably comparable with those achieved by other UK providers.

3.4 The code has the following core practice for standards;
a.   Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them. In practice, this means that the awarding organisation must put in place all necessary measures to ensure that it can maintain the academic standards of its awards. This will include an analysis of the risks associated with a potential partner, the type of partnership that will be entered into, the management of the partnership (and its associated risks), that an appropriate formal agreement is put in place, and that these arrangements are effectively monitored and evaluated. The student protection plan intends to assess the range of risks to non-continuation of study and provide the student with an overview of the measures the college has in place to mitigate those risks.

3.5 The code has the following expectations for quality;

    a.   Courses are well-designed, provide a high-quality academic experience for all students and enable a student's achievement to be reliably assessed. When working in partnership, the awarding organisation retains responsibility for ensuring that all aspects of the student's academic experience from admissions through to outcomes can be considered high quality. The awarding organisation is also responsible for ensuring that enhancement opportunities are available to students.

3.6 The code has the following core practice for quality;

    a.   Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them. In practice, this means that where an awarding organisation arranges for all, or part, of the course to be delivered by another organisation, it puts in place effective processes for the management and oversight of all aspects of the students' academic experience to ensure that this is high-quality. These will include regular monitoring and review of the course(s), the teaching staff, the facilities, other resources and seeking, and acting on, where relevant, feedback from all involved in the provision with a particular focus on student feedback and outcomes.

3.7 The following procedures apply to all forms of collaborative arrangements as outlined in the USP College (the college) Collaboration Policy.

3.8 Before the college offers any programmes in collaboration with others, outline approval must be sought, and criteria outlined in the Collaboration Policy.

3.9 There are two strands to the approval process, which includes institutional level approval by Senior Management Team (SMT), followed by approval by Validation event.

4. Legislation and Guidance

4.1 The revised UK Quality Code for Higher Education (2019). Quality Assurance Agency.

5. Initial Development and Evaluation of strategic, financial and legal aspects

5.1 All proposals for new partnerships must consider and demonstrate how they align with the college's strategic plan, the college's HE strategy and ensure that any proposed partnerships will enhance the quality and reputation of the provision at USP college.

5.2 The programme proposer should start initial discussions with the Head of Higher Education & Access and regarding potential benefits and risks. If there is significant risk in the partnership, discussion may be needed with the Vice Principal Quality and Curriculum for confirmation as to whether the proposal can progress in the early stages.

5.3 The project lead should consult with relevant internal departments to gather information required for the outline approval.

    a.   Marketing – To consult regarding market research on the programme demand and viability.

b. Registry – to outline any issues in regard to admissions and enrolment and registering students.
c. Business Support Managers – to discuss any resource implications on the proposal, including new resources and considerations of staff time.
d. Head of Higher Education & Access - to ensure that the proposal is viable in terms of quality and standards and outline any issues that may arise from the validation event and potential partnership.

5.4 The proposer will also need to consult with the proposed partner to gather due diligence information.

5.5 The proposer will also need to investigate whether there are any legal aspects to be considered when seeking approval.

6. Due Diligence and Outline Approval

6.1 Before presentation to SMT an outline approval needs to sort form the curriculum planning group. Business cases should be submitted using the online form produced by MIS.

6.2 Due diligence information will be used to ensure that the proposed partner is financially sound and viable, quality and standards will not be compromised, to determine whether any government approval is required, and the partner are capable of delivering academic programmes to the required standard of USP college.

6.3 The due diligence information should be submitted to the HE Manager for review and sign off before the outline approval is submitted to SMT. Relevant aspects of the due diligence information will be signed off by the Head of Higher Education & Access, and the Chief Finance Officer (CFO).

6.4 The Head of Higher Education & Access will work with the programme proposer and appropriate Director of Curriculum to collate the due diligence information. The due diligence enquiries will cover the following areas;
a. Public and legal standing of the proposed partner whether in the UK or overseas,
b. Standing in relation to experience with other UK HE Institutions,
c. Financial Stability of the proposed partner,
d. Ability of the proposed partner to provide human and material resources for the provision to operate successfully,
e. Ability of the proposed partner to deliver provision in a safe and appropriate working environment,
f. Ownership and the governance structures of the potential partner,
g. Ability for the partner to manage quality assurance processes and meet the expectations of the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Quality Code and UK Framework for Higher Education Qualifications and any other relevant guidance.

6.5 The following information will need to be provided by the potential partners to satisfy the queries outlined above, where information is not available the Head of Higher Education & Access would need to be informed;

6.6 For all potential partnerships;
a. A detailed business plan of the proposed partnership from the Head of Higher Education & Access, in collaboration with the CFO.

b.	A detailed description of academic and administrative resources available at the institution to support the arrangements proposed. This should include details of student support and pastoral care.
c.	Institutional Documents including (Please see the Due Diligence checklist (Appendix A);
d.	Evidence of Quality at the institution including;

6.7	For Privately funded institutions the following is also required;
a.	Legal Status of Institution i.e. Articles of Association, Trust Deed, Act of Parliament,
b.	Corporate Business Plan and Financial Forecasts
c.	A list of names under which the potential partner trades,
d.	Details of any litigation and disputes
e.	Independent evidence of reputation and standing,
f.	Documentation on any legal or regulatory requirements.

6.8	Outline approval should be submitted to the Head of Higher Education & Access for review. The outline approval form should contain the following;
a.	Details of the proposal
b.	Risk assessment matrix
c.	Summary of resource discussions with stakeholders on the proposal.
d.	Due diligence information

6.9	Head of Higher Education & Access and the CFO will determine whether the due diligence information is adequate and provide a summary report of the information to be presented with the outline approval document to SMT.

6.10	SMT will review the outline approval form and due diligence reports and determine whether the criteria for outline approval have been met and that there are adequate resources in place to proceed with the validation.

6.11	If SMT raise any issues, the programme proposer must address these and resubmit the proposal. SMT can reject proposals. Once approval has been granted from SMT the approval is logged by the HE administrator and a validation event can be arranged.

## 7.	Repeat Due Diligence

7.1	All collaborative agreements are subject to review financially by the CFO to determine whether a proposed (and existing) partnership is financially sound and viable to the college

7.2	The review of the financial information by the CFO will allocate the partner a financial risk rating, which is agreed by SMT. The rating agreed will mean that repeat due diligence will take place as follows;
a.	Low Risk – further periodic monitoring every two years,
b.	Medium Risk – further review annually,
c.	High – further information, or investigation, needed. A decision would be made to not proceed with the partner, or terminate, an existing relationship.

