CODE OF PRACTICE
IDENTIFYING, DESIGNING AND MANAGING COLLABORATIVE PROVISION
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About this Code of Practice

In recent years the School has expanded its portfolio of courses (i.e. MSc, short courses) and programmes (i.e. PhD, MPhil, DrPH) delivered with collaborator institutions and bodies. These collaborators include other colleges of the University of London, universities (in the UK and overseas) and other bodies (for example research centres).

This Code of Practice is designed to:

1. Provide a taxonomy of the various types of collaborative provision the School is involved with and to provide guidance and information on models of design, delivery and awards;

2. Ensure that proposals for new collaborative courses and programmes are designed with appropriate forethought and with the necessary level of planning for the management and development of such provision;

3. Provide a framework for ensuring that new and existing collaborative courses are managed and developed effectively;


It is important to recognise that each collaboration, whilst broadly mapping to one of the categories in this Code, will be unique. For that reason, it may be necessary to deviate slightly from the processes set out in this Code of Practice. Examples of deviation may include reducing or adapting reporting requirements to complement those used by the collaborator/s and avoid duplication of effort. Another example might remove the need for a site visit if the collaborator is another University of London College already known to the School. Any deviations from this Code of Practice will be discussed and detailed in full, usually at design stage, and approved by the Associate Dean for Quality Management and Enhancement.
## Glossary of Standard Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Lead</strong></td>
<td>Academic member of staff tasked with leading the design and approval of a new collaborative provision course or programme. The Academic Lead will usually be the member of staff responsible for the management of the programme once approved, however this is not always the case. The Academic Lead has ultimate responsibility for producing all necessary paperwork and for championing the proposed academic provision through the School’s approval channels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Provision</strong></td>
<td>Any programme of study in the School leading to an award or to credit, including but not limited to MSc, PGDip, PGCert, stand-alone modules, accredited short courses, MPhil, PhD &amp; DrPH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessor</strong></td>
<td>Assessors are appointed to assist Exam Boards in the setting of papers, the marking of scripts/essays/reports and to attend practical examinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Award</strong></td>
<td>Presented to students upon the successful completion of a course, programme or accredited short course (usually in the form of a certificate and transcript) and conferred by an examination board or group of examiners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborative Provision</strong></td>
<td>The delivery of academic provision undertaken between the School and another institution or body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course</strong></td>
<td>A taught programme of study leading to an award, including but not limited to MSc, PGDip, PGCert and accredited short courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credit</strong></td>
<td>Credit is used to express learning in terms of volume and is linked to intellectual demand by designating the level at which credit is gained. Credit is awarded after a student has successfully completed a block of learning, which may be a module, a unit, or a qualification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborator</strong></td>
<td>A body or institution with which the School has embarked on a collaboration, including but not limited to other University of London colleges, other academic institutions in the UK, Europe or overseas, professional or government bodies and company/corporate businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme</strong></td>
<td>A programme of research leading to an award, including but not limited to PhD, MPhil &amp; DrPH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Validation Panel</strong></td>
<td>A panel of internal and external academics that convenes on behalf of Senate to consider proposals for new courses, programmes and other credit-bearing activities, such as short courses. The panel is usually chaired by the Associate Dean of Quality Management &amp; Enhancement who is also the Chair of the School’s Quality &amp; Standards Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 1

IDENTIFYING CATEGORIES OF COLLABORATIVE PROVISION
1. Categories of Collaborative Provision

When determining the category of collaborative provision that a course or programme will fall within, it is important to consider two elements:

a) The identification of the formal award;

b) The extent of the involvement of collaborators in the delivery and management of provision.

1.1 Identification of the Formal Award

When considering the introduction of a new course or programme careful thought must be given to the type of award the School and collaborator wish to create.

The QAA provides useful definitions of the various types of awards associated with collaborative provision, which have been interpreted to provide a School-specific taxonomy of awards.

