

# Code of practice for collaborative provision

Academic Year 2023/24

## Contents

Introduction .....	3
Academic governance, management and strategy .....	3
Academic governance and management.....	3
Strategic Statement.....	3
Principles of collaboration .....	3
Types of collaborative provision.....	4
Table 1: collaborative taxonomy .....	5
The Process.....	9
Approval.....	10
Review and renewal.....	11
Termination .....	11
Forms and guidance .....	12
Table 2: collaborative grid*.....	11
Risk assessment and due diligence.....	13
Curriculum mapping.....	14
Fee reduction .....	14
Site visit.....	14
Agreement formalisation .....	15
Agreement documents .....	15
Collaborative provision register.....	15
Annual monitoring of collaborative activity.....	15
Institutional reporting of collaborative activity .....	16
Associated and Accredited Institutions .....	16
Validations.....	16
Annual review.....	16
Moderators and external examiners.....	16
Periodic reviews .....	17
Published Information .....	17
Responsibility of the collaborative partner to the University and students .....	17

## Introduction

1. For the purposes of this *Code of practice* collaborative provision is defined as ‘all learning opportunities leading or contributing to the award of academic credit or qualification that are delivered, assessed or supported through an arrangement with one or more organisations other than the degree-awarding body’.
2. The purpose of this *Code of practice* is to articulate the arrangements governing collaborative provision at the University of Surrey using a risk-based approach so that arrangements for collaborative provision are implemented securely and managed effectively.

## Academic governance, management and strategy

### *Academic governance and management*

3. Collaborative provision activities are considered and approved through the [academic governance committee structure](#). Faculties are supported by central teams to develop collaborative arrangements and progress them through the approval process.
4. The standard approval process (see paragraphs 18-33 below) applies to all collaborative activity types that are defined in Table 2 - Collaborative grid. Any other type of collaborative provision that is not included in this table is subject to a case-by-case exceptional approval process and may be referred to the Executive Board for approval. For further information and guidance please contact [qualitysupport@surrey.ac.uk](mailto:qualitysupport@surrey.ac.uk).
5. Contracts underpinning staff research with other institutions and organisations are managed by [Research and Innovation Services](#) (RIS) and are outside the scope of this *Code of practice*.
6. All agreements relating to collaborative provision must follow the approval and signing processes outlined in this *Code*. Countersigned and dated copies are held and formally registered by Academic Quality Services (AQS), Academic Registry. Electronic copies of final agreements are stored on the MoveOn database.

### *Strategic Statement*

7. This strategic statement relates to collaborative provision in respect of undergraduate, taught postgraduate and postgraduate research degrees.
8. The University of Surrey enters into collaborative agreements with institutions that share our vision, goals and commitment to academic excellence.
9. The [Strategic Statement](#) acknowledges that the University’s strategies for student experience, education and international engagement connect with the University’s overall [Strategic Plan](#). To this end, collaborations will only be entered into in conjunction with the following principles:

That the partner institution:

- i. supports the achievement of the University’s strategic aims and objectives;
- ii. is able to effectively meet the University’s responsibilities for the quality and standards of University awards;
- iii. is able to uphold the University’s academic standards;
- iv. follows both the University’s and relevant national legal requirements;
- v. meets the University’s financial requirements (if required);
- vi. meets or exceeds the University’s aims for an excellent student experience.

### *Principles of collaboration*

10. The University will always retain responsibility for the awards issued in its name. Any awards that are in the name of the University of Surrey will have been assessed in

accordance with the University of Surrey [Academic Regulations](#) and [Codes of practice](#). In addition to the Strategic Statement on collaborative provision, the University will only consider entering into formal collaborative arrangements with partners who meet the following criteria:

- there is a congruence of provision/subject range and level with those of the University of Surrey;
  - the medium of tuition and assessment (and, as appropriate, of programme administration) is the English language, except where the focus of the discipline is another language;
  - there is confidence in the collaborating institution's abilities to deliver the programme and to manage the collaboration;
  - there is a sound and sustainable business case;
  - the partner institution should have a profile and status commensurate with those of the University and/or should be an organisation of good repute and standing within its own peer group;
  - for the purposes of the collaboration, the partner institution should operate a policy of non-discrimination and equal opportunity, consistent with the requirements of the University's Charter, the law and any specific policy and code of practice operated by the partner;
  - the legal capacity of the partner institution to enter into a collaborative agreement, including, where relevant, the status of academic or professional awards made in its name.
11. If there is a need to create a new agreement with a partner who has an existing agreement with the University, then the due diligence that was collected from the previous agreement can be used. This will only be valid if the due diligence has been completed within the last five years. The partner will be required to confirm that the current due diligence is still accurate. If this is not the case, then an updated due diligence will be required.
12. If accreditation is sought, the relevant professional, statutory, or regulatory body (PSRB) should be consulted at an early stage about the proposed arrangement.