7.3	Any extensions or alternations to the above would need to be approved by the CFO.

7.4	Where possible, the Finance office will collate the information and undertake the investigation of repeat due diligence direct from a Credit Reference Agency. The Head of Higher Education & Access will provide support where necessary.

7.5 Once repeat due diligence has been completed, the CFO will provide a statement of confirmation to SMT and make any recommendations for further action, or changes, in the risk rating. If a partner is changed to high risk, the partnership would automatically be reviewed by SMT to determine its viability.

8.   Franchise Agreement

8.1 All forms of collaboration require a Franchise Agreement. The Franchise Agreement outlines the duties and responsibilities of each institution, along with details of the validated programmes and any financial agreements. Usually there will be one Franchise Agreement covering one partner and multiple programmes, different agreements may be needed where circumstances require a different arrangement.

8.2 The purpose of the Franchise Agreement is to;
a.   Define the terms of the agreement, and define how quality and threshold academic standards and the quality of the student experience will be assured at partner and how it will be maintained;
b.   Ensure that the arrangements, and responsibilities are clear and that channels of authority, responsibility and executive action are identified;
c.   Outline any finance arrangements and repeat due diligence agreements.

8.3 The Partnership Agreement will normally contain the following information;
a.   The full names, and address of the institutions, or organisations, which are parties to the agreed memorandum,
b.   Details of the programme(s) to be offered,
c.   The allocated responsibility for the oversight and maintenance of threshold academic standards and quality of learning opportunities and any procedures for resolving any differences which may arise,
d.   Policies, procedures and responsibilities for validation, annual review and periodic review of the programme(s) and details on the procedure for modifications required by validation, or review.
e.   Policies, procedures and responsibilities in relation to programme management and arrangements will need to be specified,
f.   Provision and responsibilities for student support and guidance,
g.   Responsibilities in relation to administrative arrangements, including student registration, notifications relating to assessment and progression and the nomination and appointment of external examiners,
h.   Policy and Procedure for student complaints, appeals and extenuation,
i.   Arrangements for publication and marketing,
j.   Details of intellectual property arrangements,
k.   Details of confidentiality, indemnity and liability,
l.   Any financial arrangements,
m.   Duration and details of the termination of the Partnership Agreement.

8.4 The Franchise Agreement will be drafted by the Head of Higher Education & Access in collaboration with the Chief Financial Officer. All relevant parties will be closely consulted during the development. The financial annex shall be provided by the CFO.

8.5 The Head of Higher Education & Access, will introduce the draft Franchise Agreement to the proposed partner for review and discussion and agreement on the responsibilities and terms. No validation event can take place unless the Franchise Agreement is confirmed on the financial terms. The Head of Higher Education & Access along with CFO will confirm the final version.

8.6 Once the final version has been completed, the document will be prepared for signing. The Partnership Agreement will be signed by the ~~Principal and~~ CEO, or their nominee on behalf of USP college.

8.7 The Franchise Agreement will be reviewed every three years by the Head of Higher Education & Access. Financial Schedules can be reviewed more frequently, and the timeline will be determined by the CFO.

8.8 The Franchise Agreement should not be signed until the validation event has taken place. The validation event will set a standard condition for the Partnership Agreement to be signed before the programme(s) can commence.

8.9 The HE Manager has responsibility and authority to ensure that the collaborative arrangement is operating effectively and that the responsibilities of the Franchise Agreement are being fulfilled. The Head of Higher Education & Access must ensure that the monitoring and quality assurance arrangements are operating effectively.

8. Validation Documentation

8.1 As part of the validation event, the programme proposer and partner will need to produce a validation document (appendix 3) which contains the following information (some of the information will need to be submitted as an appendix, see the Guidelines and template for details);

a. Details on the context of the proposal, including how the proposal meets the college's strategic mission and details on the academic profile of the proposed partner and how it relates to USP college,

b. A list of any programmes currently on offer by the proposed partner,

c. Details of any previous experience in delivering collaborative partnerships,

d. The rationale for the proposal, including evidence of demand and market research (consultation with local employers, professional bodies and the target student group)

e. Pearson Programmes will require an approved consortium arrangement

f. Outline of the proposal including programme structure and design, assessment and learning and teaching,

g. Details on academic policies and procedures including AP(E)L, Appeals and Complaints,

h. Details on the Recruitment and Selection (Admissions) Policy and criteria

i. CV's of key staff involved in the proposal

j. Details of staff development opportunities.

k. Details of Student representation and feedback mechanisms

l. Details on student academic and administrative support available

m. Information on resources including teaching accommodation, the library, IT and any other specialist resources

n. Details of employer engagement and placement activity

o. For distance learning; A schedule of work, Details on the support available, Any technical requirements the students would need & Details of the assessment and any arrangements that may be required.

8.3   The partnership proposer will also need to provide the following documents;
a.   Programme Specification(s) – For each award to be validated using the correct template.
b.   Module Specifications
c.   HE Programme Handbook
d.   For distance learning proposal; learning materials including Moodle/VLE pages for 2 modules

8.4   The programme proposer is responsible for ensuring that the documentation is submitted to the Head of Higher Education & Access on or before any deadlines that have been agreed. It is recommended that the documentation is circulated 4 weeks in advance of the validation event.

9. Programme Development Review Meeting

9.1   To support the validation process, the proposer should undergoing a formal programme development review (PDR) meeting

9.2   The membership and task of the panel will be;
a.   To critically examine the proposal to ensure that the proposal is coherent, has clearly defined aims and learning outcomes and meets with the college's regulations.
b.   To confirm that the documentation is ready for full scrutiny by the Validation panel.
c.   Ensure that any issues relating to the partnership have been address and the Partnership Agreement draft has been finalised.
d.   Identify any potential resource issues that have arisen.
e.   Highlight any key areas for discussion at the event.
f.   The PDR panel will confirm that the documentation is ready for submission for the Validation Event.

9.3   Subject to the views of the PDR panel, the documentation should be amended following any recommendations from the Panel and submitted to the Head of Higher Education & Access for checking and dispatch for the validation event. The minutes of the PDR panel will be available to the Validation panel for information

9.4   The PDR panel may deem that the proposal is not ready for the validation event. In this event the PDR Chair will confirm whether the validation event will be postponed, and a second PDR event arranged for the programme proposer to submit updated documentation.

10. Site Visits

10.1   For existing partners there may need to be a validation of a programme at an alternative site or additional location. This is when a partner opens a site at another location or moves campus.