**NB: The School is part of the federation of the University of London (UoL). With the exception of the East African Diploma in Tropical Medicine & Hygiene (a PGCert award) all of the School’s awards are currently conferred by the University of London.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Award (School)</td>
<td>An award made only by the School (usually under the aegis of the UoL).</td>
<td>This is the School’s most common type of award.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Single Award (UoL Colleges)  | An award (made by the UoL) for courses or programmes delivered and/or managed jointly by the School and one or more of the colleges of the federation of the University of London. | The School currently runs four MSc courses of this type, with the London School of Economics (LSE), King’s College London (KCL) and the Royal Veterinary College (RVC).
|                              | A few short courses and diplomas also run in conjunction with these collaborators. |                                                                               |
| Dual or Multiple Award       | Students are conferred with separate awards (and separate certificates) from both the School and other collaborators. | The School does not currently offer any dual or multiple awards.               |
| Joint Award                  | Academic provision is shared between a consortium of institutions. The consortium, (rather than any individual institution), is responsible for the management of the programme, resulting in a single award (and a single certificate) authenticated by all members of the consortium. | The School does not currently offer any joint awards.                         |
### 1.2 Extent of Involvement of Collaborator Institutions/Bodies

The School has identified four categories of collaborative provision in relation to academic provision (an explanation of School Provision is included in the final row for comparison purposes). Some of these categories are not currently in use within the School, however this does not preclude their introduction in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Validated External Provision</td>
<td>Course or programme is designed and delivered entirely by persons who are not permanent members of the School, or by a collaborator.</td>
<td>Validating a course or programme for a collaborator without degree awarding powers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The School does not currently validate any external provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Provision</td>
<td>Academic provision where teaching and assessment is shared in an established arrangement between the School and other collaborators.</td>
<td>The MSc courses that the School offers with other University of London colleges leading to Single Awards (UoL Colleges).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A joint initiative with other collaborators leading to a Joint Award or a Dual/Multiple Award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The School runs a number of Joint Provision programmes with the UoL and a Postgraduate Certificate with collaborators in East Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation Arrangement</td>
<td>Academic provision where discrete parts of the teaching provision and assessment (including but not limited to individual modules) are delivered by a collaborator. Student achievement on these parts of the courses or programmes is recognised as credits by the School.</td>
<td>Individual modules on a taught course are delivered by a collaborator (usually offsite) as part of an established pathway for student accumulation of credit towards a formal award. The School does not currently have any Articulation Arrangements in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articulation Arrangements do not include courses or programmes where small parts of the teaching provision and assessment are delivered by Assessors (see Role and Appointment of Assessors for further information on the role of Assessors).</td>
<td>NB: It is important to note that this is not a substitute for any accredited prior certificated learning (APCL) policy for incoming credit that the School might develop. The Articulation Arrangement category is for established and approved ‘pathways’ whereas APCL is considered on an individual, case by case basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Collaborator Supported Provision** | This type of academic provision is where a significant proportion of the teaching, supervision and/or assessment is provided by persons who are not members of the School or are Assessors, and/or resources or support that is integral to the course of study is provided or contracted out to a collaborator. | - Courses delivered entirely by the School, but using academic facilities of a collaborator in lieu of School resources;  
- Courses where significant teaching provision is delivered by people external to the School but the curriculum is designed and approved by the School, and where assessment is undertaken by permanent members of the School or specially appointed Assessors;  
- Research projects where research work is undertaken off School premises;  
- Student exchange programmes, where students study at a collaborator institution and this counts towards an award of the School.  

The School currently has a number of means by which it uses Collaborator Supported Provision, from research work where projects are taken off campus to student placement activities. |
| **School Provision**           | This is academic provision designed and assessed entirely by the School and includes provision where external speakers and/or Assessors are employed to deliver small parts of taught courses.                                             | - MSc, PGDip, PGCert and accredited short courses designed and assessed by the School;  
- MPhil, PhD and DrPH research programmes primarily supervised and examined by the School.  

The majority of the courses and programmes offered by the School are School Provision. |

Similarly, a research student may have a second supervisor who is external to the School, however they are still supervised primarily by School staff and examined by the School. |
### 1.3 Matrix Demonstrating Formal Awards in Relation to Collaborative Provision Categories

This matrix is designed to demonstrate which awards can be applied to the various categories of collaborative provision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORMAL AWARD</th>
<th>Validated External Provision</th>
<th>Joint Provision</th>
<th>Articulation Arrangement</th>
<th>Collaborator Supported Provision</th>
<th>School Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Award (School)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Award (UoL Colleges)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual/Multiple Award</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Award</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 2

DESIGNING AND APPROVING COLLABORATIVE PROVISION COURSES AND PROGRAMMES
2. Designing & Approving Programmes & Courses

The School has established mechanisms for the design and approval of new courses and programmes that can be viewed in the Course & Module Design Code of Practice and the Course Approval & Amendments Policies and Procedures.