### **Types of collaborative provision**

13. The collaborative taxonomy table below (Table 1) provides a list of collaborative types and their definition. Some key characteristics related to the University of Surrey's interpretation of these types is also provided.
14. The provision of learning and research opportunities that do not directly contribute to the award of academic credit or qualification; and activities that are not assessed do not constitute collaborative activity and are therefore not subject to this *Code of practice*. Such activities may include voluntary placements, delivery of provision by visiting lecturers who are not involved in assessment of students' work, mentoring sponsorship schemes, and funding only collaborations or collaborations that are part of a Doctoral Training Partnership. If further clarity is required regarding these please contact [qualitysupport@surrey.ac.uk](mailto:qualitysupport@surrey.ac.uk).
15. Studentships requiring a legal agreement between the University and another organisation to codify financial arrangements, Doctoral Training Partnerships (DTP), or other consortium agreements and studentships that are partially or fully funded by an external partner must be referred to the University's [Research and Innovation Services](#) (RIS).

**Table 1: collaborative taxonomy**

<b>Collaborative taxonomy – definitions of collaborative provision activity types</b>	
<b>Collaborative activity</b>	<b>Key characteristics</b>
<p><b>Accredited</b> – An independent institution that has been accredited to design and deliver programmes, which are awarded by the University. An accredited institution is subject to the processes outlined within the <a href="#">Code of practice for programme life cycle processes</a>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accredited organisations are empowered to carry out the University of Surrey’s quality assurance processes on behalf of the University but under the University’s oversight as the degree awarding body.</li> <li>• A member of the Academic Registry is a member of the accredited organisation’s quality committee so that a strong link is maintained between both organisations.</li> <li>• An annual report must be submitted to the University of Surrey, summarising the partner’s quality assurance and enhancement activities for the past year, which will be considered through the relevant governance structure.</li> <li>• In principle, approval must be sought from Executive Board before commencing the approval process.</li> <li>• The University has an active accreditation agreement with Farnborough College of Technology (FCOT).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Articulation</b> – An arrangement whereby provision delivered by a partner is formally recognised for the purposes of advanced standing (to levels 5, 6 or 7) towards one of the University’s awards. Students are able to enter into a University of Surrey programme with advanced standing to levels 5, 6 or 7 from another organisation, usually via credit accumulation and transfer. Entry remains subject to admission criteria, and is not guaranteed. The University of Surrey is the awarding body for the final target award.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The University of Surrey maintains its admissions processes, i.e. admission is not automatic nor guaranteed.</li> <li>• Such arrangements are sometimes referred to as ‘enhanced progressions’, or as 1+3 or 2+2, where the numbers refer to the years spent at each institution.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Branch campus</b> – A campus of the University of Surrey that is located in a country other than the home campus, has a physical presence in the host country including some local staffing and from which the students can earn University of Surrey awards (possibly under a Dual or Joint Award arrangement).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In principle, approval from Executive Board must be sought before commencing the approval process.</li> <li>• The University has an active branch campus at the Surrey International Institute at Dongbei University of Finance and Economics (SII DUFE).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Collaborative Split or Off Site</b> – A research student or cohort of students is registered at the University of Surrey but carries out all or part of their research at a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students may be enrolled at both institutions but will receive a University of Surrey-only award.</li> </ul>

<p>partner institution. The University of Surrey is the only awarding body.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is provision for supervisory contribution from both the University of Surrey and the partner institution.</li> <li>• The approval route for this type and what forms need to be completed will depend upon whether the proposal is for an individual or cohort of student(s).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Cotutelle</b> – A research programme where one student is enrolled and spends time at two institutions leading to an awarded doctorate from each institution.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students are enrolled at both the University of Surrey and the partner institution for the duration of the degree and spend time at both institutions.</li> <li>• Students are jointly supervised by and meet the assessment requirements of both institutions.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Dual Award (also known as Dual Degree)</b> – A programme delivered by one or more organisation leading to separate awards being granted by all institutions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dual Awards are arranged in consultation with the <a href="#">Quality Assurance Agency's document 'Qualifications Involving More than One Degree-Awarding Body'</a>.</li> <li>• The taught Dual Award requires the students to study at both the institutions and should involve cohorts rather than individual students. A range of models for delivery of Dual Awards are feasible and decisions on the most appropriate model should be made based on the aims and objectives of the programme.</li> <li>• A dual award may involve more than two organisations.</li> <li>• A joint committee should be established for these collaborative types to ensure that quality assurance matters and the student experience are continuously monitored and reviewed.</li> <li>• The cumulative minimum amount of time spent at each party for a Dual collaborative arrangement should be: One academic year for undergraduate programmes and one semester for postgraduate taught programmes.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Dual PhD</b> – A research programme for student cohorts delivered by one or more organisation leading to separate awards being granted by all institutions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Dual PhD requires the student completing research under the supervision of both the collaborating partners.</li> <li>• A dual PhD may involve more than two organisations.</li> <li>• A joint committee should be established for these collaborative</li> </ul>