10.2   The purpose of the site visit would be to ensure that the physical resources and accommodation at the alternative location are satisfactory, that arrangements for pastoral care and support services available are satisfactory and to ensure that any additional arrangements are included in the Partnership Agreement.

10.3   **Site Visit 1** – When either;
   a.   USP college will be approving the delivery of a USP college programme which is delivered by USP college Staff at a new premises and USP college staff are responsible for all academic elements of delivery,
   b.   When a current partner needs approval for a change of premises of an approved programme.

10.4   The site visit will be conducted by the Head of Higher Education & Access, and relevant Academic Staff. The purpose of the visit will be to ensure the suitability of academic environment and resources of the new premises. A report will be provided to SMT for approval. Any changes in staff will also need to be identified and approved. External advisors can attend when required.

11. Validation Panel

11.1   Prior to the validation event, the programme proposer is required to nominate one external advisors and a student representative for the validation event. If the provision contains distance learning, an external must have experience with distance learning provision. For collaborative arrangements,. The proposer will need to provide the names to the Head of Higher Education & Access.

11.2   The suitability of the external advisors will be determined by the Head of Higher Education and will be subject to the following criteria;
   a.   The depth of the subject knowledge,
   b.   Relevant experience,
   c.   Relevance of subject knowledge,
   d.   Prior experience of teaching at the requirement level (for academics only),
   e.   Impartiality and no conflicts of interest,
   f.   Professional expertise.

11.3   It is unlikely the nominee(s) will meet all of the criteria, and when reviewing the nominations, the Head of Higher Education & Access will consider the balance of the panel's expertise. The Head of Higher Education & Access can reject nominations and request that the programme proposer nominate additional external advisors.

11.4   The Head of Higher Education & Access will liaise with the Director of Curriculum for the internal panel membership. Staff development, briefing sessions and observations will be available for new staff where applicable.

11.5   The Chair of the validation panel will be an academic member of USP Staff. Training and observations will be available for staff that have not experienced Chairing an event.

11.6 The Collaborative Validation Panel will consist of:
  a. An academic member of USP Staff (Chair)
  b. At least one subject expect from outside the college and its partner institutions,
  c. An employer or professional body representative,
  d. At least one member external to the programme team concerned, but internal to the college, who was a member of the PDR Panel meeting,
  e. Student Representative,
  f. Head of Higher Education & Access
  g. HE Coordinator

11.7 The membership of the panel may be varied at the Chair's discretion. In the absence of one, or more, panel members on the day of the event, the decision as to whether the validation event should proceed is at the discretion of the Chair.

12. Validation Event

12.1 The Validation Panel will be arranged by Head of Higher Education & Access. The HE Coordinator will act as secretary for the event.

12.2 The role of the validation panel is to;
  a. Critically examine the documentation and undertake discussion with the programme team to make a collective judgement on the quality and standards of the programme(s) and ensure that the award is compliant with the college's regulations and any QAA requirements.
  b. Ensure that the physical and staffing resources are adequate and arrangements with the partner are fit for purpose
  c. Ensure that there is adequate support and pastoral care and administrative arrangements,
  d. Recommend to SMT whether the proposed programme(s) should be validated, either conditionally, or unconditionally, or rejected.

12.3 For franchise programmes, the programme aims, learning outcomes, structures and content would have been validated and would not be considered in detail at the event unless there were changes due to local arrangements.

12.4 For validated and joint programmes where USP college will have ultimate responsibility for the quality of the programme, the approval event will also need to approve the programme. The programme will be assessed against the Mission Statements and Strategic Aims to ensure that the awards are equivalent in quality and standards to those offered at the USP college.

12.5 Whether a programme is rejected would depend on the magnitude of the changes required to reach an acceptability threshold or confidence in the programme team to complete the changes.

12.6 Along with the documentation outlined in section 8, the panel will be sent electronic copies of;
  a. The details of panel members,

b.   Structure of the validation event,

c.   Explanation of the validation procedures,

12.7   The Validation event usually takes place over a full day depending on the size and nature of the awards being validated. The agenda is based on the quality criteria and areas for discussion and will be finalised by the panel on the day.

12.8   The event will commence with a Chair's introduction and a private panel discussion. The panel will also have a private discussion over a working lunch, and before providing any feedback to the programme team.

12.9   The agenda will include blocks of time for discussion with the programme team and the panel will have an opportunity to raise any concerns with the programme team. The panel will also tour the resources led by the programme proposer. The Chair is responsible for highlighting positive aspects of the programmes and raising issues in a constructive manner. The validation panel should conduct the discussions in the spirit of a 'critical friend'.

12.10   The panel will review the documentation and information from the discussions and tour to make conclusions from the event.

13. Event Outcomes

13.1   There are three possible outcomes for a validation event or site visit;
   a.   Recommendation to validate with no further action (unconditional),
   b.   Recommendation to validate with conditions and/or recommendations (conditional),
   c.   Reject the proposed programme(s), which means no further action is required.

13.2   The panel will provide the programme team with the following;
   a.   **Commendations:** Where the team is congratulated for areas of good practice,
   b.   **Conditions:** Where the panel highlights issues that must be addressed prior to the programme's commencement,
   c.   **Recommendations:** An issue to be considered and addressed after the programme has started.

13.3   The panel cannot add any conditions, or recommendations, to the programme after the event has closed.

13.4   During the concluding feedback, the Chair will announce the outcome for the event and notify the programme team of any conditions and/or recommendations that must be addressed or considered. A deadline will be set by which the conditions must be addressed and any recommendations must be considered in the first Review and Enhancement (REP) presentation. The Chair and Secretary will liaise to ensure that draft conditions and recommendations are circulated to the Programme Team and partner after the event.

13.5   As part of any collaborative validation, the following conditions will be set as standard conditions of the event and the programmes cannot commence until all conditions of the validation have been satisfied;

a. **Franchise Agreement** – The draft Partnership Agreement is finalised and signed by all parties,

b. **Establishment of a Curriculum and Quality Group** – Ensure that a group is established comprising of representation from USP college and the Partner. The Group should contain staff involved in the programme delivery (from all institutions), relevant Curriculum Director, administrators, and the Head of Higher Education & Access.

c. **Staff Development** – That a programme of staff development is established to cover any relevant USP college process and procedures and development relating to learning and teaching for the first year of delivery,

d. **Documentation** – To ensure that all programme documentation is updated and is accurate for the start of delivery including the programme specification, module specifications, and student handbook.