The Course Approval & Amendments Policies & Procedures sets out an approximate timeline for the design and approval of new courses and programmes, namely eighteen months to two years from inception to the first intake.

NB: For academic provision involving significant collaborative provision this should be lengthened to two to three years, to reflect the complexity of due diligence and legal requirements, comprehensive course/programme design and the need to articulate, in detail, how the course/programme itself and related financial and marketing/advertising and student recruitment aspects will be managed.

2.1 Strategic Selection of Collaborators

Before beginning to design new collaborative provision courses and programmes, due diligence requirements must be met to ensure that any proposed collaboration does not pose any legal, financial, or reputational risk to the School. This usually involves undertaking a site visit at the early stages of discussions to verify, inter alia, that the proposed collaborator has the necessary legal capacity and any required institutional and other approvals, as well as appropriate resources and infrastructure to enable the creation of an effective and sustainable collaboration. As part of the collaborator/s’ processes, the School encourages a reciprocal visit to take place.

Due diligence processes sit outside the remit of this Code of Practice as they relate to strategic decisions and legal and financial matters. The School is currently developing guidance for staff on this matter. If you are considering proposing a new strategic partnership please contact Frances Fowler (Executive Officer) or Jens Hinricher (Head of Legal Services) in the first instance.

2.2 Approval Process

The Course Approval & Amendments Policies and Procedures sets out the approval process in paragraphs 20-49 (including details on the validation panel constitution). These must be read carefully by any member of staff planning to introduce a new collaborative provision course or programme.

Staff are also strongly encouraged to contact the Quality & Academic Standards Team at the early stages of the course design and approval process. This is to ensure that Senate has prior knowledge that academic provision of this type is being developed and to obtain advice on regulations and precedents for managing collaborative courses and programmes.
All new courses and programmes are ultimately approved by the School’s Senate. As described in paragraphs 24-49 of the Course Approval & Amendments Policies and Procedures Senate delegates this decision to a specially constituted validation panel, which is established to consider each new proposal.

NB: Sufficient notice to organise validation panels is required and it is imperative that the Academic Lead (see Glossary of Terms for the definition of this role) contacts the Quality & Academic Standards Team at the start of the process to ensure that expectations regarding timings are achievable.

2.3 Documentation

There are a number of documents to be submitted to validation panels as part of the approval process. It is important to note that validation panels will be unable to meet unless all documentation is provided at least two weeks in advance of the scheduled meeting. In cases where documentation is not provided in time, there is no guarantee that an alternative date can be found to reorganise the validation panel and meet original timescales for approval.

Academic Leads are strongly encouraged to share early drafts of their documentation with the Quality & Academic Standards Team to avoid delays at a later stage.

In order to consider a proposal for a collaborative course or programme the validation panel will need to receive:

- Due diligence paperwork as defined by the School’s forthcoming guidance;
- Written confirmation from the Planning & Finance Committee that financial approval has been obtained for the course/programme (see 2.3.4 below);
- Written confirmation (usually in email format) from the Heads of Registry that discussions have taken place to determine the method by which students will be registered, assessed, examined and awarded (see 2.3.4 below);
- Written confirmation from the Head of Library & Archive Services (usually in email format) that discussions have taken place to determine the level of access to library resources that students on the course or programme will require (see 2.3.4 below);
- Written confirmation from the Head of IT Services (usually in email format) that discussions have taken place to determine the level of access to IT resources that students on the course or programme will require (see 2.3.4 below);
- Completed Scoping Document (see section 2.3.1 below);
- Completed Template for Collaborative Provision Course or Programme (see 2.3.2 below);
- Completed Programme Specification (see 2.3.3 below).

2.3.1 Scoping Document

The School has developed a scoping document to be used at the early stages of planning a new course or programme with a collaborator.

