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# 1. Introduction

This handbook has been prepared to assist members of the University of Hull, and existing and potential partners, to understand the procedures involved in the development, approval, establishment and effective management of collaborative programmes.

Throughout this document, it is assumed that the collaboration involves programmes delivered by an approved partner institution, normally a further education college offering higher education in the UK, and validated by the University.

The Handbook is subject to regular review and is published as a ‘live’ document.

The University is always interested to receive comments from partners about the content and format of the handbook and the associated quality assurance framework. Interested parties can contact the quality team with responsibility for collaborative provision for guidance on the availability of these publications. Contact details are given at the end of this section.

Any comments or questions regarding the procedures or contents of this handbook should be addressed, in the first instance, to:

**Quality Support Service**

**Collaborative Provision**

**E-mail:** [**quality@hull.ac.uk**](mailto:quality@hull.ac.uk)

# 2. Collaborative Provision

The fundamental principle overriding all types of partnership or collaborative provision is that the University retains ultimate responsibility for the academic standards of awards granted in its name. In addition, through quality assurance and enhancement processes, the University ensures that the quality and standards of collaborative programmes are comparable to on-campus programmes. With that in mind, this handbook has been designed with reference to the UK Quality Code and requirements of the Office for Students.

A key Quality Code expectation for academic standards is:

“*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 and who delivers them*.”

The University places particular emphasis on the following:

* Students registered on collaborative programmes are recognised as studying towards an award of the University of Hull;
* The University recognises those staff in partner institutions who teach on collaborative programmes as being appropriately qualified and experienced for the purposes of teaching and assessment through a formal process;
* Ideas for new programmes will be suggested at the Joint Development Board (JDB) or equivalent;
* Each programme is developed through mutual co-operation and collaboration and, once approved, is overseen by the Joint Board of Studies (JBoS) or equivalent;
* The student learning experience **mus**t be comparable to that of on-campus students
* Effective and regular communication between partner institutions and the University is essential;
* Student documentation **should** clarify at every point the source of certification and expectations of the student;
* The agreements between the University and partner institutions need to be specific and managed by a contract;
* The University is sensitive to matters of confidentiality and competition between it and its existing partner institutions;
* The University, at all times, **must** safeguard its reputation as a provider of educational programmes of high quality.

What is validation?

Validation is defined by the University as “*the process by which the awarding institution judges that a programme developed and delivered by another institution or organisation is of appropriate quality and standard to lead to the University’s award*.”

Features of a University of Hull validation arrangement include:

* Partner institutions, with support and guidance from the University, undertake the majority of the administration and promotion;
* Teaching staff are appointed by partner institutions and through a formal process approved as Recognised Teachers by the University;
* Recognised Teachers at partner institutions mark students’ work, which is then moderated by the University and reviewed by the external examiner appointed by the University, in accordance with the University’s procedures;
* Academic and administrative issues at discipline level are discussed and resolved through JBoS or equivalent, involving staff from the University and partner institutions, and by regular academic and administrative support from the University.

# 3. Quality and Standards

The University’s on-campus quality assurance framework is applied to collaborative provision with appropriate modifications and additions following careful consideration of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (QAA). Specified committees and individuals are responsible for the creation, implementation, monitoring, review and enhancement of the quality assurance framework, which is designed to enable the University to discharge its responsibilities for the quality and standards of all University of Hull awards.

The quality assurance framework is expressed in a series of regulations and codes of practice. The University maintains the standards of its awards by making key elements of the quality assurance framework **mandatory** for partner institutions. At the heart of this approach are the University’s programme regulations which govern the eligibility of all candidates for the University’s awards. Applying the same regulations ensures consistency for all programmes, irrespective of location of delivery. This approach is reinforced by a number of University codes of practice which partner institutions **must** apply, including conduct of boards of examiners, the nomination and appointment of external examiners, and the use of academic misconduct.

Throughout this Handbook, reference is made to the relevant university regulations and codes of practice. Please use the [latest versions of documents](https://www.hull.ac.uk/Choose-Hull/University-and-region/Key-documents/Quality) to avoid continued use of out-of-date paperwork and guidance.

# 4. Programme Design and Approvals Process

## 4.1 Programme Design

Modules

Each programme of study leading to a University award is made up of a number of modules – self-contained units of study that are taught and assessed within a single trimester. As a support mechanism, partners are encouraged to make use of the University’s Learning Outcomes Tool.

The University uses a decimal system of credits with the majority of modules being 20 credits.

Modules of 10, 40 or 60 credits **may** be used depending on the type of programme and programme stage. Credit ratings are based on the total time that a typical student will spend in order to complete the module successfully, that is, including class contact time, private reading and study, revision, blended/ online learning and completion of assignments or examinations. Each single credit corresponds to a notional ten hours of study time. A 20 credit module therefore demands 200 hours of student time.

**Module Levels**

A single level is assigned to each module, indicating the academic standard of that module:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Level 3  Level 4 | preliminary certificate  certificate |
| Level 5 | diploma |
| Level 6 | honours |
| Level 7 | masters |

Credits and levels - undergraduate qualifications

For the purposes of progression, each degree programme is divided into levels, where each level consists of 120 credits as follows:

**For 360 credit Honours degree programmes:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Certificate | first 120 credits at level 4 |
| Diploma | second 120 credits, with at least 100 credits at level 5 |
| Honours | final 120 credits, normally at levels 5 or 6 with at least 100 credits at level 6 |

**For 480 credit Honours degree programmes involving a Preliminary Certificate stage first year:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Preliminary Certificate | first 120 credits at levels 3 and 4, with at least 100 credits at level 3 |
| Certificate | second 120 credits at level 4 |
| Diploma | third 120 credits with at least 100 credits at level 5 |
| Honours | final 120 credits normally at levels 5 and 6 with at least 100 credits at level 6 |

**For 240 credit Foundation degree programmes:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Certificate | First 120 credits at level 4 |
| Diploma | Second 120 credits with a minimum of 100 credits at level 5 |

**For 360 credit Foundation degree programmes involving a Preliminary Certificate first year, each level shall be as follows:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Preliminary certificate | First 120 credits with at a minimum of 100 credits at level 3 |
| Certificate | Second 120 credits at level 4 |
| Diploma | Third 120 credits with a minimum of 100 credits at level 5 |

Credits and levels- postgraduate qualifications

**For taught Masters degree programmes:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Certificate | First 60 credits at level 7 with a maximum of 20 credits at level 6 |
| Diploma | Second 60 credits at level 7 with a maximum of 20 credits at level 6 |
| Masters | Final 60 credits at level 7 with a maximum of 20 credits at level 6 |

## 4.2 The Approvals Process

The initiative for a programme usually originates from within a partner institution interested in establishing a collaborative programme and this should be discussed in the early stages with the academic contact in the relevant University faculty (ies). Proposals should normally be complementary to the operations of the University faculty involved.

The partner institution will be expected to seek approval for the programme through its **own** management approval structures, i.e. with the approval of the Senior Management of the partner institution. It is expected that either party will be responsible for their own costs incurred in developing the proposal e.g. costs associated with visits to or from the University to discuss academic or administrative arrangements.

Development consent

Development Consent is the first stage of the Programme Approvals Process at the University of Hull. The application is a two-stage process:

1. Business Case

2. Academic Case

It enables a number of fundamental matters to be addressed to ensure that the programme is appropriate for delivery leading to a University award and can be supported in a way that will enable the quality of the learning opportunities to be assured, and the standards of the award to be maintained.

The partner institution must identify, in consultation with the relevant faculty the university academic unit(s) which it considers to be best suited in terms of subject comparability to support and oversee the development and delivery of new programmes.

Following identification of the academic unit(s), the partner must approach the head of academic unit and relevant dean of faculty to facilitate discussion over the proposal and elicit the willingness of the academic unit to support the proposal. Where it appears that there is no academic unit with sufficient subject comparability, the provision is deemed to be non-comparable and an academic consultant **must** be appointed.

1. The Business Case must explain the business rationale for the programme and evidence how the proposal aligns with strategic plans for both the Partner Institution and the University.
2. The Academic Case facilitates the proposal of academically-sound programmes of study which meet the ‘expectations’ outlined in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education. The Academic Case will also facilitate a programme-level approach to curriculum design; prioritising coherent programme-level curriculum design over individual module developments and placing the student experience and the strategic direction of both the PI and University at the heart of the design process.

The application will be approved by the Education Planning Committee (EPC).

For new partnerships, Development Consent for the programme should only be considered following the approval of the new partnership.

Development Consent permits the partner institution to advertise the programme **as long as** it is made clear in all forms of publicity that the programme is ‘**subject to approval**’.

Development consent and university validation panels will be convened by the relevant faculty as required **throughout the academic year**, following receipt of all **finalised** **paperwork** from faculty.

Full approval

Full approval is the process through which the University confirms that recruitment to, and delivery of, a programme of study may commence. The application for full approval must be submitted to the relevant faculty, who is responsible for establishing a University Validation Panel (UVP) to consider the application.

Prior to submission the full programme proposal **must** be endorsed by:

* The head of the relevant university academic unit or equivalent;
* The partner HE manager or equivalent, internal arrangement for scrutiny and sign-off as determined by the partner;
* The academic contact / consultant.

The UVP must be chaired by an independent chair, as per current regulations. The UVP is empowered to make the following decisions:

* To recommend to EPC that the programme be approved;
* To recommend to EPC that the programme be rejected.

EPC will receive the recommendations of the UVP via the UVP record and will make one of the following decisions:

* To approve the programme;
* To defer decision pending further information;
* To reject the programme.

Following approval by EPC, the relevant legal agreement between the University and the partner institution and the collaborative provision register must be updated.

Required paperwork

Please see below an overview of the required information for each approval stage. If the submission is incomplete the faculty will request the outstanding information. **Following receipt of all information and documentation**, a panel will then be convened.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Development Consent** | Development Consent form |
|  | Completed Development Consent Checklist |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **New Programme** | Programme and module specifications |
|  | Any additional mapping or flowcharts to explain structure (optional) |
|  | External Advisor Nomination Form |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Major Modification**  **(see 4.4)** | Programme and module specifications, including any new modules. Tracked changes or comments should be used on existing documentation to show what has changed. |
|  | A signed major modification form including an outline or rationale for the modifications. |
| Please note that not all major modifications will need to be presented to a validation panel if changes are minimal. If a panel is required then a completed University Validation Panel Checklist will be requested. | |

Timeframes

Collaborative partners should liaise with the relevant faculty quality teams to discuss paperwork deadlines.

Please allow **four to six weeks** for the convening of a development consent panel, and **six to eight weeks** for a university validation panel. This will enable sufficient time for quality checks to be made.