13.6 The outcome of the event is formally recorded in the validation report, which would be completed by the event Secretary and submitted to SMT for final approval. The Head of Higher Education & Access will be responsible for coordinating any follow up activity from the event.

13.7 The institution will be required to make a formal response to the institution's validation report evidencing how specific conditions have been met. The conditions should be submitted to the Secretary before the deadline for review by the panel Chair and if necessary a panel member. The Chair will confirm whether the conditions have been met.

14. Language of Instruction

14.1 The language of instruction for all USP college programmes is English.

15. Final Approval

15.1 The Programme Team will be required to make a formal response to te validation report by the specified deadline. The Head of Higher Education & Access will need to submit the application for ratification of a programme of study with a partner document along with any amended documentation and any appropriate evidence.

15.2 The Chair of the Validation event will confirm that the conditions have been met after the event. Depending on the condition, another panel member may review the condition due to their expertise. The Chair will sign off that the conditions have been met.

15.3 Subject to the Chair being satisfied that the conditions have been met, the Event Report, Conditions Responses and programme specification will be submitted to SMT for final approval.

15.4 SMT will formally validate the programmes at the partner. SMT will judge whether due process has been followed and that all relevant actions have been completed. SMT will not add any conditions to the approval, or 'second guess' the academic judgement of the panel, or external advisors.

15.5 Where SMT has concerns about the process, it may seek further information from the Chair and event Secretary for further consideration.

15.6 SMT will validate the programme for a fixed period, usually 5 years. The programme will be up for Periodic Review in the penultimate year of validation.

15.7 The HE Manager will note any issues that have institutional significance and report them to Academic Standards and Quality Enhancement Committee, where they will be monitored.

15.8 Validated awards can only be delivered at the location specified and language approved at the time of validation.

16. Periodic and Annual Review

16.1 As with USP College on-campus programmes, all programmes at partners will need to complete REP process at course and institutional level.

16.2 The deadline for partner REP will be the same as the on-campus REP and will be considered by the Academic Quality and Standards (AQSC) subcommittee.

17. Periodic Review

17.1 As with on-campus programmes, the Partner institution's programmes are to be reviewed and revalidated in the year before the validation expires. The periodic review will be the same as the on-campus periodic review with the event taking place at the partner institution.

17.2 As with the information required for the on-campus periodic review, the panel will have the responsibility of ensuring that the resources and learning environment at the partner continue to meet the required standards and to confirm that the programmes at the partner continue to meet the college's mission statement and regulations.

17.3 Depending on the size and nature of the partnership, the periodic review will also incorporate the Institutional Review as outlined below.

18. Institutional Review

18.1 Institutional Review will take place every 5 years. SMT in exceptional circumstances may request that an institutional review takes place earlier if cause for concern has been raised.

18.2 The purpose of the institutional review would be to;
- a. Undertake a review of the portfolio of provision at the partner,
- b. Provide an opportunity to review the nature of the collaborative relationship and resolve any problems that may exist,
- c. Review the academic and administrative infrastructure to ensure that there continues to be a suitable learning environment.
- d. Review student achievement and retention rates to ensure that the quality of student achievement meets with the college standards,
- e. Review quality assurance process to ensure that due process is being followed,
- f. Encourage further development and collaboration between the institutions.

18.3 The scope of the review will be determined by the nature of the validation. If a partner only has one programme, or scheme, the institutional review will be incorporated into the periodic review. For franchise programmes, the focus will be on achievement and academic standards, rather than programme content. For validated programmes, the review of the programme content may be included.

18.4 An explanation of the collaborative link and developments that have taken place since initial approval, or the last review,

18.5 Analysis of strengths and weaknesses of the link,

18.6 Details on how USP college assures themselves of the quality and standards,

18.7 Identify any issues that need to be addressed,

18.8 Provide evidence on continued quality and standards.

19. Termination of Partnerships

19.1 Proposals for terminating a partnership should be presented to SMT. Staff would need to give the details of the proposed arrangements for current students at the partner to complete their studies in line with the college's Student Protection Plan.

19.2 Advice on contractual and financial matters should be sort from the CFO.

19.3 It should considered whether suspending, or withdrawing, programmes will affect collaborative partners (especially for franchise programmes).

20. Staff Link Duties

20.1 Any proposed partnership should support the college's mission statement and quality of provision. Partnerships should be developed where the college has the

expertise to support the partner programmes. The Head of Higher Education & Access plays a significant part in the quality assurance mechanisms.

20.2 Specific roles and duties would be discussed with the Curriculum Director and agreed with the partner. As a minimum, it is expected that the Head of Higher Education & Access will visit at least twice per annum and contact the partner at least once per month via phone, email, Teams, etc. the Head of Higher Education & Access would also be expected to complete the below areas of activity.

20.3 Areas of activity should also include;
   a.   Taking part in and attending Programme Committee Meetings,
   b.   Taking part in and attending meetings with students,
   c.   Assist in curriculum development,
   d.   Review assessment arrangements and moderate partner assessment briefs and students work,
   e.   Attend assessment, or exam boards,
   f.   Review external examiner reports,
   g.   Provide advice and guidance on college systems and processes,
   h.   Provide staff development when needed.

20.4 The Head of Higher Education & Access should receive and review the following documentation from the partner;
   a.   Validation Documents,
   b.   External Examiner Reports and Team Responses,
   c.   REP Action Plans,
   d.   Minutes of any relevant course meetings,
   e.   Prospectus and any marketing (which should also be approved by marketing department).

21. Rules, Regulations and Other Duties

21.1 Depending on the type of relationship, the college's regulations would apply. Negotiations can take place on what partners must follow and will be outlined in the Franchise Agreement. The following would be expected for partnerships;

21.2 Franchise – All college procedures, Rules of Assessment and Regulations would apply.

21.3 Distributed Delivery - All college procedures, Rules of Assessment and Regulations would apply.

21.4 The CFO will be responsible for ensuring that the financial arrangements are appropriate. The financial arrangements would need to safeguard against activity that would compromise academic quality and standards. Any fees paid by the collaborating institution must be sufficient to cover the full costs of assuring the quality and standards of the programme(s) on offer.

21.5 programmes delivered at partners shall be in English and will make reference to all partners within the collaboration, by list USP college as the registering body. The transcript is the only document to provide full details of the partner, the place of registration and language of delivery.