	<p>types to ensure that quality assurance matters and the student experience are continuously monitored and reviewed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cumulative minimum amount of time spent at each party for Dual collaborative arrangements should be one academic year for postgraduate research programmes.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Flying Faculty</b> – Teaching is provided entirely by University of Surrey staff, but delivery occurs away from any of the University’s campuses and the provision of facilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In principle, approval must be sought from Executive Board before commencing the approval process.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Franchise</b> – A partner organisation delivers and sometimes assesses part or all of a University of Surrey programme.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seek in principle approval from Executive Board before commencing the approval process.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Joint Degree</b> – Two or more awarding bodies deliver a programme that leads to an award made jointly by all participants.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The University of Surrey preference is to offer a dual award (see above), which is usually an acceptable alternative model for most partners.</li> <li>• In principle, approval must be sought from Executive Board before commencing the approval process.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Joint Delivery</b> – Two or more organisations deliver a programme that leads to a University of Surrey award.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An external organisation delivers part of a University of Surrey programme; for example, by delivering a subset of the programme’s modules.</li> <li>• Both parties may also be involved in developing the programme as a joint venture.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)</b> – a non-legally binding agreement / statement of intent may be suggested by an international partner as a method of formally identifying between the two parties that there is an intention to collaborate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outlines activities or areas for further exploration and development, without legally committing to any such activities.</li> <li>• There is no University of Surrey requirement to sign a MoU in order to collaborate with a partner; but where a need has been established, for instance where requested by the partner or as an initial step to signal official University intent to negotiate further activities, a MoU can be arranged.</li> <li>• The International Engagement Office manage MoU requests upon receipt of a completed initial proposal form, and the process falls outside the scope of this <i>Code of Practice</i>.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Placements</b> – an opportunity outside of the University that forms part of a University programme and counts towards the final</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Placement agreements are arranged within the relevant Faculty, who therefore assume the</li> </ul>

<p>award that is not a Professional Training Year.</p>	<p>responsibility for the due diligence and risk management of these arrangements. Key stages that the Faculty must follow in order to meet the above requirements are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dialogue between the University and the potential provider to establish arrangements;</li> <li>• Placement visit to ensure due diligence and appropriate risk management is in place;</li> <li>• Faculty Committee approval ensuring that the arrangement is in line with the University <a href="#">Code of practice for Professional Training</a> and University <a href="#">Regulations</a>;</li> <li>• Upon approval, the placement agreement to be drafted and signed by the appropriate members of staff and issued to the provider for signature and return. This is to be held by the Faculty and a copy sent to the partner;</li> <li>• The placement/work-based learning/collaborative element contributes to the overall credit load of the programme but may or may not contribute marks that count towards the final award;</li> <li>• The placement can vary in length from an element within a module to a whole year placement embedded within a programme.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Professional Training Year (PTY)</b> – a one year study, work based, or blended (50/50) placement embedded within a University of Surrey programme.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional Training Year (PTY) placements are approved through the University’s validation process, which approves new programme proposals.</li> <li>• PTYs are embedded within the majority of the University’s undergraduate programmes.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Progression</b> – A progression route whereby students who have successfully completed an agreed programme of study at a partner institution may be admitted at entry level to a University of Surrey degree programme.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This arrangement only grants eligibility to apply for entry to the first year of a University of Surrey programme and does not guarantee admission.</li> <li>• The achievements of students completing the provider programme are deemed equivalent to other students entering the programme at the same stage.</li> <li>• Does not involve recognition for advanced standing or credit transfer.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where students on the agreement have not yet completed an agreed programme of study, a curriculum mapping exercise will be required.</li> <li>• Sometimes known as an admission or recruitment agreement or referred to as a 4+1 or 1+1 where the numbers indicate years of study at each institution.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Study Abroad</b> - A Student from another institution comes to the University of Surrey to study one or more module and receive a transcript of credits achieved. This is a non-reciprocal one-way arrangement for inbound students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study Abroad arrangements are fee-bearing. Fee-reductions are sometimes negotiated.</li> <li>• Study Abroad agreements are implemented when demand is only one way. The University of Surrey may host students with no obligation to reciprocate.</li> <li>• Study Abroad as an activity type is feasible for independent applicants without the need for an agreement in place. Agreements usually facilitate whole cohorts of students to Study Abroad.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Student Exchange</b> - A bilateral arrangement whereby the University sends (outbound) and hosts (inbound) an agreed number of students (usually in balance) to study one or more module, complete a traineeship placement or complete a summer school.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study Exchange is only possible where a Student Exchange agreement is in place.</li> <li>• The agreement should state what the arrangements are for the transfer of credit and/or marks.</li> <li>• Whilst most agreements will be study exchanges, some agreements may be study in/traineeship out.</li> <li>• The period abroad contributes to the overall credit load of the programme but may or may not contribute marks that count towards the final award.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Work-based Learning</b> - A range of work-based learning that may involve delivering full programmes, individual modules or elements of programmes for a specific employer, or otherwise using the workplace as a site of learning.</p>	<p>The placement/work-based learning/collaborative element contributes to the overall credit load of the programme but may or may not contribute marks that count towards the final award.</p>