Final approval of development consent and programmes is confirmed at the Education Planning Committee, which meets every two weeks.

## 4.3 Programmes where the University does not offer Comparable Provision

The University has developed procedures to deal with any instances where partner institutions wish to offer programmes in a discipline in which the University does not offer a comparable programme of study. The purpose is to require arrangements to be put in place, primarily through the engagement of an academically qualified individual or individuals in the discipline in question, to promote the quality of learning opportunities and ensure academic standards are comparable with such provision elsewhere in the UK. Where the University does not have subject expertise, an academic consultant **must** be appointed.

## 4.4 Modifications to Collaborative Programmes of Study

The University Code of Practice: Modifications to Programmes of Study splits modifications to programmes into ‘major’ and ‘minor’.

The following changes to programmes are **examples** of **major** modifications:

* A change to the programme title, the nature of the award (e.g. changing an MA award to an MSc award) or the addition or removal of other award routes as part of an existing programme where these have not already been approved (e.g. new points of entry and/ or exit);
* A change to the duration of the programme;
* A change to the location of delivery of the programme;
* A change in the mode of delivery of the programme (e.g. a move from face-to-face tuition to distance learning or vice versa, or the introduction of an additional distance learning route to an existing face-to-face programme or vice versa);
* Collaboration with another institution or organisation in the delivery of the programme and/ or delivery of a programme, or part of a programme, overseas;
* The addition, or substantive revision, of a work-based placement or study abroad element
* The addition/ withdrawal/ modification of core, compulsory, optional or elective modules that results in changes to the intended learning outcomes of the overall programme (as defined in the programme specification);
* The systematic re-structuring of a programme, or part thereof, for example as a result of a review (e.g. the reorganisation of a stage of the programme and/ or changes to module credit values/ levels);
* The designation of modules as pass/ fail or core and/or elective;
* Substantive changes to the assessment rules of the programme as a whole (i.e. rather than of individual modules).

In addition to the above, there are sometimes difficult cases that would benefit from, or require, consideration at University level by EPC, which also fall under the definition of a major modification. These include:

* Modifications which would require changes to the published teaching timetable once teaching has begun;
* Modifications to a programme of study that affect programmes offered by other subject groups where agreement has not been reached, for example in the case of combined degrees;
* The addition of optional modules which supplement rather than replace existing modules;
* Modifications which do not comply with the University’s quality framework.

Applications for major modifications require the approval of EPC, usually, but not necessarily, involving consideration by a University Validation Panel in accordance with the University Code of Practice: New Programmes.

The application must be endorsed by the head of the relevant university academic unit(s), the HE Manager at the partner institution and the JBoS.

The following changes to programmes are **examples** of typical **minor** modifications:

* The withdrawal or substitution of individual option modules for a **future cohort of students**, where this does not affect the overall intended learning outcomes as defined in the programme specification;
* Changes within option modules (e.g. to reflect a different emphasis brought to the module by a new or different member of teaching staff), where these do not affect the overall intended programme learning outcomes as defined in the programme specification, although there might be some changes to module outcomes;
* Changes to the delivery model of a module or modules, where these do not affect the statement in the programme specification relating to the teaching and learning methods for that programme or the intended learning outcomes;
* Changes to the assessment for a module or modules, where these have not already been published to students (including in the programme specification or written statement of assessment policies and practices) or where students will be informed sufficiently in advance of a change to published details to not be disadvantaged.

‘Minor’ modifications require University faculty approval only via the Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee (FESEC). However, as with major modifications prior to submission, the application must be endorsed by: the head of the relevant university academic unit(s); the HE Manager at the partner institution and the JBoS.

Note, for both major and minor modifications, that where appropriate, and in consultation with the relevant professional, statutory and regulatory body (PSRB), the processes of University approval will be conducted in parallel with the relevant PSRB.

## 4.5 Suspension or Withdrawal of Programmes

Definitions

**Suspension of recruitment** refers to the temporary suspension of recruitment to a programme for up to two years with the expectation that the programme will resume recruitment in the future.

**Withdrawal** refers to the permanent withdrawal of a programme from the partner institution’s portfolio.

**Suspension pending withdrawal** refers to the phasing out of a programme through suspension of all future recruitment, until all cohorts complete and the programme can be permanently withdrawn.

Applications for suspension must be made by the partner institution through the relevant JBoS and thereafter through the Education Planning Committee (EPC). Applications must be supported by documentation as specified in the code of practice and for withdrawal where the programme has students registered on it an exit strategy must also be submitted. Please note that a temporary suspension of recruitment of a programme that has students on other years will still result in a programme charge being raised for the programme.

The withdrawal of a programme requires the approval of EPC.

Suspension of recruitment

1. Suspension of a programme requires the approval of EPC;
2. Applications to suspend a programme must be approved at least five months in advance of the date the programme is due to begin;
3. Suspension of recruitment to a programme for up to a maximum of two consecutive academic years is permitted. Where it is proposed to suspend recruitment to an existing programme of study, or to modules which do not form part of a programme, application for suspension **must** be made to the faculty using the relevant form. Recruitment onto a programme cannot be suspended for more than two years; during the first year of suspension, arrangements must be made to either re-commence recruitment or withdraw the programme;

Applications **must** include details of the following:

* Clarification of precisely when it is intended the suspension will take effect;
* Arrangements to resume delivery of the programme;
* Evidence that the external examiner has been notified;
* Evidence that alternative arrangements are in place for prospective students, including those who have already been made an offer, to ensure that applicants are not negatively impacted.

1. Applications from partners **must** be submitted by the partner institution Higher Education manager (or equivalent) following consultation with the relevant university academic contact and endorsement by the Head of Academic Unit or equivalent;
2. Other current students **mus**t be informed of the reasons that recruitment to the programme on which they are studying is being suspended, for example through the student/staff forum;
3. The external examiner **must** be informed of the decision.

Withdrawal of programme

1. The withdrawal of a programme, including suspension pending withdrawal, requires the approval of EPC;
2. Applications to withdraw a programme must be approved at least five months in advance of the date that the programme is due to begin;
3. Applications to withdraw programmes delivered by partners **must** be made by the partner institution HE manager through the relevant Joint Board of Studies prior to being considered by the EPC;
4. Programmes involving two (or more) academic units **must** be supported by the heads of both (or all) academic units (signified in writing);
5. Where the programme is tied to another programme (for example by providing the articulation route for a Foundation Degree) evidence of the impact on the other programme, and consultation with the programme provider, **must** be provided;
6. Applications **must** include details of the following:
   * Details of the number of students currently registered by level/year and mode including students currently suspending their studies;
   * Details of offers accepted;
   * If applicable, an exit strategy, which explains how the students will be affected, including how they will be supported to complete the programme (in relation to teaching, resources, academic and pastoral supervision) indicating whether there are any differences in impact for students on different levels of the programme;
   * Clarification of precisely when it is intended the withdrawal will take effect;
   * Evidence of consultation with (the) external examiner(s);
   * Evidence of consultation with current students;
   * Any other risks of which the University should be aware.

# 5. Committee Structure for Collaborative Provision

The University has a number of committees which oversee the management of its collaborative activities. This section aims to provide an understanding of the reporting and management structures and describes the key committees with oversight of, or impact on, collaborative provision.

## 5.1 Senate

Senate, chaired by the Vice-Chancellor, is ultimately responsible for the quality of the University’s programmes and the standards of its awards.

## 5.2 University Education Committee (EC)

The Education Committee provides assurance to Senate regarding the quality of learning and teaching and the appropriateness of academic standards.

Its main function is the promotion of effective practice and enhancement in learning, teaching and assessment and for ensuring the quality of student academic experience, including the assurance of effective student engagement in the development and enhancement of the student learning experience.

## 5.3 Collaborative Provision Forum (CPF)

The Forum includes members from the quality team and representation from all partner institutions. This is the key forum in relation to collaborative provision and disseminating quality and standards updates from the university as well as sharing good practice. It also provides a forum for discussion on matters affecting the sector and in particular, the relationship between partner institutions and the University.

## 5.4 Education Planning Committee (EPC)

The Education Committee is responsible for strategic academic portfolio planning and development. Specifically, it approves on behalf of Senate new programmes, suspension or withdrawal of existing programmes, and recommends to Senate new approval and withdrawal of partners.

Its main function is to ensure that the University’s academic taught portfolio is continually developed and enhanced in response to changes in external markets and activities, and remains in line with the University’s Strategic Plan.

## 5.5 Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee (FESEC)

Each University faculty has structures to achieve effective oversight of collaborative provision principally through a Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee.

## 5.6 Joint Development Board (JDB)

There is a JDB for each partner institution to provide a forum for supporting the strategic relationship, including broad matters of academic provision between the College and the University. The JDB **must** meet **at least** once a year and the membership is constituted from a small group of senior management and officers from both institutions.

The board’s purpose is:

* To oversee the contractual relationship governing collaborative provision and accompanying financial arrangements;
* To consider the relevant Higher Education strategies of both institutions;
* To strategically consider initial programme proposals to the University, including the rigour of the underpinning market research, the student choice and the strategic fit of the proposal;
* To consider plans for the development of the portfolio of programmes in the medium-to-long term;
* To receive reports of all matters relating to admission, progress, withdrawal, and termination of students undertaking UoH validated programmes.

The JDB requires the partner institution to submit an annual report to inform the governing bodies and senior managers of both institutions as to progress of the relationship. The annual report will provide information to support the:

* Confirmation of the agreed development agenda;
* Evaluation of progress towards that agenda;
* Denote actions for the policy makers of the institutions;
* Raise awareness of institutional issues;
* Report on programme and recruitment activities;
* Report on other activities, such as staff development.

## 5.7 Joint Board of Studies (JBoS)

Introduction

At discipline level, the University delegates the routine oversight of collaborative programmes to University faculty (ies) by means of a JBoS, which reports to the relevant Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee (FESEC), and JDB via annual summaries. Specifically, the JBoS is responsible for reviewing programmes, drawing on feedback from annual monitoring and external examiners’ reports and for identifying opportunities for enhancing the programmes. Where a partner institution operates more than one programme in the same discipline, these may be covered by one JBoS providing that membership is revised accordingly and subject to prior agreement by the University.

Membership

Typical membership of a JBoS is:

* At least 2 members nominated by the University;
* At least 2 members nominated by the partner institution;
* 1 student member per programme covered by the JBoS.

From these, a Chair and a Deputy Chair is appointed (alternating between the two institutions). The Chair or the Deputy Chair must be a University member of staff. Where a programme spans more than one University faculty the JBoS should include membership from every faculty that is involved. Where membership of a JBoS is to differ from the above, the University must be satisfied that there is adequate and effective University representation.