Equality and Diversity Statement & Impact Assessment

USP College is committed to equality of opportunity. The aim is to create an environment in which people treat each other with mutual respect, regardless of: age, disability, family responsibility, marital status, race, colour, ethnicity, nationality, religion or belief, gender, gender identity, transgender, sexual orientation, trade union activity or unrelated criminal convictions.

This form should be used by managers and policy owners within their area of responsibility to carry out Equality and Diversity Impact Assessments (EDIAs) in relation to protected characteristics including, but not limited to: Age, Disability, Gender reassignment, Marriage and civil partnership, Pregnancy and maternity, Race, Religion and belief, Sex, Sexual orientation. The word 'policy' is taken to include strategies, policies, procedures and guidance notes; both formal and informal, internal and external.

1.   Name of Policy

HE Collaboration policy

2.   Which of the following groups could be affected by this policy?
(Tick all that apply)

Students	X
Staff	X
Wider Community	x

3.   Complaints

Have complaints been received from anyone with one or more protected characteristic about the service provided? If yes then please give details.

4.   The Impact

Four possible impacts should be considered as part of the assessment:

   a.   **Positive Impact -** Where the policy might have a positive impact on a particular protected characteristic.
   b.   **None or Little Impact –** Where you think a policy does not disadvantage any of the protected characteristics
   c.   **Some Impact –** Where a policy might disadvantage any of the protected characteristics groups to some extent. This disadvantage may be also differential in the sense that where the negative impact on one particular group of individuals with protected characteristic is likely to be greater than on another.
   d.   **Substantial Impact –** Where you think that the policy could have a negative impact on any or all of the protected characteristics. This disadvantage may be also differential in the sense that the negative impact on one particular protected characteristic is likely to be greater than on another.

Thought-provoking questions, which might help come to a decision about the impact of a policy on individuals with protected characteristics:

   e.   Does policy outcomes and service take up differ between people with different protected characteristics?
   f.   What key information do we have? Does data or engagement with people with protected characteristics give insights into areas of disadvantage, which relate to the policy area?
   g.   If the policy is likely to have a negative impact on individuals, sharing particular characteristics what steps can be taken to mitigate these effects?
   h.   Will the policy deliver practical benefits for certain groups?

i. Does the policy miss opportunities to advance equality of opportunity and foster good understanding/ relationships between groups?
j. Do other policies need to change to make this policy more effective?
k. Is there any elements of the policy that could be unlawful under the Equality Act 2010?

Use the guidance provided above and complete the following table: **(Please Tick √)**

Gender/Age	Positive Impact	No or Little Impact	Some Adverse Impact	Substantial Adverse Impact
Gender		√		
Age		√		
Disability	Positive Impact	No or Little Impact	Some Adverse Impact	Substantial Adverse Impact
Visually Impaired		X		
Hearing impaired		X		
Physical Disability		X		
Specific Learning Difficulties		X		
Global Learning Difficulties		X		
Autistic Spectrum Disorder		X		
Any other disability – Various		X		
Other Factors	Positive Impact	No or Little Impact	Some Adverse Impact	Substantial Adverse Impact
Race		X		
Culture		X		
Religious Belief		X		
Sexual Orientation		X		
Gender Reassignment		X		
Marriage/Civil Partnership		X		
Pregnancy /Maternity /Paternity		X		

Please comment on any areas where some or substantial impact is indicated. Any resulting actions must be added to the below action plan.

5. Is there anything that cannot be changed?

What cannot be changed?	Can this be justified?	If so, how?
Not applicable		
E.g., Disabled people can be treated more favorably under the Disability Discrimination Act 2005. If a policy appears to treat disabled people more favorably than other equality groups, the disadvantage may be justifiable		

Please list the main actions that you plan to take as a result of this assessment in your area of responsibility.
(Continue on separate sheets as necessary)

Action Plan:

Appendix 1- Due Diligence Check List

DUE DILIGENCE CHECKLIST

This list should be used as a checklist when obtaining due diligence information for consideration and submission with the Collaborative Outline Approval Form. The checklist should be submitted to assist when the evidence is being reviewed.

NB: In certain circumstance some information may not be obtained (i.e. for international partnerships). Where information cannot be obtained please indicate on the form and the reason why.

Information	Received	
General details of Partner – All partners	**Yes/No**	**Document Type**
Detailed Business plan of the proposed partnership		
Evidence of the credibility of the proposed partner as an academic partner		
Institutional Mission statement and operational plan.		
Confirmation of the public and legal standing of the partner		
Details of the portfolio on offer		
Example of a prospectus and marketing material		
Organisation Chart and Committee Structure		
Equality and Diversity Policy		
Disability and widening participation statement		
Human Resources, Employment Policies and Profile, and Staff Development Policy		
Information on previous collaborations		
For International: Information on the proposed language of delivery		
For International: Information on the financial legal and cultural environment from relevant government offices and UK bodies such as British Council, UKNARIC		
For International: Details of any regulatory or government bodies or agencies that would need to approve the programme.		

For International: Any details that the college should be aware of that may affect the ability of the college to exercise its responsibilities in relation to academic standards and quality.		
Finance – All partners		**Document Type**
Audited Management Accounts from previous 3 years		
Budget Statements from previous 3 years		
Audited Financial Statements Inc. Income and expenditure from previous 3 years		
Quality Assurance, Regulations and Procedures – All partners		**Document Type**
Reports from external bodies such as the Pearson, QAA and HEFCE		
Partner Strategies including HE and learning and teaching		
Academic Appeal policy and procedure		
Complaints policy and procedure		
Information on quality assurance processes and procedures in place		
Reports from any reviews under a previous partnership		
Details of feedback mechanisms for students.		
Policies, Procedures and reports relating to external examiners		
Policies and procedures relating to assessment		
AP(E)L Policy		
Details on internal review and approval procedures		
Mapping to UK Quality Code expectations		
Examples of student and programme handbooks		
Details of any PSRB requirements		
Staffing and Resources – All partners		**Document Type**
CVs for all HE staff including full, part-time and hourly paid		
Staff development and review scheme		
Details on staff development and scholarly activity completed		
Details on teaching accommodation		
Details on Library resources available		
Details on IT facilities		
Details on any specialist resources		
Details on social and catering spaces		
Recruitment, Selection, Retention and Performance – All partners	**Yes/No**	**Document Type**
Recruitment and Selection Policies and Procedures		
HE admissions statistics from previous 5 years including: applicant numbers, enrolment rates, ratio of applicants to enrolments, percentage intake to target		
Student entry profile (inc. gender, age, ethnicity, disability, qualifications)		
Student retention, progression and achievement data for 5 years previous		