## The Process

16. Collaborative arrangements covered by this *Code of practice* must be approved through the University's committee structure and have an agreement signed by an authorised University of Surrey signatory. Agreements will be reviewed by the International Engagement Office, Doctoral College or by Academic Quality Services, depending on whether the agreement is national or international, taught or research, in consultation with relevant Faculty representatives and the initial proposer. This includes initial review and agreement renewal.
17. If a collaborative arrangement is related to a University of Surrey programme, then the [Code of practice for programme lifecycle processes](#) will need to be followed in

addition to the collaborative approval, review, renewal or termination process detailed below.

### **Approval**

18. The Collaborative provision approval process can be broken down into three main stages:
  - **Initial proposal** – once an idea to collaborate has been conceptualised the Academic Lead will work with the relevant professional service department (Academic Quality Services (AQS), International Engagement Office (IEO) and / or the Doctoral College (DC)) to complete, review and approve the initial proposal form. The proposal form has two parts, A and B. Part A is to consider the proposed partner and part B is to consider the collaborative proposal in more detail.
  - **Committee approval** – the completed initial proposal form will need to be approved via various Faculty and University level committees before an agreement can be drafted. The following committees form part of the approval route. The committees approving specific collaborative types can be found within the collaborative grid (Table 2):
    - Doctoral College Board (DCB)
    - External Engagement Committee (EEC)
    - Faculty Education Committee (FEC)
    - Faculty International Engagement Committee (FIEC)
    - Faculty International Mobility Committee (FIMC)
    - Faculty Research Degrees Committee (FRDC)
    - Quality Enhancement Subcommittee (QESC)
    - University Education Committee (UEC)
    - University Research and Innovation Committee (URIC)
  - **Agreement drafting** – Academic Quality Services and the International Engagement Office are responsible for co-ordinating the drafting of agreements once the initial proposal has been approved. The drafting process will require collaboration from various professional service departments, including but not limited to: Assessment and Awards, Admissions, Doctoral College, Finance, Governance and Risk Assurance, Marketing and Recruitment and Student Records and Data. Agreement templates have been developed with the University's Governance and Risk Assurance Department and are reviewed regularly.
19. It should be made clear to the potential partner that discussions do not constitute approval and that the proposal will require initial formal approval by the relevant University or Faculty committee, before the implementation of any academic activity. No statements may be made to potential partners which implicitly or explicitly indicate otherwise. Academic Leads and other stakeholders should consider the timelines for approval and liaise with their prospective collaborative partners to ensure a realistic start date for the academic activity is proposed.
20. For postgraduate research arrangements it is important to note that no advertising for studentships can take place until an agreement has been signed by both parties. Once the agreement has been signed then the studentship can be advertised in accordance with the guidelines for published information and in line with the terms of the agreement.
21. Amongst other checks the University will need to be assured that the proposed partner meets the requirements of Condition B3 of the [Office for Students](#) ongoing conditions of registration. A section has been added to the proposal forms to consider this point.