Meetings of the JBoS are scheduled by agreement between the faculty and partner institution but are usually held at least once per University trimester and are fully recorded. Minutes and actions from these meetings are considered by the relevant Faculty Education and Student Experience Committees. They **should** be available for audit and **may** be useful supporting material should the partner institution wish to propose a further collaboration within the discipline.

Terms of reference

Standard terms of reference for a JBoS are:

* To consider and make recommendations to University and partner institution bodies as appropriate on all matters relating to the association between the University and the partner institution at programme level, including proposals concerning the content, structure and form of assessment of the programme(s) and procedures for the admission and progress for students;
* To encourage and discuss programme development within the academic discipline.

Matters considered by the JBoS and falling under the responsibility of the appropriate faculty (ies) include all academic matters associated with the programme of study such as:

* Recruitment;
* Admissions criteria;
* Student progress and retention;
* Professional body registration and requirements;
* Teaching - personnel and methods;
* Accuracy and appropriateness of materials used at programme level e.g. student handbooks, course materials;
* Student support including resources;
* Assessment strategy;
* Staff development for both academic and support staff;
* Maintenance and oversight of academic standards;
* New programme developments and amendments to existing programmes;
* Annual reporting including summaries of student feedback and monitoring of action taken;
* External examiner reports and University responses;
* Student representation e.g. student/staff forums or equivalent;
* Verbal report on marketing and publicity materials;
* Preparations and actions for reviews and audits carried out by the University, QAA OfS or PSRBs;
* Monitor action plans arising from audits and reviews;
* Monitor applications for Recognised Teacher Status (RTS) and receive report on training, development and proficiency of staff with RTS;
* At the autumn meeting, to receive a report listing all staff involved in the delivery and support of University of Hull awards confirming all have the necessary level of RTS approval;
* Monitor the application process if devolvement of admissions has been authorised;
* Receive report on use of student handbooks and confirmation of compliance with UCoP;
* Receive confirmation that student guides have been issued.

There are standard templates for JBoS agendas which may be of use to partners and faculties. Copies can be obtained via the University faculty.

The JBoS does not have the authority to consider and decide on any individual cases of student progress (including appeals and complaints) but should if appropriate discuss and consider issues of principle or process. Cases which fall under this category should be referred to either the Boards of Examiners, the appropriate committee within the partner institution or the University (i.e. Student Cases Committee).

The location of the JBoS may alternate between the University and the partner institution. Where a meeting takes place on partner institution premises, the University expects the partner institution to service the meeting.

At the end of each academic year faculties are required to produce, in consultation with partners, a single summary report (one for each partner) highlighting issues arising from JBoS meetings at each partner institution for consideration by each individual JDB. Copies of annual summaries together with details of any action taken should be included in the Faculty Annual Monitoring Review and Enhancement of Programmes - AMREP). Urgent matters arising at JBoS meetings may be considered outside of the formal JDB meeting if appropriate. A brief report summarising all faculty annual summaries should be produced by the JDB secretary for consideration by the Education Committee.

## 5.8 Student Cases Committee (SCC)

Student Cases Committee is a committee of the Education Committee and acts within the remit of the Education Committee, and within the delegations given to it by the Education Committee. It provides assurance to the Education Committee regarding the consideration and determination of individual student cases submitted by students and academic areas.

The Student Cases Committee deals with individual student cases, including overseeing all matters of academic discipline e.g. termination of programme of study and academic appeals for both on-campus and collaborative students. SCC considers and adjudicates cases involving individual students including matters relating to suspension of study, extensions to periods of study and repeat periods of study. SCC is also responsible for the management of the University Appeals Process.

# 6. Communications

Contact details for University staff associated with collaborative provision can be found at the back of the Handbook for reference. If partner institutions are unsure of whom to contact then, in the first instance, they should contact the quality team who will direct them to the appropriate faculty or University representative as appropriate.

The day-to-day contact regarding programme administrative management issues normally takes place through direct contact between academic unit and faculty administrative staff at the University and at the partner institution. Indeed, it is **essential** that a strong link is built at that level, not only to ensure that the mechanics of running the programme progress smoothly, but also to provide a useful link to academics in either institution. This link is supported by the roles that academic staff perform at the University and at partner institutions which would normally be the Academic Contact and Programme Leader respectively.

If partner institution staff have queries relating to general quality assurance and regulatory issues then they should in the first instance contact their Higher Education Manager or equivalent.

# 7. Roles and Responsibilities

## 7.1 At the University

For each programme or set of programmes within an academic discipline, the University will provide a named contact who will be an academic member of the University faculty nominated as Academic Contact or equivalent. On behalf of the faculty, the Academic Contact will be responsible for those areas identified in this Handbook and specifically for:

* Providing guidance to ensure that the programme of study and syllabus is appropriate for the named award of the University prior to EPC approval;
* Advising on the appropriate quality processes and on the submission of appropriate documentation;
* Overseeing the scrutiny of assessment tasks and review of student output in accordance with the UoH code of practice on Moderation;
* Representing the University on the Board of Examiners and advising accordingly;
* Where appropriate, attending any final exhibition, performance or other summative outcome;
* Advising on the appointment of external examiners and liaising with external examiners accordingly;
* Advising on programme development and quality enhancement of the subject, in line with University of Hull expectations of the student experience;
* Liaising with Faculty Collaborative Provision administrative staff as necessary over routine administration, and any problems that arise;
* Liaising, where appropriate, with the faculty office seeking their advice and guidance on generic quality issues, and keeping them informed on subject specific issues;
* Acting as the main contact within the faculty for the purposes of admissions, examinations, annual reporting etc. and liaising, where appropriate through Faculty Collaborative Provision administrative staff, with central University administration on such matters;
* Being a member of relevant Faculty collaborative committees, and the appropriate JBoS (where they will help to co-ordinate items for discussion);
* Reviewing annually programme specific marketing and recruitment information and reporting this to the JBoS;
* Identifying areas for development for University and partner institution staff;
* Providing guidance and support in the preparations for relevant external audits, and representing the area of work in internal and external review processes.

For academic disciplines where the University does not offer comparable provision, the University **should** provide an academic contact to provide the appropriate leadership and management responsibilities and an academic consultant from outside the University to give subject-specific guidance

In addition to the above, the University will nominate a member of staff within each faculty who will be the administrative contact for the partnership and who will be responsible for supporting the administrative functions as specified in this Handbook.

## 7.2 At Partner Institutions

The University requires partner institutions to similarly nominate a lead academic contact for each programme or set of programmes (e.g. Programme Leader) and identify those members of staff who will be providing administrative support for the programmes as specified in this Handbook e.g. Programme Administrator. Partner institutions **should** aim, where possible, to liaise with the University via the sponsoring faculty, **except for** matters relating to the agreement, fee negotiation and the identification of newly-proposed programmes.

The University requires partner institutions to provide the appropriate academic guidance and leadership before, during and after module/programme boards for details of the role of the Exam & Assessment Co-ordinator. If this role is not to be carried out by the Programme Leader, then partner institutions should nominate another academic member of staff to fulfil this role.

# 8. Staff at Partner Institutions

## 8.1 Recognised Teacher Status

The University requires that staff at partner institutions who are engaged in delivering and supporting programmes leading to a University of Hull award **must** be appointed as Recognised Teachers of the University. Furthermore, it is expected that anyone being appointed as a Recognised Teacher will have a period of induction, support and training for staff development purposes at the partner institution. Where an applicant has less than 3 years teaching experience, such induction and support is **mandatory.**

RTS is not required for guest speakers involved in providing a limited amount of teaching. Guest speakers **must not** be involved in any part of the assessment process or in providing academic or personal supervision and/or support.

There are two entry routes, one is qualification based and the other is experience based. For entry by academic qualification, the qualification must be relevant to the discipline and should be at least honours level, but preferably Masters level. For entry by experience, staff should possess no less than 3 years’ relevant teaching experience including sustained engagement in relevant scholarly activity or relevant professional qualifications or no fewer than 3 years’ other relevant professional/industrial experience. To teach at Masters level an applicant must possess a Masters degree or equivalent.

Staff with a Masters degree who seek RTS to teach level 6 must also have a PGCE in HE or equivalent. Staff with a doctorate who seek RTS to teach level 7 must also have a PGCE in HE or equivalent. This ‘equivalent’ could be, for example, an institutional qualification in teaching in the higher education sector accredited against the UK Professional Standards Framework, recognition as a fellow of the Higher Education Academy (HEA) through Advance HE, holder of a National Teaching Fellowship Scheme Individual Award, or holder of a PGCE in secondary education, further education or lifelong learning.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level at which delivering/supporting** | **Essential** | **Desirable** |
| Pre-Certificate (level 3) | Foundation degree | Honours degree |
| Certificate (level 4) | Foundation degree | Honours degree |
| Foundation Degree (levels 4 & 5) | Honours degree | Masters degree |
| Honours (level 6) | Honours degree plus PGCE in HE (or equivalent) | Masters degree\* |
| Masters Degree (level 7) | Masters degree plus PGCE in HE (or equivalent) | Doctorate\*\* |

Teaching any part of a programme will disqualify applicants from the role of external examiner.

Further information on the process of appointment, the roles and responsibilities of both University faculties and partner institutions in relation to Recognised Teacher status can be found within the Quality and Standards section of the University website.

Recognised Teachers have access to the library and to computing facilities, including the University intranet on the University campus and will be issued with the relevant usernames and passwords on appointment.

## 8.2 Staff Development

The University expects partner institutions to have an appropriate staff development policy for staff involved in programmes leading to University awards and to provide suitable opportunities for support staff in administrative roles.

The University is keen to foster the development of the relationship with partner institutions and to assist with the development of partner institution staff. Staff at partner institutions may attend events and courses offered by the University’s Staff Development Office subject to the availability of places and payment of a fee if appropriate. The University also offers the PCAP programme (Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice) which provides the opportunity for academic staff to undertake a nationally accredited award and the DARTE scheme (Disciplinary Approaches to Research and Teaching Excellence).

Academic staff at partner institutions are also encouraged to enhance their scholarly activities through establishing links with academic counterparts in University academic units and faculties and by registering for research degrees offered by the University. Staff from partner institutions can also apply to act as part of a supervisory team for University of Hull PhD students in the same way as any other external supervisor. Full details can be found in the University Code of Practice: Postgraduate Research Students.

The University is committed to working with partner institutions to develop both the academic programmes and the supporting procedures. The quality team will assist in arranging bespoke staff development programmes as identified by the two institutions normally through the JBoS and JDBs.

## 8.3 Peer Support for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning

The University expects partner institutions to have a peer observation scheme for staff that deliver programmes/modules leading to University awards. The scheme must be appropriate and relevant for the provision of higher education.