	Yes/No	Document Type
Destination for graduate leavers		
Information on the student records system		
Example of a transcript and certificate		
Data from student surveys i.e. internal and NSS		
Student Support and Guidance – All Partners	**Yes/No**	**Document Type**
Tutorial Policy and system in place		
Information on student support and guidance service		
Details on the careers service		
Employer Engagement – All Partners	**Yes/No**	**Document Type**
Information on links with employers		
Work placement and Work Based Learning Policies and Procedures.		
Additional Information – Private Providers Only	**Yes/No**	**Document Type**
Legal status of institution i.e. Articles of Association, Trust Deed, Act of Parliament		
Corporate Business Plan and Financial Forecasts		
A list of names under which the partner trades		
Details of any litigation or disputes		
Independent evidence of reputation or standing		
Documentation on any legal or regulatory requirements		

Information Collected by: **Name:**

Position:

Date:

Appendix 2- Due Diligence Form and Report

DUE DILIGENCE FORM AND REPORT

The purpose of the due diligence process is to establish at an early stage whether the proposed partner aligns with the college's strategic mission and strategy, and presents no undue risk to the college's reputation and standing. The process also determines whether the proposed institution has the academic, financial and legal standing to support a high quality and sustainable partnership.

The process should be completed early in negotiations and throughout the partnership to allow risks to be fully explored and understood. It can help in avoiding any misunderstandings and will allow the college to (re)evaluate the partnership. Further advice can be sought from the Head of Higher Education & Access.

You should use the due diligence information provided to answer the questions below. The reports will then be used when reviewed by Head of Higher Education & Access and the CFO. Please see the Due Diligence Checklist and Collaborations Procedure for further details of the documentation required.

1.   **Partner Details**
For completion by the Partnership Proposer:

1.1	Name of Proposed Partner Institution
1.2	**Address**
1.3	**Website Address**
1.4	**Status of Institution (e.g. public or private college/university)**
1.5	**Date institution established**
1.6	**Size of Institution (Staff and Students)**
1.7	**Academic Portfolio**
1.8	**Language of Delivery and Assessment**

2. Academic and Quality Background

For completion by Head of Higher Education & Access, countersigned by the CFO:

2.1	**What is the academic standing of the proposed partner institution? Is it comparable to USP college?**
2.2	**Does the proposed partner institution have the required experience in delivering programmes at a similar level?**
2.3	**What is the language of assessment and delivery?**
2.4	**Is the Institution familiar with the QAA Quality Code Part A in relation to threshold standards, and relevant qualification frameworks and Subject benchmark statements?**
2.5	**What are the institutions processes for monitoring academic standards and quality assurance?**
2.6	**What are the institutions learning, teaching and assessment processes?**
2.7	**Where relevant, does the proposed partner own the necessary intellectual property, or should licenses be obtained from third parties?**
2.8	**Is the proposed partnership subject to any accreditation requirements?**

List of Evidence Seen					
Additional Comments					
Recommendations and Conclusions					
Risk Rating	**Low**		**Medium**		**High**	

Signed
Name
Position: Head of Higher Education & Access
Date
Name
Position: Chief Financial Officer
Date

Examples of Evidence:
- Institutional Standing i.e. league tables

- External audit and review reports
- Advice from relevant government bodies
- Relevant policies and procedures
- Staff and Student profile information
- Advice from relevant government bodies or agencies i.e. British Council
- Student handbooks

3. Financial Standing

For Completion by the Chief Financial Officer

3.1	Does the proposed partner institution have the financial means to carry out its obligations under the Partnership Agreement?

3.2	Does the proposed partner receive any public sector or state funding? Is the institution of a mixed economy?

3.3	Does the proposed partner institution receive any other grants, subsidies, payments or allowances?

3.4	Is the institution adequately resourced? (in terms of facilities, staff resources and infrastructure)

List of Evidence Seen

Additional Comments

Recommendations and Conclusions

Risk Rating	Low		Medium		High	
Repeat Due Diligence Recommendation	Annually			Biennial		

Signed
Name Position Date

Examples of Evidence;
- Audited management account from previous 3 years,
- Budget statements from previous three years,
- Audited financial statements from previous three years,
- Details of any grants, subsidies, payments and allowances,
- Staff numbers,
- Wider Information Sets data,
- State or public sector funding information.

4.   Mission and Legal Status

For completion by the Head of Higher Education & Access

4.1   Does the proposed partnership align with the college's mission and strategy?
4.2   Does the proposed partner support the academic portfolio of the college?
4.3   Does the proposed partner have the power/permits/licenses required to collaborate?
4.4   Is the proposed partnership subject to any consent from foreign ministries before programmes can commence?
4.5   Does the proposed partner own or lease their site/premises where the programmes are delivered?
4.6   Are any local third party consents required? What are the procedures and timescales?
4.7   Does the institution have any current, pending or threatened or possible litigation or arbitration proceeding? Any possible prosecution or any investigation inquiry pending by a government official or body?
4.8   Is the partner institution aligned to a government or party, which may be considered a risk politically?
4.9   Are there any Foreign or Commonwealth office concerns regarding the personal safety, health and travel to the institution's region?
4.10   Will the prospective partner be able to provide a safe working environment for students and staff?
4.11   What insurance policies are in place? Are they appropriate and equivalent to maximum cover in place in the UK?
4.12   Is the institution committed to the equal treatment of all staff and students?
4.13   Does the proposed partner institution have any previous or existing collaborative partnerships with other Higher Education Institutions? If they were terminated, what were the reasons?