This scoping exercise is designed to help the Academic Lead to define the responsibilities of the School and its collaborator/s in delivering and managing the course or programme. It will also help to identify details that should be included in the legal agreement and any other required legal documentation that will need to be drafted and processed by the School’s Legal Services and respective collaborators’ legal offices.
Academic Leads are strongly encouraged to complete this scoping exercise before they start to complete the Collaborative Provision Template, details of which are set out below.

2.3.2 Template for Collaborative Provision Course or Programme
The School has developed a special course or programme template to be completed by the Academic Lead when proposing new collaborative provision. The School does not currently have a template for standard School courses and programmes.

The reason for introducing a template is to ensure that Senate, via its validation panels, has all the necessary information to make a decision on whether the course or programme should be approved.

The template is available to download online and the Quality & Academic Standards Team can be contacted for advice on completing this.

2.3.3 Programme Specification
All courses and programmes offered by the School are required, by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA), to have in place a programme specification. A programme specification is a concise description of the intended learning outcomes of a course or programme, and the means by which the outcomes are achieved and demonstrated.

The School’s programme specification template is available online and examples of existing specifications are also available to view.

Academic Leads should contact the relevant member of the Quality & Academic Standards Team for further guidance on completing the programme specification.

2.3.4 Confirmation of Resources to Deliver the Course/Programme
The approval process for the introduction of standard courses and programmes requires Academic Leads to liaise with the Finance & Planning Committee (through the Secretary and Director, Resources & Planning), the Registry, Archive & Library Services and IT Services to ensure that appropriate central resources are in place to administer courses/programmes (e.g. registration, examination etc.) and that the proposed course/programme has financial approval.

For collaborative provision courses and programmes this will be sought in the earlier stages of establishing the strategic partnership, alongside other due diligence activities.
SECTION 3

MANAGING COLLABORATIVE PROVISION COURSES AND PROGRAMMES
3. Managing Collaborative Provision

Courses or programmes with elements of collaborative provision present a higher risk to the School’s reputation and to the student experience than academic provision developed and delivered entirely by the School. To counterbalance these risks it is important that all elements of the management of the course or programme are considered and detailed at design stage and continuously developed and enhanced once the course/programme is underway.

The School operates a principle of proportionality with regard to the checks and balances required for all collaborative provision programmes and courses. Furthermore the School recognises that a single procedure to cover all the collaborative provision categories would prove inappropriate and potentially discourage innovative and developmental academic collaborations. Therefore, for each category of collaborative provision there are targeted mechanisms that address those principles for each category (see Sections 3.2 to 3.5 below).

The School maintains a register of all collaborative provision courses and programmes that can be accessed on its website.

3.1 Collaboration Management Groups

One of the key challenges in managing collaborative provision is ensuring that effective communication takes place between the School and its collaborators. To facilitate effective communication, some collaborative provision courses and programmes will be required to establish a Collaboration Management Group.

The membership of each Collaboration Management Group will vary depending on the scope of the collaborative provision, however all Groups will contain the following core membership:

- Academic Lead/s from each institution;
- Course Director/s from each institution (if different from the Academic Lead);
- One professional support staff (from the lead institution if applicable, or alternated annually if both institutions take an equal lead) to advise on course/programme practices and associated regulations.

Depending on locations, meetings may take place in person or remotely via Skype or video conferencing.

The role of the Collaboration Management Group will be to:

- Review student data, such as progression statistics, and enhance support mechanisms where necessary;
- Review information provided to students, such as handbooks for example;
- Ensure that administrative processes are robust and that communications are taking place between central services within each institution to facilitate appropriate support for students;
- Take a lead in producing documentation for any appeals or student disciplinary processes;
- Produce an annual report (known as Collaboration Management Group Report) for submission to the School’s Quality & Standards Committee. As well as confirming academic arrangements and providing an overview of the performance of students on the course, the report will also be operational in nature and provide updates on resources, finances and staff changes;
• Produce any other material as required by either institution, for example periodic review self-evaluation documents, standard annual reports etc.

For some collaborative provision courses and programmes (e.g. short courses, Joint Provision leading to single awards) the Collaboration Management Group will have a small membership and may only meet once a year to ensure that all necessary checks and balances take place and that the course or programme is running smoothly.

For other types of collaborative provision (e.g. Joint Awards, Dual/Multiple Awards) the Collaboration Management Group is likely to meet at least bi-monthly and have a wider membership to reflect the scope of the arrangement.