### ***Review and renewal***

22. The ongoing monitoring and review of collaborative activity will be covered by the University's Continuous Enhancement Review whereby the Faculty is required to include an evaluation of the collaboration. The University reserves the right to conduct interim reviews during the default period as specified in the agreement, together with any appropriate and proportionate due diligence enquiries.
23. At the end of each academic year, Faculties will be expected to undertake the systematic review of the agreements for all collaborative arrangements in their area to identify any that are out-of-date and any that are due to be renewed.
24. Agreements shall be subject to periodic formal review as specified in the written agreement.
25. Agreements must be reviewed to determine whether to or not to renew them. This should be carried out in the year preceding the expiry date of the existing legal agreement to ensure sufficient time to review the arrangements and secure approval to renew the arrangement prior to the agreement lapsing. The review provides an opportunity for the School/Department and the collaborative partner to reflect upon the operation, management and development of the partnership and to consider the future. Where the School/Department intend to renew the agreement, they are required to complete the renewal form.
26. If new or different activities are to be included in the partnership, any due diligence checks relevant to the changes should be undertaken.
27. The approval route for renewal forms follows the same route as for initial approval. Further information can be found within the collaborative grid (Table 2).
28. Renewed agreements will be sent to the collaborative partner by the relevant Faculty representative (usually the initial proposer) and the original signed and dated document (and signed agreement renewal form) will be sent to Academic Quality Services/International Engagement Office for recording. All renewed agreements are stored on MoveOn.

### ***Termination***

29. The University is committed to the ongoing review and development of its portfolio of collaborative arrangements to assure itself of their quality and standards. Subsequently, the University may decide to withdraw from, or not seek renewal of, a collaborative arrangement.
30. If it is decided not to renew the agreement, the termination form can be used. Evidence may also be provided and might include a formal letter indicating the termination of the collaboration and should be sent to the partner institution(s) by the Associate Dean, Education of the Faculty or Postgraduate Research Director for postgraduate research arrangements.
31. In addition, the University shall be permitted to terminate an agreement for any significant breach of the terms of that agreement, for example, but not limited to, deviation from other matters detailed in the agreement, such as the prohibited use of the name and logo of the University and/or financial irregularities.
32. Any decision to terminate an agreement will be subject to satisfactory arrangements being made for existing students to complete their programme and be assessed for the award for which they registered. Such arrangements will be determined by agreement between the University and the collaborative partner(s).
33. All agreements which have been terminated are reported to the appropriate Committee for information (Quality Enhancement Subcommittee/Doctoral College Board as appropriate and additionally External Engagement Committee for

International agreements). Faculty Managed agreements should be reported to the relevant Faculty Committee (Faculty Education Committee/Faculty Research Degrees Committee and additionally Faculty International Engagement Committee for international agreements).

### ***Forms and guidance***

34. To complete the approval / renewal / termination of a collaborative proposal one or more of the following templates will need to be completed. Further information on which templates are required can be found within the collaborative grid (Table 2) or by contacting [qualitysupport@surrey.ac.uk](mailto:qualitysupport@surrey.ac.uk):
- Initial proposal form (parts A and B)
  - Due diligence template
  - Risk assessment template
  - Curriculum mapping template
  - Fee reduction form
  - Site visit template
  - Agreement template (to be completed by AQS /DC / IEO)
  - Renewal form
  - Termination form

**Table 2: collaborative grid\***

Type	Co-ordinating Dept	Risk level	Approval route	Initial proposal (part A and B) (NB: general due diligence is included within this form)	Risk assessment	Legal and Health and Safety due diligence	Curriculum mapping***	Fee reduction (optional)	Site visit (to be completed by the Academic Lead)	Agreement	Renewal
Articulation	IEO	Low	FEC, FIEC, EEC	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Collaborative Site**	AQS /DC /IEO	Low	FRDC, DCB, EEC	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Cotutelle	AQS DC /IEO	Medium	FIEC, DCB, EEC	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Dual Award	AQS /IEO	Medium	FIEC, QESC, UEC, EEC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dual PhD	AQS /DC /IEO	Medium	FIEC, DCB, URIC, EEC	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Memorandum of Understanding	IEO, Partnerships	Low	FIEC, EEC	Y (part A only)	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Placements	Faculty	Low	Faculty***	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Professional Training Year	Faculty / Employability	Low	Validation	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Progression	IEO, Partnerships	Low	FIEC, EEC	Y (part A only)	Y	N	Y***	Y	N	Y	Y
Joint Delivery	AQS	Low	FEC	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Study Abroad	IEO, Mobility	Low	FIMC, EEC	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Student Exchange	IEO, Mobility	Low	FIMC, EEC	Y	Y	N	Y	NA	N	Y	Y
Work-based Learning	Faculty	Low	Faculty*** *	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

\* Risk levels may change depending on the total score calculated within the risk assessment form.