List of Evidence Seen						
Additional Comments						
Recommendations and Conclusions						
Risk Rating	**Low**		**Medium**		**High**	
Signed						
Name Position Date						

Examples of Evidence:
- Constitutional Documents of the proposed partner (copies),
- Copies of relevant permits/authorities/registrations/licenses/approvals,
- Details of legal framework and jurisdiction,
- Details of education in partners home country,
- Mission statements and strategies,
- Advice from relevant national offices, and foreign and Commonwealth website,
- Organisational structures

Appendix 3 Validation template for collaborative partners

Validation title, course inti

USP College

Mr. L Brewster, Head of Higher Education & Access

Insert Partner Logo

Contents

Introduction

This section should be a brief summation of the submission document, approximately 3 or 4 paragraphs:

- Programme(s) and titles to be approved
- Refer to partner Organisation and its background
- Main reasons for wanting to validate the new programme
- Major influences on content

1. List of Participants USP Complete

Title First Name Surname	Role, School/Department, Faculty

Complete with proposed list of attendees

32

2. **Programme of Meetings** USP Complete

Add Agenda of the Day

09.30 – 10.00	Tour of Resources
10.00 – 11.00	Private Meeting of the Panel with tea and coffee
11.00 – 11.15	Brief presentation by Chair of the Development Team *(optional)*
11.15 – 11.45	Meeting with Senior Managers with Responsibility for Resources
11.45 – 12.15	Meeting with Students
12.15 – 12.30	Private Meeting of the Panel
12.30 – 13.15	Lunch
13.15 – 14.30	Meeting with the Programme Development and Teaching Team, to include Employers involved in the development
14.30 – 15.00	Additional meeting time for individual programmes if necessary
15.00 – 15.45	Private Meeting of the Panel with tea and coffee
15.45	Report back

3. Panel Responsibilities and Terms of Reference

4.1 The panel is asked to consider the coherence of the programme in terms of content, curriculum, assessment, progression, structure, and appropriateness of standards of the award and for professional practice.

4.2 The panel is also asked to consider whether the programme can be delivered at an appropriate level and quality and that teaching and learning strategies are designed to meet the aims and objectives and that these are appropriate for an undergraduate programme.

4.3 The panel must also consider the institutional context in which the programme is to be delivered. In recommending approval, they should be satisfied that the resource support for the proposal is appropriate.

4.4 External members will contribute towards the collective academic judgement of the panel and will have an equal voice in the recommendations which are made to the Academic Board. They will not, however, have the power of veto and the Chair of the panel has discretion and authority where differences of opinion arise.

4.5 At the conclusion of the validation, the panel will make recommendations regarding:

i   the approval / non-approval of the programme;

ii   the term for which approval is fixed;

iii   any conditions of approval, which must be fulfilled before the programme can begin to operate and the mechanism by which the panel will confirm that this has been achieved;

iv   any specific recommendations which the panel wish to make to the team.

4.6 It is part of the panel's responsibilities to ensure that the Programme Specification represents an accurate, fair and workable contract with students.

4.7 Standard requirements of approval will be that a copy of the Programme Specification is lodged with USP College by a date to be agreed during the event.

4. Programme Information

4.1.1. [partner institution]

In this section give a brief background to the Partner. Include the history of the partner etc… Please do not repeat information included in the introduction.

4.1.2. Strategic Developments

In this section give a brief background to the Partner. Include the history of the partner etc… Please do not repeat information included in the introduction.

4.1.3. Faculties / Schools

Provide an overview of the Faculty/ School /Department etc. of the Partner in which the

programme(s) will sit

4.1.4. Management Structure Insert Chart Below

4.2. Rationale and Philosophy

4.2.1. Programme Title

4.2.2. Rationale for Development

This section should include the rationale for the development and an overview of the development process. This may refer to the results of feedback from employers, external advisors, academic colleagues, collaborative partners or students. If views have been sought from either current students on related programmes or prospective students for this programme, this section should detail how the student views informed the development. It is worth noting any key reference documents in this section that have been used to support the development, e.g. government reports.

The section should outline the impact of consultation and provide an overview of the feedback gathered during the development process from all stakeholders and how this has informed the development.

4.2.3. Strategic Overview

This section should include a brief statement positioning the programme(s) within the context of the strategic plan of the School and the current portfolio of programmes. The strategic overview should also outline how the programme(s) address the USP Colleges Graduate Attributes and all the internal drivers. In demonstrating how the Graduate Attributes are embedded in the programme, a narrative providing examples of activities (both within modules and on an extracurricular basis) is preferred to a tick-box approach on a module-by-module basis.

4.2.4. Professional and Statutory Regulatory Bodies

There are no professional or statutory regulatory bodies relevant to this programme.

4.3. Curriculum Design, Content and Organisation

4.3.1. Programme Aims, Learning Outcomes and Documentation

Please see appendix 1 Programme Specification for

This section should make reference to how the aims and learning outcomes have been conceived to accommodate current knowledge in the discipline and in developments in learning and teaching. The aims of the programme(s) should not be stated here, but reference made to the Programme Specification attached as Appendix

This section should explain how the programme will embrace research informed teaching.

4.3.2. Programme Structure

Year One

Term	Unit	Core / Specialist	Credit Value (Level)
Total Credit Value:			*120*

Year Two

Term	Unit	Core / Specialist	Credit Value (Level)
Total Credit Value:			*120*

4.4. Learning, Teaching and Assessment
4.4.1. Learning and Teaching Strategies

Please outline the learning and teaching strategies employed to enable the module and programme learning outcomes to be achieved.

4.4.2. Assessment Strategy

Please justify the overall assessment strategy here, with particular reference to chosen assessment approaches, assessment equivalency in line with module academic level / credits etc. It is important that the strategy identifies the role of formative assessment and that the Panel is provided with sufficient information about the nature of coursework to understand how the articulated assessment strategy will be put into effect. You are asked to include at two examples of an IV'd assessment brief to show how grading criteria / marking schemes are applied to assessments.

Include an overview table for each programme

Assessment Overview

Produce an assessment landscape in line with the example provided below, and delete all italic text.

Module code	Module Title	Assessment Methods	Duration/ Word limit	Further Details
7BSP1249	*Research Skills for Management*	*LO1 Presentation* *LO234 Preparation of Dissertation Proposal*	*500* *2500*	
7BSP1248	*The Management Environment*	*LO1 2 Report* *LO3 4 Infographic*	*2000* *1000*	*Assignment 1 week 7* *Assignment 2 week 11*
7BSP1244	*Project Management*	*LO 12 Podcast* *LO3 4 5 Group project report but with 30% for individual contributions*	*3000*	*Timed in-class test*
7BSP0389	*Accounting & Finance in the Organisation*	*LO1234 Report involving numerical analysis and commentary and recommendations on findings*	*2000*	

4.4.3. Work-based/Placement learning

Reference should be made to any work-based or placement learning (including short term placements during the year, summer placements, sandwich/study year, or single semester placement) which forms an integral part of the programme(s). Where relevant, the section should make reference to any discussions with stakeholders arising out of consultations during the development period.

4.4.4. Ethical Issues

Please outline what your policy is on ensuring primary research is conducted ethically, for example codes of practice or terms of reference of ethics panels/committees.

4.5. Admission, Progression and Achievement

4.5.1. Anticipated student profile

There should be an explanation of the anticipated student profile. This might include student demand, required entry qualifications, employers' expectations, and employment opportunities. Commentary on graduate employment or further study patterns, citing evidence.