## 8.4 Appraisal

The University expects partner institutions to have an appraisal scheme for staff that deliver programmes/modules leading to University awards. The scheme must be appropriate and relevant for the provision of higher education.

# 9. Management of Collaborative Programmes

The successful operation of a programme requires a mixture of administrative and academic activities. This Handbook includes information in sections covering administrative issues, student related management activities, academic management and quality assurance issues. If there are any aspects of programme organisation and management about which you would like further information or guidance, please contact the quality team for advice.

# 10. Administrative Management

This section covers some of the administrative responsibilities, which do not relate to students directly, but which **must** be managed effectively to meet the University’s expectations, as outlined in the Agreement. It will be of interest to those staff that carry out or manage the administrative tasks related to collaborative programmes both at partner institutions and at the University. It should be brought to the attention of the Programme Leader (or equivalent) at the partner institutions and the Academic Contact at the University and other appropriate officers.

A key aspect of the relationship between the University faculty and the partner institution is the ability to schedule dates for the various meetings and tasks that are necessary to enable students’ results to be processed in time to meet the various deadlines for the ratification of results and invitations to graduation ceremonies. It is considered good practice for partner institutions to work with faculties to produce an academic calendar detailing planned dates for JBoS meetings, receipt and return of assessment tasks and output and Boards of Examiners meetings. In this way we can work together to ensure that all of these processes operate as smoothly as possible.

## 10.1 Marketing and Communications

The University has responsibility for the accuracy of all public information relating to its awards including marketing and promotional materials e.g. prospectuses, web pages and press releases plus material distributed at careers fairs and open days. The University recognises that it is not always feasible to obtain approval prior to publication and as a consequence has delegated the responsibility to partner institutions in accordance with the following principles:

* All material should be a true representation of the relationship with the University and should not be misleading to the reader;
* Material must be of a quality comparable with that produced by the University;
* Material must only be included within reputable publications and should create a positive image of the University;
* Compliance with the University of Hull visual identity – no alteration of the logotype is permissible;
* For new partnerships, advertising material must not be published in any format until the proposed partnership has been granted prima facie approval in accordance with the code of practice on academic partnerships;
* For new programmes, advertising material must not be published until development consent has been granted in accordance with the code of practice on programme approval;
* All use of the University’s name or visual identity in an international context (advertising, recruitment fairs, news release etc.) must be approved by the University in advance of publication.

The Marketing and Communications Directorate at the University will be happy to offer advice on general marketing matters and advice on design and University publications.

## 10.2 Discover Uni

It is the responsibility of the partner institution to inform the university who in the partner institution has responsibility for the accuracy of the information published on the discoveruni.gov.uk website. The University is only responsible for data for indirectly funded students. It is the responsibility of the partner institution to make returns to the relevant bodies for all directly funded students.

## 10.3 National Student Survey (NSS)

NSS results are reported against the institution that students are taught at regardless of funding arrangements. It is the responsibility of each partner institution to make suitable arrangements for the survey to be completed each year.

## 10.4 Student Handbooks

Partner institutions are required to provide each student with a handbook at the level of the appropriate organisational unit (or equivalent) or programme. The handbook **must** be distributed to students at the start of their studies. The University has a template which provides text which must be included in all handbooks and guidance on other information which should be inserted by the partner institution and provides advice on what to include. Using the template ensures compatibility and accuracy of the information provided across all provision. The template is updated annually and partners **must** ensure that the latest version of the template is used.

## 10.5 Student Induction

Partner institutions are **required** to give all students a formal induction. Induction is based on the premise that retention can be increased by enhancing the speed and effectiveness with which students settle into all aspects of institution and University life. Induction should recognise the diversity of students’ experience, needs and expectations. Reasons for diversity will include whether the student is a home or an overseas student, the age and educational background of the student and the type of accommodation in which the student is staying.

Induction should cover: academic requirements of the programme; student support available; health and safety issues; (academic unit or equivalent) arrangements and student representation. In addition to the standard information given, partner institutions should take the opportunity to inform students of the relationship between the two institutions and clarify the role the University plays.

Partner institutions will wish to note the University guidelines and are expected to have in place mechanisms for the welcome, orientation and induction of students which are comparable with the University Code of Practice: Welcome, Orientation and Induction. The code is provided **for information** to partner institutions. Increasingly it is recognised as good practice that induction should be a continual process during the early weeks and months that a student attends, rather than a one-off event on arrival.

Students **should** also receive an electronic copy of the Guide for Students on Validated Programmes Leading to an Award of the University of Hull which is updated annually. Copies will be distributed electronically to partner institutions at the start of each academic year and these must be provided to students by the partner.

## 10.6 Notification of Results and Transcripts

Partner institutions are responsible for notifying all results to students (and for providing appropriate feedback and academic guidance) at the end of each assessment process. Results may never be ‘published’, for example on a notice board or through any means by which one person may see the results of another student identified as that student. **Results must not be given orally, especially over the telephone, and must never be given to a person other than the student without the written consent of the student.**

Partner institutions **must** produce a transcript at the end of the final level and may choose to produce a transcript at other intermediate levels. Transcripts **must** record all modules where the assessment has been attempted, including fails, although the higher of the two fail marks must be recorded. The transcript should indicate that the programme was delivered by the partner institution but is a University of Hull award.

The University devolves the responsibility to partner institutions to initiate the production of the transcripts for students on directly funded programmes whilst retaining the authority to monitor the accuracy of the data prior to being despatched to the students. A sample of transcripts must be made available to the University.

Faculties **must** also check that details of the final award are accurate; any anomalies should be reported to the Student Services Directorate. Faculties should record that an accuracy check has been undertaken on a copy of the approved pass list. Transcripts for students on indirectly funded programmes will normally be produced by the University.

## 10.7 Graduation Ceremonies and the Issuing of Certificates

Students who have been awarded qualifications at undergraduate or postgraduate degree level may\* be entitled to attend and have their awards presented at a University graduation ceremony. The certificates issued will be the same as those awarded for successful completion of on-campus programmes with additional wording specifying the location of teaching. Students are responsible for their expenses in attending the ceremony and must adhere to the same rules and regulations, as for on-campus students. The University Graduation Office will contact graduands with details of the ceremony and action to be taken for the hire of appropriate academic dress. Students unable to attend the University ceremony may graduate in absentia.

(\*some partner institutions have elected to not attend a University of Hull graduation ceremony. Partner institutions must inform students whether this is applicable to their institution.)

The University recognises that most partner institutions may want to hold their own award ceremonies either before or after a University Graduation Ceremony and **must** inform their students they will be invited (\*subject to the above) to attend both ceremonies. Degree certificates will be presented at the University of Hull ceremony or issued following the ceremony. As students of the University, those who graduate with a degree will become alumni of the University.

# 11. Management of Student Related Issues

This section looks at the procedures involved in the general, day-to-day running of a collaborative programme. These procedures may involve staff at all levels of management, from support staff to more senior management staff and this information is designed to give those staff with such responsibilities some guidance on the University’s expectations and requirements. It will also be useful for those members of staff involved in the academic management of collaborative programmes to ensure the efficiency of administrative procedures.

Partner institutions must ensure that the requirements of the legal agreement are met, particularly those relating to intake dates and minimum and/or maximum numbers for an intake. Intake dates are agreed and detailed in the Agreement. Partner institutions must consult faculty representatives if minimum numbers have not been achieved. This is particularly important where the partner has devolved admissions. Partner institutions must also make arrangements to inform students if the start date is postponed due to the failure to meet the minimum numbers required.

## 11.1 Record Keeping and Archiving

For students on **validated** programmes:

**Partner institutions** will be expected to take responsibility for maintaining a full record of the student’s academic progress, including module marks and periods of study, as well as personal data. Partner institutions should complete all statutory returns required for higher education students. The University **must** be provided with basic information about each student enabling it to maintain a basic record to facilitate the production of student cards and statistics. Up-to-date and accurate information is especially important for the Degree Ceremonies Office who issue invitations to graduation ceremonies and produce certificates. Finally, partner institutions are reminded of their legal duty to comply with the General Data Protection Regulations (2018).

For students on **franchised** programmes:

**The University** will normally take responsibility for maintaining a full record of the students’ academic progress, including module marks and periods of study as well as personal data. The University will complete all statutory returns required for HE students.

## 11.2 The Application Process

The University **must** assure itself that admissions procedures are consistent across all partner institutions and equivalent to its own activities. It is the partner institutions’ responsibility to ensure that prospective students are aware of the University’s involvement in the programme. It is important that the procedures are adequately understood and essential for partner institutions without devolved admissions to provide all required documentation to enable the University to reach a timely decision regarding applications, thereby ensuring an efficient service to the applicants.

If a partner institution is a registered member of UCAS, then the expectation is that UCAS rules will be followed by the partner institution at all times even though the offer for admission is with the University.

Partner institutions **must** ensure that students applying for part-time study are eligible and satisfy immigration and fee status requirements.

## 11.3 Devolved Admissions Process

The University has developed a framework whereby the admissions process may be devolved to partner institutions who can demonstrate the ability to comply with the University requirements specified in the code of practice. The University **must** ensure that arrangements for admission to collaborative programmes comply with the expectation set out in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

UK Quality Code ‘expectations for quality’ states that “as a core practice, the provider must have a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system.”

With the above in mind, partner institutions are required to have in place policies and procedures to deal appropriately with, amongst other things; APL, English language proficiency, equal opportunities monitoring, applicants with disabilities, risk assessment processes to deal with applicants with criminal convictions, making student offers, induction, staff development, and complaints regarding admissions matters. In addition, partner institutions **must** demonstrate the ability to monitor and oversee the process. Consideration will be on a partner-by-partner basis and partner institutions must apply to the Admissions Committee for the authority to make offers on the University’s behalf.

Applications not meeting the published entry criteria should be dealt with using the procedure outlined in 11.4 below which is now articulated in the University Code of Practice Applications Procedure: Collaborative Provision available from Admissions Services.

Those partners who have devolved admissions authority and are not using electronic data transfer to notify the University’s Student Services Directorate of students who have enrolled on UoH programmes must provide the appropriate University faculty with details of students who have registered in order that they can be entered onto the University’s Student Information System. This will enable the appropriate enrolment information to be generated. In addition, these partners should provide the Admissions Office with copies of completed applications and offer letters in order that a student record can be created in advance of the registration process.

Partners are reminded that the University Code of Practice on Devolved Admissions requires partners with devolved admissions authority to produce a report to be included in the Annual Monitoring Review and Enhancement of Programmes - AMREP.