An example constitution and terms of reference for a Collaboration Management Group is included in the Template for Collaborative Provision Course or Programme in Appendix A.

3.2 Validated External Provision

QAA defines Validated External Provision as:

‘A process by which a degree-awarding body judges a module or programme developed and delivered by another organisation and approves it as being of an appropriate standard and quality to contribute, or lead, to one of its awards. Students normally have a direct contractual relationship with the delivery organisation.’

QAA Quality Code, Chapter B10, p.48

For any programme leading to an award of the School (under the aegis of University of London), the School retains full responsibility for assuring the quality of the provision and standards of the awards. Validated External Provision collaborations essentially delegates responsibility for the delivery of the programme and the assessment of students to the delivery organisation. Consequentially, clear mechanisms and auditing tools are required to ensure that quality and standards remain appropriate. This is particularly acute for this category of collaborative provision as, typically, the activity takes place away from School premises.

The School does not currently validate any external courses or programmes. If in the future the School was to do so, the following monitoring arrangements would be put in place:

• Revalidation of course or programme to take place every three years (as part of a periodic review exercise) by a panel including at least one external specialist and senior members of the School’s academic and professional support staff;

• An operating statement to be submitted each year detailing and analysing:
  ○ feedback from external examiner reports;
  ○ feedback from students, e.g. via surveys, module evaluation, meetings etc;
  ○ any proposed changes to the course or programme for the forthcoming academic year;
  ○ pass rates and progression data;
  ○ an operating statement, covering key contacts, dates and operational data relating to the delivery of the course;
  ○ an action plan for the year ahead.

• An annual site visit to the collaborator to discuss the annual report, undertaken by members of Senate (as identified by the Chair of Senate).
3.3 Joint Provision

The QAA defines Joint Provision (called Jointly Delivered Programme in their Quality Code) as:

‘A programme delivered or provided jointly by two or more organisations, irrespective of the award (whether single, joint, dual/double or multiple). It refers to the education provided rather than the nature of the award.’

QAA Quality Code, Chapter B10, p.47

For any programme leading to an award of the School (under the aegis of the University of London), the School retains full responsibility for assuring the quality of the provision and the standards of the award. Joint Provision may delegate responsibility for the delivery of part of the programme or course and the assessment of students outside of the School. Where this occurs clear mechanisms and auditing tools are required to ensure that quality and standards remain appropriate. This is particularly acute where the provision leads to a joint, dual or multiple award.

The School’s monitoring arrangements for Joint Provision will vary depending on the final award, and so details for each award type are set out below.

3.3.1 Joint Provision Leading to a Single Award (School)

- Periodic review of the course or programme to be undertaken on a rolling basis as outlined in the School’s Periodic Review Handbook;

- Participation in the School’s standard annual reporting activities;

- Collaboration Management Group to be established to meet at least once per academic year and manage and review the course or programme activities (see Section 3.1 above);

- Academic Lead for the course or programme to sit on the relevant Faculty Teaching Committee and the School’s Learning & Teaching Committee and report back to the Collaboration Management Group on School and Faculty developments;

- Representation from the collaborator on the School’s relevant examination board.

3.3.2 Joint Provision Leading to a Single Award (UoL Colleges)

- Lead College to be identified at the design stage of the collaborative arrangement;

- Standard periodic review and annual monitoring arrangements of the lead College to be followed;

- Collaboration Management Group to be established to meet at least every six months and manage and review the course or programme activities (see Section 3.1 above);

- Academic Lead for the course or programme to sit on the relevant Faculty Teaching Committee and the School’s Learning & Teaching Committee and report back to the Collaboration Management Group on School and Faculty developments;
• Representation from the collaborator institution/s on the School's relevant examination board or vice versa if the collaborator College is the lead.

3.3.3 Joint Provision Leading to a Dual/Multiple Award
• Agreement at the design stage, articulated in the course or programme proposal, as to which review processes will be followed, i.e. the School's or the collaborator/s. It may be necessary to follow two different review processes depending on the nature of the agreement, i.e. if a joint PhD contained a pathway of taught modules at one institution it might be necessary to undertake standard monitoring arrangements for research degrees at one institution and standard monitoring arrangements for taught modules at the other.