4.5.2. Entry Requirements

There should reference made to the relevant section of the Programme Specification **(do not repeat entry requirements here)**. However you should note any special entry requirements or give reasons behind entry requirements, i.e. professional body, widening participation, English language, APCL or 2+2 arrangements, recognition agreements etc.

4.5.3. Levels of study

In England, Wales and Northern Ireland, BTEC HNC and HND may either be awarded by degree-awarding bodies under a licence from Pearson (which allows them to devise, deliver and award Higher National qualifications themselves), or they may be awarded directly by Pearson, as an awarding body regulated by Ofqual. The majority of BTEC HNC and HND Diplomas are awarded by Pearson. Only those HNC and HND Diplomas that are awarded by degree-awarding bodies are included in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) (because this framework comprises qualifications awarded by degree-awarding bodies.) BTEC HNC and HND Diplomas awarded directly by Pearson are qualifications at Level 4 and Level 5 on the Regulated Qualifications Framework and are subject to the academic standards and regulations of Pearson. Level descriptors have been used to describe the relative intellectual demand, complexity, depth of learning and learner autonomy associated with the level 4 or 5 level of learning and achievement. QAA subject and qualification benchmark statements have also been used to provide points of reference for each level.

4.6. Resources

Statement of provision of resources available to students of [partner]

Learning Resources

Provide an overview of the learning resources at the partner institution. The section should make reference to any discussions with stakeholders arising out of consultations during the development period.

Include detail of specific learning resources relevant to the programme(s) *only.*

4.6.1. Physical Resources (Inc. Teaching Accommodation)

In this section, the development team should include consideration and discussion of the following areas:
- Teaching accommodation;
- Specialist laboratories and equipment required.

4.6.2. Staff Resources (including Academic, administrative and technical)

Staff CV's can be found in Appendix 5

Details of staff resources should include:

- The total number of full-time equivalent academic staff who will teach on the programme;
- The identity of Module Leaders;
- The identity of any staff who make a significant contribution to the teaching of specialist knowledge within the programme;
- Reference to the professional support staff (administrative and technical);
- Planned staff development activity.

Complete a staff matrix for each programme, as illustrated on the next page.

Modules for HNC/D	Unit Number	Module Leader	Additional Teaching Staff	Staffing hours

4.7. Student Support and Guidance

4.7.1. Academic support at School/Department Level

Analysis of the programme(s) student support system making reference to any discussions with stakeholders (particularly academic and personal tutors and relevant student feedback) arising out of consultations during the development period.

4.7.2. Pastoral Support at School/Department Level

Provide an overview of the student support systems available at institutional level within the partner organisation. Include details of central services such as:
- student administration
- support for employability and careers guidance
- counselling service

4.8. Programme Management
4.8.1. Programme Committees

The Programme Committee has overall academic oversight of, and is responsible for, the on-going development of the programme(s). Programme Committees are sub-committees of the USP Quality and Standard Sub Committees that have established them and form part of the committee structure of the Academic Board. Their terms of reference, compositions and operating procedures are prescribed by USP College. They should be scheduled 3 time a year

4.8.2. Student representatives and hearing student views

Articulate how students will be involved in the quality management processes for the programme and how the programme team will ensure that student views are heard effectively.

4.8.3. Plan Employer engagement

This section should include details of how employers are involved in the quality management processes for the programme, such as the role of Professional/Industrial Advisory Groups

Appendix 4- Application for the ratification of a programme of study with a partner organisation

Application for the ratification of a programme of study with a partner organisation

Subject Area:
Name of paper's Author:
Date:

FULL NAME of the programme being validated:

The(se) title(s) should match the title on the programme specification.

Name of the Partner organisation:

Programme Code(s):

Programme Start Date:

Type of event: Validation

Ratification   I am satisfied that the enclosed documentation (Programme Specification and Resourcing) have been approved in accordance of the USP terms of reference for a validation event at a partner organisation and any conditions specified at the event.   Signature: Date:
Ratification   I am satisfied that the enclosed documentation (Validation report, Programme Specification) have been approved in accordance of the USP terms of reference for a validation event at a partner organisation and any conditions specified at the event.   Signature: Date:
Ratification   I am satisfied that the enclosed documentation (Validation report, Programme Specification, admission information) have been approved in accordance of the USP terms of reference for a validation event at a partner organisation and any conditions specified at the event.   Signature: Date:
Ratification of the confirmed recommendation of the validation panel by Principal & CEO USP college: Signature: Date:

1. **Name lead for quality assurance:**
~~Head of Higher Education~~ Head of Higher Education & Access

---

2. **Programme level Collaborative Partner:**
Curriculum Director:

---

3. **Nature of the relationship with Partner Organisation:**
Collaborative Partner

  a) **Please give details about where the programme(s) of study will be taught and/or assessed:**

  b) **Does the academic board or equivalent of the partner organisation have/ share academic responsibility for the programme?**

  c) **If part of the programme of study is taught and or assess in a language other than English, please give details:**

  d) **Is there a Franchise Agreement in place? Yes ☐ No ☒**

---

4. **a) Awards to be conferred including all titles to be conferred (as shown for certification)**

Award Title:		
Mode of Study		
Full Time		
Award Title:		
Mode of Study		
Full Time		
Award	Certification Requirement	Availability at end of level
	Certificate for confirm completed units of study	Any Time
	120 credits at level 4	4
	240 credits including at least 120 credits at level 5	5

b) Does the programme run for more than 45 weeks with in the year: Yes* ☒   No ☐
* Ensure adjustment is made to SLC portal to set as a long qualification

---

5. **JACS Code(s): UCAS Code(s): N/A**

---

6. **Eligibility for funding: OfS: ☐ Funded by tuition fee loans: ☐ Other:☐**

---

7. **Recommendation of Approval:**
Outcome of the validation event:

Date of the event:

Recommendation of the panel:

Was the approval subject to any conditions, other than USP standard requirements?   Yes ☐   No ☐

Are there any future conditions/ recommendations that require monitoring? Yes ☐   No ☐
If Yes, please list below:

Conditions:

<u>Standard Conditions</u>

- Production of a Programme Specification, approved by the Head of Higher Education & Access on behalf of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee.

- An approved Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) must be in place.

  Recommendations

  USP college measures of support

---

8. Revalidation is Due:

I am satisfied that the conditions of the approval contained in the report of the validation have been met.   **Chair, Event Panel:** Signature: Date