## 11.4 For Partners without Devolved Admissions Authority

Partner Institutions not having authority to make their own admissions decisions should follow the procedure set out below.

The application form

Students apply for a place on the programme using an application form, which is normally prepared by the partner institution. The application form must be approved by the Head of Admissions (& Applicant Services) at the University to ensure that it meets the University’s requirements.

Managing the application process

Partner institutions must send by email the applications that are to be considered to the Partnerships Admissions Team together with supporting documentation using specific admissions criteria agreed during the approvals process. The Admissions Office is responsible for verifying that the qualifications and/or experience of the applicant are commensurate with the approved admissions criteria. Partner institutions must ensure that students are aware that any application is subject to further consideration and final approval by the University.

Where students are passing from one University of Hull programme to another e.g. Masters after successful completion of an Advanced Diploma, students must make a formal application for the second programme and receive a formal offer letter. The student would otherwise not be able to enrol for the second programme of study. If a student wishes to transfer from one programme offered by the partner institution to another, it will be necessary to withdraw formally from the programme the student is currently registered for before being accepted onto the other programme.

Guidelines for the admission of students to a particular programme are outlined within the programme regulations and partner institutions should satisfy themselves that applications meet with the pre-requisites before submitting them for consideration by the University. The pre-requisites should comply with the University’s English language requirements which can be found on the University website. The University’s decision on applications is final. As mentioned in Section 9, each programme will be allocated an administrator, located within the sponsoring faculty. Partner institutions must ensure that applications are sent to the Administrator (UoH) with complete documentation. Incomplete applications must be placed on hold, and not processed until all required information is received. Generally, the requirements are as follows:

* An approved application form;
* Copies of relevant academic certificates, on which it has been noted that the original documents have been seen by partner institution staff and who are satisfied by the authenticity. The University retains the right to see the original documentation including IELTS certificates or equivalent and NARIC assessments, if deemed appropriate;
* At least one reference; normally an academic reference although some academic units may ask for an additional work reference;
* Evidence of the student’s proficiency in English language (if appropriate);
* Interview report (if appropriate).

Exceptional cases by Dean’s approval

In exceptional circumstances where applicants do not possess the standard entry requirements, the partner institution can recommend the applicant for acceptance as an exceptional case. In addition to the standard supporting documentation, the partner institutions should submit an interview report carried out by staff from the partner institution, which details discussions conducted with the applicant regarding their application. Examples of areas where an interview report are especially helpful include:

* A student who does not seem to fulfil the academic entry requirements but has extensive work experience which may compensate;
* A student who has performed poorly during their most recent study, due to ill health or other circumstances (these cases should also be supported by academic references).

Each case will be considered individually on its merits by the Dean of the relevant University Faculty. If a partner institution receives an application about which they are uncertain, they should contact the relevant faculty at the University for guidance.

Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL)

Where it is expected that students might routinely be granted exemptions, by virtue of prior experience/qualification, from specific aspects of the programme this should normally be declared within the initial programme documentation. Thereafter exemptions are at the University’s discretion, in discussion with the partner institution. The University programme regulations specify the number of credits that must be passed in order to gain a University award.

Approval of applications

Applications submitted by the partner institutions are considered by the Partnerships Admissions Team. The University will prepare a formal offer letter for the applicant which is sent to successful applicants via the partner institution.

The pressure from applicants who are keen to learn the outcome of their application is well understood within the University and every effort is made to ensure rapid decisions concerning applications. The University will endeavour to send offer letters as soon as practicable within a maximum of five working days of receiving the complete application, and provide official acceptance letters normally within ten working days. However, this turnaround can only be achieved if full documentation is provided with each application. The University reserves the right to request additional information to support any application and may grant an applicant conditional acceptance dependent on receiving additional information, for example, satisfactory references.

The University will ensure that staff absences do not normally delay the processing of applications and, although the Admissions Office has periods of high levels of activity, it will seek to maintain a regular flow of acceptance notifications throughout busy times.

The formal offer

Offers of places on programmes of study leading to University awards are the responsibility of the University. Offers are made through the University’s Admissions Office, which will issue a letter of acceptance. Applicants will receive either:

* A formal unconditional offer letter stating details of the programme, its location and the start date for which the applicant has been accepted;

OR

* A formal conditional offer letter stating details of the programme, its location and the start date for which the applicant has been accepted, but also including the conditions which the offer is subject to.

In the event of a conditional offer being made, the requirements must be fulfilled before a student commences a programme unless the letter of acceptance specifically states otherwise. Examples of conditional offers include the receipt of a satisfactory reference or the successful completion of another award.

Partner institutions **may not**, in any circumstance, issue acceptance on behalf of the University, **unless** they hold devolved admissions. No student may commence any programme until the partner institution has received confirmation of official acceptance. In exceptional circumstances, an application may be made immediately prior to the start of an intake. The partner institutions may allow the applicant to attend classes, or receive module study material, but it is the responsibility of the partner institution to make clear in writing to the applicant that continued participation on the programme is conditional on a formal acceptance by the University. In these instances, it is expected that the partner institution include of copy of the letter with the application. The University must also be immediately informed of such a decision and partner institutions must therefore ensure that they have procedures in place to cater for students whose applications are subsequently rejected by the University.

Summary of application process for partner institutions without devolved admissions authority

* The partner institution sends the completed application, together with copy certificates, references and evidence of English language proficiency (where appropriate), to central partnership admissions in the first instance;
* The Admissions Service review and where appropriate approve standard offers;
* The formal offer letter is produced and sent to the applicant, via the partner institution;
* In the event of an application being rejected the partner institution may choose to write a letter to the applicant, but the Admissions Service produces no formal rejection letter. In such cases the partner institution will be kept informed.

English language proficiency

For all University programmes, applicants whose first language is not English should submit evidence of English language proficiency. The applicant may be regarded as proficient, in respect of admission to undergraduate and postgraduate degree programmes when they have achieved one of the qualifications or tests approved by the University for admission to undergraduate and postgraduate degree programmes. A list of such programmes is available on the website.

Some applicants may not hold any of the qualifications accepted and may wish to be considered on the basis of substantial use of English in their profession. The procedure for consideration in this way is explained below. However, applicants should be aware that special cases of this nature will be considered individually by the University and there is no guarantee that applicants will be accepted on the basis of references and other information provided to the University. Consideration of the application may also take longer than an application which fulfils the University’s requirements. Applicants are recommended to take IELTS wherever possible.

If an applicant wishes their English Language proficiency to be considered on the basis of use in the applicant’s profession, it is necessary for the applicant to:

* Discuss the application with the partner institution. If it is agreed that the applicant’s English language proficiency should be considered as a special case, an interview report should be completed by the partner institution and forwarded to the University with the application to support the case;
* Provide academic and/or professional references that specifically mention the way in which English is used by the applicant (e.g. through report-writing, written and oral communication).

In addition, applicants who do not hold any of the qualifications may also demonstrate their English skills through successful academic study taught and assessed entirely in English within recent years. If this is the case, then this should be clearly indicated on the application form.

Applications from staff members at partner institutions

The University’s normal policy is that, for quality assurance reasons, it is not possible to accept members of staff of our partner institutions on programmes that the partner institution administers. However, it is possible to consider applications of this nature as a ‘special case’ where the partner institutions can assure the University that appropriate safeguards are in place. In order to consider applications in this way, the University requires a detailed report from a senior member of staff at the partner institution (e.g. Principal, HE Director etc.). This report should include:

* A description of the nature of the staff member’s work at the partner institution;
* An explanation of actual and potential access to student records, the work of other students and confidential material related to the programme (examination papers and scripts, student results etc.);
* Assurance from the partner institution that the applicant will have no advantage or disadvantage over other students on the programme or access to programme-related information which is not available to the other students, because of their professional role within the organisation.

Partners with devolved admissions authority should act in accordance with the code of practice for devolved admissions. It should be noted that this code of practice makes an exception for certain agreed teacher training programmes.

## 11.5 Student Registration

In line with requirements from the Office for Students, as a registered provider of higher education the University has a [Student Protection Plan](https://www.hull.ac.uk/choose-hull/university-and-region/key-documents/docs/student-protection-plan.pdf) available on its website, detailing how continuation and quality of study will be preserved for current and potential students if a risk to their continued study crystallises.

New and continuing students

Students on validated programmes **must** also be registered with the University of Hull. If a student is not registered with the University they will **not** be able to receive a University of Hull award.

As part of the partner institution own enrolment process, we ask that partner institutions ensure that students comply with the following when they register on a validated programme:

* [University of Hull Misconduct Regulations](http://www.hull.ac.uk/editor-assets/docs/2017-06-14-Student-Disciplinary-Regulations-Approved-by-Senate-2017-06-14.pdf) (so far as it applies to Collaborative Provision students)
* [University of Hull Complaint Regulations](http://beta.www.hull.ac.uk/Choose-Hull/Student-life/Student-support/Complaints/docs/Complaints-Regulations.pdf) (so far as it applies to Collaborative Provision students)
* University of Hull [Academic Appeal & Queries Regulations](https://universityofhull.app.box.com/s/6pgx1dv2g57sf6wpep7tzse5qwiv284w) (so far as it applies to Collaborative Provision students)
* University of Hull [Library](http://beta.www.hull.ac.uk/choose-hull/study-at-hull/library/help/our-policies/library-regulations.aspx) and ICT Regulations and Guidelines
* Any other University of Hull policy, procedure, regulation or requirement as may be communicated from time to time

We **recommend the partner institution includes these statements** in their own terms and conditions.

More detailed information on the registration process for both new and continuing students is available in a guidance document available from Registry Services ([collaborative@hull.ac.uk](mailto:collaborative@hull.ac.uk))

International students

It is the partner institution’s responsibility to advise students about visas and other Home Office requirements. As a consequence, partner institutions must ensure that staff receive adequate training to provide guidance on issues relating to visas and students must be made aware of whom to contact if they have this type of query.

In addition, partner institutions must ensure that international students are aware of the need to register with the police if appropriate.

Access to library facilities

Partner institutions are asked to note that students will not be able to apply for a student card or use any of the university facilities until they have been registered with the University. Partners are also asked to remind students that it will take 24 hours for their library card to become activated once they have registered with the university.

## 11.6 Changes to Student Personal and Programme Details

Any changes to a student’s personal or programme details must be notified to the University as they occur. To assist with this process there are forms available from Registry Services ([collaborative@hull.ac.uk](mailto:collaborative@hull.ac.uk)) for these changes. All forms must be completed by the partner institution and sent to Registry Services ([collaborative@hull.ac.uk](mailto:collaborative@hull.ac.uk)).

The forms the partner institution complete and forwards to the University are to allow for the sharing of information between the partner and the University. We advise all partners to have their own internal process in place which involves agreement between the partner and the student to the change to their student record.