• Collaboration Management Group to be established to meet at least quarterly and manage and review the course or programme activities (see Section 3.1 above);

• Academic Lead for the course or programme to sit on the relevant Faculty Teaching Committee and the School's Learning & Teaching Committee and report back to the Collaboration Management Group on School and Faculty developments;

• Representation from the collaborator on the School's relevant examination board and vice versa;

• A triennial site visit to the collaborator to review facilities for students and to meet with key academic and professional support staff, undertaken by members of Senate as identified by the Chair of Senate.

3.3.4 Joint Provision Leading to a Joint Award
• The nature of a Joint Award necessitates, at design stage, the need to clearly assign responsibilities for all aspects of the management of the course or programme. When it comes to mechanisms for reviewing and monitoring provision this will usually be an agreed adaptation of existing review processes already in place across all collaborators. The course or programme will therefore be reviewed in line with the arrangements agreed at design stage and confirmed in Memorandums of Understanding and other legal documents as required;

• Collaboration Management Group to be established to meet on a monthly basis and manage and review the course or programme activities (see Section 3.1 above);

• Academic Lead for the course or programme to sit on the relevant Faculty Teaching Committee and the School's Learning & Teaching Committee and report back to the Collaboration Management Group on School and Faculty developments;

• Representation from all collaborators on the combined examination board;

• A biennial site visit to the collaborator/s to review facilities for students and to meet with key academic and professional support staff, undertaken by members of Senate as identified by the Chair of Senate.
3.4 Articulation Arrangement

The QAA defines an Articulation Arrangement as:

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

QAA Quality Code, Chapter B10, p.46

For any course or programme leading to the award of the School (under the aegis of the University of London) the School retains full responsibility for assuring the quality of the provision and the standards of the awards. An Articulation Arrangement delegates responsibility for the delivery of discrete and defined parts of the programme along with the assessment of students outside of the School for a determined proportion of the marks. Where this occurs, clear mechanisms and auditing tools are required to ensure that quality and standards remain appropriate and comparable to other parts of the programme.

The School’s monitoring arrangements for Articulation Arrangements are set out below:

- Periodic review of the course or programme to be undertaken on a rolling basis as outlined in the School’s Periodic Review Handbook;
- Participation in the School’s standard annual reporting activities;
- Collaboration Management Group to be established to meet at least once per academic year and manage and review the course or programme activities (see Section 3.1 above);
- Academic Lead for the course or programme to sit on the relevant Faculty Teaching Committee and report back to the Collaboration Management Group on School and Faculty developments.

3.5 Collaborator Supported Provision

The QAA refers to this category as Support Provider and defines it as:

‘An organisation, other than the degree-awarding body, which supplies support, resources or specialist facilities for student learning opportunities. This may be a higher education provider without degree-awarding powers, a degree awarding body other than granting the award (for example, in the context of some federal structures), an employer or another organisation approved by the degree awarding body.’

QAA Quality Code, Chapter B10, p.50

For any course or programme leading to an award of the School (under the aegis of the University of London) the School retains full responsibility for assuring the quality of the provision and the standards of its awards. Collaborator Supported Provision does not delegate responsibility for the delivery of the course/programme or the assessment of students outside
of the School, but will likely take some aspects or provision of support outside the direct control of the School. Sufficient checks are required prior to and during delivery to ensure that the quality and standards remain appropriate, consistent and comparable to other parts of the programme.

A distinction is drawn between a collaborative provision arrangement that applies to a cohort of students (i.e. to a course or programme as a whole) and to collaboration arrangements that are negotiated on an individual student basis. The most common example of the latter category would include taught course project placements, and arrangements for these are managed in a different way to other forms of Collaborator Supported Provision.

The School’s monitoring arrangements for Collaborator Supported Provision are set out below:

**For Courses or Programmes**
- Collaborator /s to provide an annual operating statement, covering key contacts, dates and operational data relating to resources;
- An annual site visit to the collaborator/s to review facilities for students and to meet with key staff, undertaken by members of the course team.

**For Individual Students**
- For arrangements relating to individual students, the School’s Combined Academic & Risk Assessment Ethics Approval (CARE) Form requires all postgraduate taught students to undertake and articulate a necessary risk assessment. Faculties are responsible for managing arrangements relating to individual research students registered in their Faculty via existing processes and procedures.