\*\*The level of approval is dependent upon the number of students included within the agreement. If the collaborative site proposed is for one student then only Faculty approval would be required, as an example.

\*\*\*Curriculum mapping is only required where the agreement involves progression of students where they have not yet completed their undergraduate studies.

\*\*\*\*The approval route will be determined by the Faculty on a case-by-case basis.

## ***Risk assessment and due diligence***

35. The adoption of a risk-based approach to the consideration and approval of all collaborative provision is the fundamental principle underlying the procedures in this *Code of practice*.
36. Prior to formal consideration by the appropriate committee, risk assessment and due diligence checks are undertaken on the prospective collaborative partner, which are co-ordinated by Academic Quality Services for home proposals and the International Engagement Office for international proposals, to ensure consistency of process for different prospective collaborative partners.
37. The University adopts a proportionate, risk-based approach to the due diligence process to establish at an early stage in the development of the proposed collaboration whether the proposed collaborative partnership aligns with the University's strategy and presents no undue risk to the University's reputation and standing. The process also enables the University to evaluate whether the collaborative partner possesses the academic, financial, and legal standing to support a high quality and sustainable partnership, where appropriate.
38. The perceived risk for any collaborative activity is identified at the initial stages of the approval process whereby the proposer completes a risk assessment template which will calculate the business risk that the agreement presents. This should be completed for all types of collaborative activity.
39. The degree of risk associated with the proposal will fall into three categories: 'low', 'medium' or 'high'. Factors that determine the perceived level of risk associated with proposed collaborative provision include the type of collaborative activity, the location (including where the provision is to be online-only), socio-political and economic context of the proposed partner's country of operation, comparability of education and quality assurance systems, experience and delivery and collaborative partnerships, financial health and status of the proposed partner.
40. For the purposes of this *Code of practice*, the University defines:
  - low-risk collaborative provision as that where any perceived risks may be mitigated sufficiently.
  - medium and high-risk collaborative provision as those activities where, due to the perceived level of risk, additional arrangements may be required to mitigate and manage the associated risks/collaboration.
41. The initial proposal form is used to gather accurate information regarding the proposed collaboration to provide a basis for the completion of the University's due diligence procedure and assessment of the business case. It forms part of the first stage of the approval process and determines what further steps are required.
42. Further due diligence checks may be recommended to cover the following areas: financial, legal, health and safety and regulatory/quality assurance issues:
  - **Financial** due diligence seeks to provide assurance about the collaborative partner's financial standing and whether they have the capacity to meet the financial obligations of a partnership with the University. Academic Quality Services and / or the International Engagement Office will determine whether this level of due diligence is required on a case-by-case basis. If it is necessary, Academic Quality Services will contact the University's Finance Department by e-mailing [financesupport@surrey.ac.uk](mailto:financesupport@surrey.ac.uk) and request that they carry out a credit check of the proposed partner. The outcome of which will be recorded within the initial proposal form.
  - **Legal and Health and safety** due diligence seeks to establish the statutory and constitutional framework governing the operation of the prospective collaborative partner and its capacity to enter into a legal agreement with the

University, as well as ensuring that the student's wellbeing is paramount and will not be compromised by studying at the proposed partner's site. There are two health and safety forms: one for UK arrangements and one for international arrangements. This form requires completion by the potential partner and is submitted with the initial proposal forms.

- **Academic** due diligence seeks to establish whether the prospective collaborative partner is of good academic standing based on the quality assurance systems and experience appropriate to the proposed collaboration. This activity will normally be overseen by Academic Quality Services who will confirm whether there are any areas that warrant further investigation and identify any potential risks associated with the proposal.

### ***Curriculum mapping***

43. Where a collaborative arrangement involves the transfer of students from one institution to another within an award a curriculum mapping exercise will need to be completed as part of the initial proposal stage.
44. The curriculum mapping template allows the Academic Lead to map module learning outcomes between the home and partner institution, which helps identify where there are similarities and differences/gaps. Where differences and/or gaps are identified a plan will need to be devised so that students can meet the necessary requirements to complete the programme(s) they have applied to.

### ***Fee reduction***

45. For any potential collaboration which proposes a fee reduction, the fee reduction form should be completed and submitted to the Faculty Business Finance Manager for approval and for consideration by the Pricing Committee.
46. Once approval has been received within the Faculty, the fee reduction form will be sent through to the Head of Market Insight, and Data for consideration by the Pricing Committee. The fee reduction form will need to be considered and approved during the initial proposal stage of the approval process.