Changes to personal information

You are required to inform the University if a student reports a change to their personal information, e.g. name, address, title, gender etc.

The sole purpose of the University change of details form is to exchange information between the partner institution and the University. As a result, we do not require any signatures on the form. Instead, we insist each partner must have their own approval process to ensure both the student and the partner institution agree to the change. We would also expect that the partner institution will have verified the student’s new details by checking the appropriate official documentation.

The University issues final degree certificates with the name recorded on our student record system. The University will not alter the certificate after it has been issued.

## 11.7 Change of Programme

If a student wishes to change their programme of study, the partner institution must notify the University when the change involves the student transferring from one University validated programme to another University validated programme.

The sole purpose of the university change of programme form is to exchange information between the partner institution and the University. As a result, we do not require any signatures on the form. Instead, we insist each partner must have their own approval process to ensure both the student and the partner institution agree to the change.

## 11.8 Withdrawal from Programme

If a student wishes to withdraw from their programme of study with the partner institution then the University must be notified of these changes as they occur.

The sole purpose of the university withdrawal form is to exchange information between the partner institution and the University. As a result, we do not require any signatures on the form. Instead, we insist each partner must have their own approval process to ensure both the student and the partner institution agree to the withdrawal.

# 12. Academic Management

## 12.1 Activities Relating to the Assessment Process

The Agreement between the University and the partner institution will outline the respective responsibilities with regard to assessment. This includes anonymous marking and second marking carried out by the academic staff at partner institutions and the moderation process carried out by University academic staff.

The University Code of Practice on Assessment Procedures **must** be applied for all modules and programmes classified as collaborative provision unless expressly stated in the text. The code includes specific guidance on anonymous marking, second marking and penalties for over-length and late submissions.

Moderation

Moderation is a standard feature of collaborative provision. It is a process by which the University assures itself that any work undertaken by the student is set and assessed in a consistent and fair manner, to ensure parity of standards and that the level of achievement reflects the required academic standards comparable to programmes on campus and nationally. The University has developed a code of practice that applies to two specific processes: the scrutiny of summative assessment tasks; and the review of student output arising out of those tasks. Partner institutions must however ensure that their internal processes for the approval of assessment task and the moderation of student output are rigorous and not reliant on the University processes or the external examiner.

It should also be noted that the external examiner **must** be consulted on all draft assessment tasks, irrespective of their format, level or stage within a programme. The precise range of tasks which the external wishes to see, and the timing of the consultation, must be discussed with the external examiner in advance. In the event of disagreement the University Moderator has final responsibility for determining assessment tasks.

The code of practice devolves the responsibility to University faculties in determining what must be moderated and sets out criteria for guiding the decision subject to the minimum standards defined. Prior to the commencement of a programme, University faculties will liaise with partner institutions to agree what proportion of student output will be moderated for the forthcoming academic year. Volume will depend on a number of criteria including: the length of time the partnership has been established; the length of time the programme has been running; the higher education experience of the lecturer at the partner institution; the level of the module and contribution to the overall degree classification.

It is considered to be good practice for partner institutions to submit reassessment tasks for moderation at the same time as the primary tasks.

Due to the nature of some assessment tasks it may not always be practical to carry out the moderation process as set out by the code. In these cases, University faculties will liaise with partner institutions to facilitate this process such as attending, where possible, presentations, exhibitions, and performances.

External Examiners

External examiners are appointed by the University for every programme. The appointment will be for four years. The proposal for appointment is made in consultation with partner institutions. The University appoints three types of external examiner; a module external examiner, a programme external examiner and a chief external examiner. There may be more than one external examiner for a programme depending on the subject areas and an external examiner may be responsible for more than one programme.

**Note:** for the majority of collaborative provision there is normally one external examiner who acts as **both** the module and programme external examiner.

External examiners receive a formal letter of appointment together with an initial briefing. The University requires there to be at least a five-year break in association before an external examiner can be reappointed to an institution regardless of whether that external examiner acted for the University or another institution. The five-year rule also applies to members of academic staff who have previously worked at the partner institution or at the University of Hull.

The role of the external examiner is to assist the University in discharging its responsibility for the quality and standards of the education it provides and the awards it offers by:

* Commenting on the standards of modules/awards and that modules/awards are comparable to all appropriate nationally recognised standards [Examiners are primarily directed to the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications and applicable subject benchmark statements (see [www.qaa.ac.uk](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/)). Oversight may include modules which do not directly contribute to a student's classification results, but is nevertheless important in defining the academic standard];
* Ensuring that assessment methods are fair, that assessment is operated fairly and in accordance with University regulations;
* Reviewing the assessment performance of students as a cohort;
* Reviewing assessment tasks, irrespective of their format, level or stage within a programme
* Reviewing a representative sample of student output. The purpose of this is to oversee that robust moderation of assessments has taken place. External Examiners must not be involved in marking student work;
* Verifying that the University's policy for second marking has been applied and provide comment on the evidence provided;
* Commenting on the way in which feedback on assessments is being provided to students to promote learning;
* Commenting on any other opportunities provided to enhance the quality of the student's learning opportunities;
* Commenting on examples of effective practice and innovation relating to learning, teaching and assessment;
* Attending and making recommendations to Boards of Examiners relating to the awards of degrees, diplomas and certificates or the confirmation of results for stand-alone modules;
* The decisions of the programme board, including compensation, referral and condonement, must be recorded in the format specified by the University. All board decisions **must** be approved by the external examiner and a record of the approval must be recorded in the minutes;
* Be consulted on curriculum development, including the introduction of new programmes of study and revisions to the existing programmes of study;
* Make a full report on the assessment process to the University on an annual basis;
* Immediately report any circumstances relating to allegations of academic misconduct in writing to the Chair of the Board of Examiners concerned;
* External Examiners are not required to give approval to degree classifications or overall module marks where the decision has been deferred due to issues relating to academic misconduct or an administrative error has occurred with respect to the recording of marks or calculation of result.

External examiners are not permitted, and must not be asked, to undertake any of the following:

* Setting assessment tasks (whether coursework, examination scripts or other);
* First or second marking of student output;
* Revising the marks awarded for the output of individual students other than through giving an opinion in specific cases at the request of the internal examiners.

External examiners are required to make an annual written report using the University pro forma. External examiners' reports are in the first instance sent to the relevant faculty office. The JBoS must monitor action taken upon examiners' reports as well as the manner in which they are brought to the attention of the appropriate persons. In addition to the above, any issues relating to the partnership will be raised at FESEC and may be referred to the relevant JDBs for consideration. Partner institutions will have the opportunity to respond to the issues raised by the external examiner which should be communicated through the relevant academic unit at the University. Faculty will send the response to the external examiner. External Examiners should be notified of where they can obtain copies of report forms but must never be sent the hard copy (as forms must be submitted electronically).

It should also be noted that the external examiner is entitled to be consulted on all draft assessment tasks, irrespective of their format, level or stage within a programme. The precise range of tasks which the external wishes to see, and the timing of the consultation, must be discussed with the external examiner in advance. The opinion of the external examiner on the validity of assessment tasks is persuasive but **not** binding. In the event of disagreement the University Moderator has final responsibility for determining assessment tasks.

## 12.2 Examination Arrangements

Partner institutions may operate examinations under their own, well-defined procedures, providing that the University is satisfied that appropriate levels of security are maintained. Examination regulations are expected to be in every way as rigorous as those of the University. The University provides instructions to invigilators and to students regarding conduct during examinations e.g. the use of academic misconduct.

It is the partner’s responsibility to arrange examination times and deadlines for other assessed work and make these known to students, together with any penalty in case of late submission/failure to submit assessed work. For example, the partner institution will need to explain to students:

* The attendance requirements for the programme;
* The consequences for missing a teaching session without prior notice;
* The penalties for submitting work after an agreed deadline;
* Exceptions to the above – for example in the case of illness or emergency – in this case, claims normally need to be substantiated by documented evidence;
* Mitigating circumstances and coursework extension procedures.

When a student has declared a disability or a health problem, partner institutions must ensure that a formal process exists to assess student requirements and ensure that where appropriate alternative examination arrangements are in place.

## 12.3 Boards of Examiners

For students on validated programmes

Partner institutions **must** operate a two tier system of Boards of Examiners, albeit membership of the two tiers may be identical as set out in the code of practice referenced below. Module Boards of Examiners must be established to determine the marks for each module, taking into account claims for mitigating circumstances. Marks must be awarded according to the University standard scale unless the module has been specifically designated and approved as ‘pass/fail’. It is expected that the Academic Contact will represent the University at Boards of Examiners meetings and advise accordingly.

Programme Boards of Examiners **must** be established to determine the progression of each student between the stages of each programme and to the award. A Programme Board may never change a mark or other decision of the Module Board. Careful attention must be paid to the regulations governing progression, compensation and condonement and degree classification. The decisions of the programme board, including compensation, referral and condonement, must be recorded on the Programme Board Report – which constitutes the official record of the University. All board decisions **must** be approved by the external examiner and a record of the approval must be recorded in the minutes.

The quality team visit a sample of Boards of Examiners meetings to observe the process in order to:

* Identify examples of good practice worthy of wider dissemination;
* Observe the regulations and procedures in operation and to identify scope for enhancement;
* Identify any areas of concern.

It is the responsibility of the partner institution to ensure that Chairs of Boards of Examiners meetings are adequately trained and have a good understanding of the University regulations. The University will provide training for partners on an annual basis and on request. The quality team has available a ‘Key Concepts’ guide covering the main items likely to be of interest to Chairs and staff involved in these meetings. It is expected that a representative from the partner institution will chair the Boards.

For students on franchised programmes:

The University faculty/academic unit will normally make the necessary arrangements for Boards of Examiners meetings for students on franchised programmes unless specifically requested by the partner institution.

Role of the exam and assessment co-ordinators

The University will work with partner institutions to ensure that all parties are aware of the responsibilities and activities involved in advance of, during and after Module and Programme Boards. For on-campus activities, each academic unit appoints Exam and Assessment Co-ordinators to oversee and ensure the smooth running of the process. This position is normally held by an academic member of staff who takes on the role as part of their duties. It is not expected that Exam and Assessment Co-ordinators deal personally with the activities but rather ensure that the duties have been carried out accurately and to the deadlines specified. In addition, it is expected that they will be a point of contact for the University academic unit/faculty representatives and external examiners. Partner institutions must consider making such appointments or adopting a similar approach.

## 12.4 Actions to be taken in Advance of Module and Programme Boards

**Module Board and Programme Board Grids**

It is the **partner institutions**’ responsibility to prepare the mark grids used at Module and Programme Boards. Examples of good practice are available from Faculty. It is advisable for the Administrator (UoH) to receive copies before the meetings take place in order to check that all the students are registered and on the correct programme, however, it is acknowledged that time constraints do not always allow for this. Any recommendations for alterations to marks by the University moderator and/or the external examiner **must** be considered by the Module Board and the appropriate changes made to mark grids. It is considered good practice to hold a **‘mock’ board** in advance of the actual board meeting where possible in order that potential issues can be identified and investigated. Please remember that the Boards must be quorate in order for any decisions to be made.

**Mitigating Circumstances**

Partner institutions **must** consider cases of mitigating circumstances prior to the Boards and the decisions **must** be reported to, Module and/or Programme Boards as appropriate.

**Cases of Academic Misconduct**

Cases of academic misconduct identified before the appropriate Module Board **must** be investigated in accordance with the approved procedures. If an investigation has already taken place, the decision of the Academic Misconduct Panel **must** be reported to the Module Board and the decision for the module made accordingly. If the investigation has not yet taken place, the mark grids should indicate that the decision has been deferred as “under investigation for the use of academic misconduct”.

**Moderator Reports**

The Administrator (UoH) should make available the moderator reports to the Academic Contact or equivalent to review and understand any particular issues that have arisen during the assessment period. It is good practice to make the moderator reports available to the External Examiner.

**Students in Debt**

Results for any students in debt **must** still be considered at the relevant boards. It is the partner institution’s responsibility to manage certificates provided by the University to students who are in debt.

Actions during Module and Programme Boards

The Chairs of both Module and Programme Boards must ensure that the meetings are conducted in accordance with the relevant code of practice. A sample of typical agendas for Module and Programme Boards with guidance on writing minutes can be found within the University Code of Practice: Boards of Examiners. It is the partner institutions’ responsibility to minute the meeting and to make available to members of the Boards the following:

* Agendas;
* Minutes of the last meetings;
* Module /programme board grids;
* Copies of moderator reports;
* External examiner comments (if available);
* List of any core and/or elective modules;
* Programme regulations and other relevant guidelines in operation e.g. treatment of borderline cases.

Actions post Module and Programme Boards

The Administrator (UoH) must send the Programme Board results in the format specified by the university (which constitutes the official record of the University and which **must** be approved by the external examiner) to Registry Services for processing.. The partner institution must publish results to students after the programme board.

Following the Board, the partner institution must distribute the minutes to the members of the Boards. It is the responsibility of the Administrator (UoH) to ensure that documentation is accurate and is signed appropriately.

The decisions of the programme board, including compensation, referral and condonement, must be recorded and documented in the format specified by the University. All board decisions **must** be approved by the external examiner and a record of the approval must be recorded in the minutes. Partner institutions and the relevant University academic unit/faculty offices will be expected to keep a copy of the documentation for their own records.

## 12.5 Role of the Student Cases Committee (SCC)

The underlying principle adopted in matters of student progress is that students on collaborative programmes should be treated as if they were students on on-campus programmes.

The structures and procedures are intended to ensure that students are treated in the same way as other University students. However, the University respects the autonomy of its partner institutions and endeavours to ensure that students are not disadvantaged through the additional application of University procedures.

## 12.6 Student Cases Issues

Extension to the dissertation period (Post Graduate Masters only)

A postgraduate student’s study period is normally the programme length (1 or 2 years dependent on the regulations). Students should complete their study at the end of this study period, but the University recognises that some may not complete the programme requirements on time, due to mitigating circumstances. It may be possible for these students to be given an extension of study. Common grounds for an extension to the period of study are medical or personal.

Students can apply for an extension to the next submission point if they cannot submit at their original submission date. If students cannot submit at this next submission point, they would need approval by the partner institutions mitigating circumstances committee. There will only be three submission points in each academic year. These are an agreed date in January, May and September.

The sole purpose of the University dissertation deferral form is to exchange information between the partner institution and the University. As a result, the University does not require any signatures on the form. Instead, each partner **must** have their own approval process to ensure both the student and the partner institution agree to the extension and were applicable, evidence has been obtained to support the decision

However if the student was unable to submit at the next submission point and it was agreed they could submit at a later submission date, a form signed by the mitigating circumstances committee would be required.

Suspension of study

Circumstances may arise which cause the student to require a break from their studies rather than complete them according to the usual duration of the programme. For example, if a student’s employer sends them out of the country on business, or in cases of illness or family crisis. Suspension of study is essentially a legitimate interruption of the period of registration.

A student may apply to suspend their studies for periods not exceeding 12 months to the Head of Academic Unit, and to the Student Cases Committee for periods of more than 12 months. Suspension of study should **not** be used as a device for extending the period of study. Once the student resumes study, they have the same amount of time to complete the programme as was available prior to the period of suspension. During the period of suspension, the student is not expected to study and is not liable to pay fees. Although there is no officially designated minimum or maximum period for suspension of study, the University does require that each stage of study must be completed within a period of 3 years.

**First Standard Suspension**

The University **must** be notified immediately if a student wishes to suspend their studies for up to one year and the student does not wish to repeat their studies.

A first standard suspension will be processed without approval from the Student Cases Committee.

The sole purpose of the University suspension form (first standard) is to exchange information between the partner institution and the University. As a result, the University does not require any signatures on the form. Instead, each partner **must** have their own approval process to ensure both the student and the partner institution agree to the suspension and were applicable, evidence has been obtained to support the decision

**Extension to Suspension/ Repeat Studies (year or trimester)/ Retrospective Suspension**

The University **must** be notified immediately if a student wishes to suspend their studies, which will result in one of the following:

* An extension to their existing suspension;
* Repeating their year or repeating the trimester;
* Retrospective suspension.

The final decision for a student wishing to suspend which will result in one of the above will be made by SCC. In order for SCC to make that decision, partner institutions **must** complete all sections on the suspension form, this includes the reason why the students wishes to extend their suspension, repeat their studies or why their suspension should be back-dated. This should also include the relevant evidence and must signed by the students programme leader.

**Repeat Year**

A decision on whether a student can repeat a year of study must be made by SCC. In order for SCC to make that decision partner institutions must complete all sections on the repeat studies form, this includes the reason why the students wishes to repeat their studies and must be signed by the students programme leader.

Mitigating circumstances and coursework extensions

To ensure consistency with students undertaking University awards elsewhere, provisions for the consideration of mitigating circumstances and coursework extensions should be the same or equivalent. The University has approved forms for mitigating circumstances and coursework extensions which can be adapted for use within the partner institution if considered appropriate.

For consideration of mitigating circumstances, the partner institution must establish local implementation arrangements. It is good practice for discussions to take place with the external examiner(s) to ensure that they are satisfied with the mechanism and can be involved to the extent they deem appropriate. The Mitigating Circumstances Committee or equivalent must meet in advance of the Board of Examiners and should report decisions to the Module Board. The meetings of the Committee should be minuted and a copy available for reference at the Module/Programme boards when appropriate.

Academic misconduct

The University has regulations on the use of academic misconduct governing plagiarism, cheating and similar forms of academic misconduct which **must** be followed by Partner Institutions. It has been established after extensive consultation and detailed legal advice to ensure compliance with the Human Rights Act.

Academic misconduct is **defined as** conduct which may gain students an illegitimate advantage or benefit for themselves or another or which may create a disadvantage or loss for another. This definition applies whether the candidate acted alone or in conjunction with another or others, whether members of the University or not, and includes conduct which is attempted. It also includes the successful (or attempted) inducing or coercing of another or others, whether they are members of the University or not.

**Definitions**

Acts of academic misconduct can take many forms. The following non-exhaustive list provides examples of the kind of conduct which may constitute ‘academic misconduct’ but this is not an indicator that Academic Misconduct has definitely been committed:

* ‘Cheating’ in an examination by either possessing or using materials prohibited in the examination room, falsifying the results of laboratory, field-work or other forms of data collection and analysis;
* Impersonating another during an examination or other assessment/related event;
* Conspiring with another or others to have work completed by another candidate, including offering work, whether for sale or not, for use by another without acknowledgement;
* Collusion (work submitted is the result of collaboration with another or others without acknowledgement of this contribution by the candidate submitting the work);
* Submitting work for assessment which has been performed or created by other persons, or commissioning third parties to perform or create the work whether for payment or not;
* Using false statements or presenting false evidence in support of a request to withdraw from an examination, obtain an assessment extension, or explain any form of absence or default;
* Falsifying a transcript or other official document;
* Making work available to others, giving opportunity for them to plagiarise (group work must acknowledge the contribution of others or collusion may be deemed to have occurred);
* Submitting work for assessment which is substantially the same work as submitted for a previous assessment (sometimes referred to as ‘self-plagiarism’).

Plagiarism is a specific form of ‘academic misconduct’. It is work which purports to be a candidate’s own but which is taken without acknowledgement from the published or unpublished work of others. Such unattributed taking is plagiarism whether from articles, books, computer programs, data, essays, papers, reports, or any other material originated by another person, whether obtained from written, printed or electronic sources, including via the Internet or any other computer-based or networked system. It is plagiarism whether the medium is literary (essays and reports), graphical (designs, diagrams, graphics), electronic (computer programs) or mathematical (proofs). It is dishonest to seek credit for work which is not one’s own.

Academic appeals

Appeals on collaborative programmes are governed by the University Code of Practice: Academic Appeals. Partner institutions must establish regulations and procedures which comply with the expectation set out in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, that “the provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students.”

Partner institutions must designate an Officer or Committee responsible for its appeals procedures and inform the Secretary of the Hull Student Cases Committee (SCC) of the identity of the said Officer or Committee. The designated Officer or Committee **must** lodge with the Secretary of the SCC a copy of the current appeals regulations and procedures. This should conform to the OIA Good Practice Framework and allow for both a formal appeal and review stage.

A candidate on a programme of study validated by the University of Hull **is entitled** to challenge the decision of the Appeal Committee through the University of Hull Student Cases Committee where the following conditions are satisfied:

* That the Partner’s appeal procedures have been exhausted, and;
* That the candidate can demonstrate on a balance of probabilities that the body which made the final decision relating to the candidate's appeal was not constituted in accordance with the regulations and procedures of the institution, or acted outside its jurisdiction.

Students wishing to appeal will need to complete the appropriate appeal form. This will include information about their appeal and should be supported by the relevant evidence. This form will be submitted to SCC who will make a final decision.

The partner institution is responsible for keeping a record of specified information and making an annual report to the SCC.

Academic discipline

The University operates a system of discipline regarding attendance and submission requirements so that students are not simply allowed to drift through a year without attending. However, any mechanism should be flexible enough to identify genuine problems, where support rather than discipline is appropriate, and to provide opportunities for students to explain and improve their conduct.