### ***Site visit***

47. As indicated in Table 2 it may be deemed necessary to conduct a site visit to the collaborative partner to ensure that various areas, including the resources and safety regulations of the potential partner, meet those of the University. Reasons for a site visit include:
  - Ensuring that due diligence is conducted conscientiously and comprehensively.
  - Ensuring that academic, safety and legal procedures and resources meet the University's expectations for a collaborative partner.
  - Ensuring that the student experience is as would be expected from higher education associated with the University of Surrey.
48. If a site visit is required, this will take place during the initial approval stage of the approval process and will be funded by the School/Department/Faculty that is proposing the partnership, along with any further visits required. The Site Visit form will be completed by a member of the University party visiting the site. This will be used to confirm whether the partner meets the requirements of the University. It will also be used to document the original issues that were identified.
49. Site visits will be conducted if, during the due diligence checks, issues have been identified such as:
  - The collaboration has been identified as high risk (this on occasion could be waived at the discretion of Academic Quality Services/International Engagement Office/Doctoral College).

- The potential partner's resources are considered to be inadequate when considering the proposal form.
- There are concerns about health and safety issues.

If a site visit is deemed appropriate, then a team from the University which includes, as a minimum, the Academic Lead will visit the site. Site visits have three possible outcomes:

- Approved.
- Approved with conditions.
- Not approved.

50. The initial proposal stage cannot be concluded until the site visit, if required, has been undertaken with an outcome of 'Approved' or 'Approved with conditions'.

## **Agreement formalisation**

### **Agreement documents**

51. Each collaborative arrangement is regulated by a formal written agreement. The purpose of the agreement is:
- To ensure that arrangements have been put in place to secure and maintain the quality and academic standards of the programme of study.
  - To ensure that channels of accountability and executive action are identified.
  - To ensure that the nature of the collaborative arrangements and the relative responsibilities of the parties to the agreement are defined and understood.
  - To ensure that any transfer or distribution of resources relating to the programme are specified.
52. The agreement will set out the relative responsibilities and arrangements for collaboration (including the financial arrangements, where appropriate). The nature and content of the agreements will be proportionate according to the scale and nature of the activities involved.
53. The University will only sign agreements in English or translations attached to the English version, and the signed English version will take precedence over any translations.
54. It is important that only appropriate and authorised representatives of the University sign the agreements used for collaborative partnerships by the University which fall under the remit of this *Code of practice*. Any agreement between the potential collaborative partner and University may only be signed by the University Vice-Chancellor or authorised delegate.
55. Approved agreements will be sent to the collaborative partner by the proposer or the International Engagement Office (for University-wide international agreements), and the original signed and dated document will be uploaded to the MoveOn database.
56. Original hard copy/electronic copies of the agreement must be kept for the term of the agreement, plus a further seven years.

### **Collaborative provision register**

57. Academic Quality Services and the International Engagement Office maintain a register of all approved collaborative provision. All signed agreements are stored on MoveOn.

### **Annual monitoring of collaborative activity**

58. It is the responsibility of the School/Department to monitor any active collaborative arrangements within their area. It is important to note the number of students linked

to the activity, areas of good practice and any concerns and how they are being addressed This information will be captured annually through the annual programme and Faculty enhancement review reports. More information can be found within the [Code of practice for continuous enhancement review](#).

### **Institutional reporting of collaborative activity**

59. Academic Quality Services with the International Engagement Office will monitor active collaborations through quality assurance processes, such as the continuous enhancement review process and agreement renewals. An annual report will be produced by Academic Quality Services and submitted through the governance structure to Senate, which will report on active collaborations and their compliance with University and external requirements.

### **Associated and Accredited Institutions**

#### ***Validations***

60. The Accredited Institutions are responsible for the validation of their programmes in accordance with the [Code of practice for programme lifecycle processes](#). The Accredited Institution submits a report of each validation and periodic enhancement to Academic Quality Services for recording. If there are any discrepancies of process identified by Academic Quality Services, then these will be communicated to the Accredited Institution.

#### ***Annual review***

61. Regular, formal monitoring and review of validated programmes by the Associated and Accredited Institutions is an important feature of the University's quality assurance procedures. The processes for annual review of the validated programmes replicate, in essence, those for on-campus provision with emphasis on the collaborative partner's management of the programmes.
62. Associated and Accredited Institutions are expected to submit an annual review report to the University, in line with the [Code of practice for continuous enhancement review](#). The report is designed to confirm that the Institution has in place appropriate procedures for monitoring and maintaining academic standards, and for quality enhancement, which are subject to evaluation and review.
63. The reports are considered by Quality Enhancement Subcommittee for Farnborough College of Technology (FCOT) or the Doctoral College Board for St Mary's University Twickenham, who consider whether the Institutions are fulfilling their responsibility for quality and standards.