Mechanisms **should** be established for warnings to be issued, and ultimately, for a programme of study to be terminated where the misconduct is sufficiently extensive. However, the University will not delegate that final decision to the partner institution. Partner institutions should establish two levels of written warning, the first within the academic unit or equivalent, and the second out of the academic unit or equivalent. That latter **must not** be issued unless the student has been given the opportunity to explain their conduct, and **must** be based on new defaults subsequent to the first warning. Partner institutions **must** establish the criteria for issuing warnings in terms of the level of defaults triggering action.

Where both warnings have been issued and conduct remains unsatisfactory, the student should be advised that a recommendation will be made to the University that the programme be terminated. The student **should** be given the opportunity to advance reasons why the programme should not be terminated. The level of formality of this process should be carefully considered e.g. should the student be accompanied by a person of their choosing. Both ‘sides’ of the case should then be set out in writing to SCC who will make the final decision.

Partner institutions should note that there is a **distinction** between ‘termination of programme’ (activated as described above) and ‘academic failure’ (where a student has insufficient credits to progress on an award, determined by the Programme Board in accordance with the relevant programme regulations).

## 12.7 Complaints

Complaints by students on collaborative programmes are governed by the University Complaints Regulations. Partner institutions must establish regulations and procedures which comply with the Expectation set out in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education which states that the provider must have “fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students.”

Partner institutions must designate an Officer or Committee responsible for its complaints procedures, inform the University Complaints Investigation Officer of the identity of the said Officer or Committee, and deposit a copy of its appeals regulations with the University Complaints Investigation Officer.

It is the partner institution’s responsibility to make the complainant aware of their right to make a further challenge to the University of Hull Complaints Investigation Officer within 21 days of the decision if they remain dissatisfied.

In addition, the partner institution must include in its Annual Monitoring Review and Enhancement of Programmes - AMREP the following information relating to complaints from students undertaking programmes leading to University of Hull awards:

* The number of complaints made and whether upheld or rejected;
* The nature of the matters raised and any remedial action recommended and taken;
* The ethnic origin, gender and any disability of the complainant.

## 12.8 Academic Support Tutors

Partner institutions **must** allocate academic support tutors (or equivalent) to students in accordance with the guidance for the University’s own on-campus provision or operate an equivalent system. The University guidelines provide information to staff and students in terms of the allocation and role of academic support tutors, changing academic support tutors, record-keeping and confidentiality.

# 13. Quality Assurance

The University’s approach to quality assurance has been covered previously. Because of the nature of its collaborative activities the University needs to review both the academic and institutional issues of each partnership regularly. Appropriate procedures have been developed and continue to evolve in the light of experience as set out in the University Code of Practice: Academic Partnerships. Further information and guidance is available from the quality team.

## 13.1 Annual Review and Enhancement of Programmes

Most collaborative arrangements are dealt with at faculty level and the faculty bears responsibility for the overall review of collaborative programmes in the same way that it bears responsibility for programmes offered by the faculty. The mode and scope of review is set out in the codes but this is extended to cover additional organisational issues in the case of programmes offered at other institutions.

Partner institutions will join the **University’s Annual Monitoring, Review and Enhancement of Programmes (AMREP) process**. This new process forms a single cycle of reporting, action planning and implementation, and impact analysis, and helps to cover the University’s obligations as a validating body in respect of collaborative providers.

## 13.2 External Audit

Partner institutions must inform the University of any Academic Audit or review carried out by an external body affecting any programme leading to a University award e.g. QAA, OfS or Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) reviews. It is essential that the University is involved as the outcome of such audits will not only impact on partner institutions but the University. It is important therefore that the University is consulted and participates in preparations and receives reports through the relevant Committees e.g. JBoS and JDBs. Notification of such events should in the first instance be reported to the quality team.

## 13.3 Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies

It is the University’s responsibility to inform any PSRB which has approved or recognised a programme that is the subject of a possible or actual collaborative arrangement, of its proposals and of any final agreements which involve the programme. As a consequence, the University must be informed of any PSRB requirements by partner institutions at the programme approvals stage. Subsequent issues which arise should be brought to the attention of the JDBs.

## 13.4 Monitoring

The University and partner institutions receive feedback on programmes from three main sources, as follows:

Student feedback

As a minimum, it is expected that partner institutions will collect feedback from students following teaching on each module and will have in place mechanisms for acting upon such feedback and informing students of action taken. Examples of good practice are available from faculty. University faculties are expected to monitor feedback through the JBoS. It is the responsibility of partner institutions to summarise the student feedback, positive and less positive aspects of this feedback, and action taken. Partner institutions are also encouraged to look at other forms of obtaining feedback through establishing focus groups, comments boxes, electronic feedback and surveys.

Student representation

The University of Hull and the Students’ Union are jointly committed to implement an effective and coherent system of student representation at all levels of the institution. The University’s commitment is driven by the overriding objective of continuing to improve the student learning experience. It is founded on the belief that listening to students and treating students as partners, with shared ownership of their learning, results in much improvement, both for current and future students.

The University’s guidelines for student representation set out a number of fundamental principles which must be adhered to by all partner institutions. The code of practice also contains examples of good practice which partner institutions may find useful. This will normally take the form of a student/staff forum, membership being elected students on the programme and academic and administrative staff involved with the programme, preferably to also include representation from areas such as the library and IT. Partner institutions **must** ensure that for each programme:

* There is a formal means through which staff and students can regularly communicate on all issues affecting the student experience either through personal comment or via a representative;
* There are effective mechanisms for logging and responding to issues raised by students, reporting back on actions or not taken;
* There is sufficiently wide dissemination within the academic areas of issues raised and to be raised and actions taken;
* The Student Union (or equivalent) in partner institutions is properly informed of activities relating to student representation on a yearly basis.

The student experience includes: academic matters (relating to any aspect of modules and programmes including their delivery and assessment); curriculum design and development (both module and programme); learning resources and pastoral care and other forms of student support. Items which should not be discussed at these meetings include issues relating to individual members of staff or students or personal complaints and personal grievances. These areas should be referred to at the appropriate meeting or procedures.

This committee should meet at least as regularly as the JBoS and the meeting be fully recorded, with the result of resolved actions being noted, in order that the minutes are able to be audited and are received by the JBoS.

Partner institutions are also expected to encourage student representation and attendance at appropriate academic unit/faculty and institution level committees.

# 14. Key Contacts at the University

**Central**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Curriculum management, programme approvals and modifications | [QSS-Partnerships@hull.ac.uk](mailto:QSS-Partnerships@hull.ac.uk) |
| Quality enquiries – including regulations, codes and forms | [quality@hull.ac.uk](mailto:quality@hull.ac.uk) |
| Student Services Directorate  - registration, exam boards, Student Progress Committee, graduation, certificates | [collaborative@hull.ac.uk](mailto:collaborative@hull.ac.uk) |
| Fees, contracts and JDBs | [QSS-Partnerships@hull.ac.uk](mailto:QSS-Partnerships@hull.ac.uk) |

# 15. Training

Please refer to the staff development website for details of all staff development.

Particular events of interest for partner institutions are:

* Academic misconduct
* Admissions
* Module and Programme Board Briefings

# 16. Acronyms & Abbreviations

ACB Associate Colleges Board

AMREP Annual Monitoring Review and Enhancement of Programmes

APL Accredited for Prior Learning

CPF Collaborative Provision Forum

FACE Faculty of Arts, Culture and Education

FBLP Faculty of Business, Law and Politics

FEC Further Education College

FHS Faculty of Health Sciences

FEC Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee

FoSE Faculty of Science and Engineering

IELTS International English Language Testing System

JDB Joint Development Board

JBoS Joint Board of Studies

NARIC National Academic Recognition Information Centres

OIA Office of the Independent Adjudicator

EPC Education Planning Committee

PSRB Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies

QAA Quality Assurance Agency

RTS Recognised Teacher Status

SMT Senior Management Team

SCC Student Cases Committee

SSD Student Services Directorate

URS University Registrar and Secretary

UUK Universities UK

# 17. Definitions

**Accreditation** is used to describe a process by which an institution without its own degree awarding powers, or which chooses not to use its awarding powers, is given wide authority by a university or other awarding institution to exercise powers and responsibility for academic provision. The awarding institution exercises only limited control over the quality assurance functions, but remains ultimately responsible for the quality and standard of the award.

**Accreditation of Prior (Experiential) Learning (AP(E)L)** is a process by which individuals can claim and gain credit towards qualifications based on their prior learning and, sometimes, experience. Credit should only be given where there is evidence that the experience or learning has resulted in the student achieving the appropriate and clearly expressed learning outcomes.

**Agent** is used in this code to describe a third party employed by the Awarding Institution to fulfil certain functions in order to facilitate a collaborative arrangement. An agent is not normally directly involved with the delivery of the programme.

**Articulation** is used in this code to describe a particular form of formal credit-rating and transfer agreement between two institutions, one of which agrees to recognise and grant specific credit and advanced standing to applicants from a named programme of study pursued in the other.

**Award** is any UK higher education award or qualification as defined by The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies (Nov 14).

**Awarding Institution** is a university or other higher education institution empowered to award degrees, diplomas, certificates or credits by virtue of authority given to it by statute, Royal Charter, or the Privy Council, or under licence from another authorised body. It is the UK institution whose academic award is the award to which a programme of study leads.

**Collaborative Provision** denotes educational provision leading to an award, or to specific credit toward an award, of the University delivered and/or supported and/or assessed through an arrangement with a partner organisation.

**Level** is a broad indicator of the relative demand, complexity, depth of study and autonomy of learning associated with a particular award. Descriptions of the levels of UK higher education awards are given in The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies (Nov 14).

**Partner**, or partner organisation, is the term used to describe the institution or other body or individual with which the awarding institution enters into an agreement to collaborate. In this handbook, the partner will normally be a further education college in the UK providing higher education and consequently the term partner institution is used throughout.

**Programme** (of study) is the approved curriculum followed by a registered student. A programme may be multidisciplinary, or refer to the main pathway through a modular scheme.

**Professional, statutory and regulatory bodies (PSRBs)** is used to denote organisations which are authorised to accredit, approve or recognise specific programmes in the context of the requirements for professional qualification.

**Programme specifications** provide concise published statements about the intended learning outcomes of programmes of study, information about the teaching, learning, learning support and assessment methods used to enable the learning.

**UK Quality Code for Higher Education** (*the Quality Code*) sets out the expectations all providers of UK higher education are required to meet. It gives all higher education providers a shared starting point for setting, describing and assuring the academic standards of their higher education awards and programmes and the quality of the learning opportunities they provide.