#### ***Moderators and external examiners***

64. The [Code of practice for Moderators within the Associated Institutions of the University](#) sets out the University's policy and procedural framework relating to the roles and responsibilities of Moderators.
65. The [Code of practice for external examining: taught programmes](#) sets out the roles and responsibilities for external examiners appointed for programmes both within the University of Surrey and its Associated and Accredited Institutions.
66. External examiners for students at St Mary's University Twickenham are appointed in accordance with standard University of Surrey procedures, specifically section A2 [Regulations for research degrees](#) and the [Code of practice for Postgraduate Research](#).

### **Periodic reviews**

67. Accredited Institutions follow the University's procedures for periodic enhancement as set out in the [Code of practice for programme lifecycle processes](#) and are required to submit copies of the report for each periodic enhancement, together with the definitive programme documentation, to Academic Quality Services for central recording and review to ensure the University's [Regulations](#) and [Codes of practice](#) are being adhered to. During the review of the documentation, any issues of concern that are identified are communicated by Academic Quality Services to the Accredited Institution to ensure they are resolved effectively.

### **Published Information**

68. Degree-awarding bodies should ensure that they have effective control over the accuracy of all public information, publicity and promotional activity relating to learning opportunities delivered with others which lead to their awards. It is crucial for the University to ensure that its collaborative partners produce information for prospective and current students that is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy.
69. In this context the term 'published information' refers to all forms of:
- Publicity/promotional material (hard copy and electronic).
  - Prospectuses.
  - Programme specifications.
  - Module descriptors.
  - Programme handbooks.
  - Certificates, transcripts and the Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR).
70. This section outlines the responsibilities of the University and the collaborative partner with regards to published information, along with information for students.

### **Responsibility of the collaborative partner to the University and students**

71. It is the responsibility of the collaborative partner to ensure that:
- i. the consistency any of marketing and publicity materials using the University's name is kept up-to-date including the corporate image;
  - ii. marketing and publicity materials do not compromise but enhance the image of the University;
  - iii. the message communicated is clear and consistent and compliant with the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA);
  - iv. all publicity materials accurately represent the nature of the relationship with the University and are a fair and reasonable description of the University and of the approved provision, in accordance with this *Code of practice*;
  - v. all references to the University and its relationship to the collaborating partners are used only in the context of the activities as set out in the formal written agreement. Unless otherwise specified in the agreement, the University will not permit its name or logo to be used to imply a general endorsement or similar of another party over and above the specific activity stated in the agreement;
  - vi. any use of the University's name or logo does not imply any responsibility on the University's part for the collaborating partner's student visa sponsor license;
  - vii. any information published in the public domain that refers to the relationship with the University must be approved by the University prior to publication;
  - viii. the University's corporate identity is used in the following circumstances in association with the name and / or corporate identity of the collaborating partner, with no part of the identity ever appearing on its own:
  - ix. On/in all publicity materials concerning programmes leading to awards of the

- University of Surrey, whether these are produced in hard copy format or made accessible through the institution's website (for example, the institution's prospectuses; programme brochures; annual reports; display boards);
- x. Social media websites managed by collaborative partners, advertising websites used by a collaborative partner to advertise its services, and recognised and reputable programme listing websites;
  - xi. On institutional signage;
  - xii. On transcripts/HEAR of a student's academic career and achievement at the institution;
  - xiii. the University Branding Guidelines must be adhered to whenever the corporate identity is used. Any proposed use of any element of the corporate identity must be sent to [Creative Services \(film, photography, design, copywriting, brand\) - Marketing and Communications | SurreyNet](#) for approval prior to publication and usage. No other use of the University of Surrey corporate identity may be made by a collaborative partner without the prior written permission of the Creative Design Team within the Marketing, Recruitment and Admissions directorate;
  - xiv. Associated and Accredited Institutions are to submit all materials in electronic form every July to Academic Quality Services, who will then disseminate this to the appropriate internal departments for approval. Ten University working days must then be allowed for the approval by the University. If information does not comply with the University or CMA, or is found to be misleading in the University's review, the collaborative partner will need to recall and reprint all material immediately;
  - xv. any and all costs for any published material, printed or electronic, are the responsibility of the collaborative partner;
  - xvi. all students who are on dual degrees, placements or taking modules are provided with information about their studies and clear statements about their rights and responsibilities as students, in the handbooks which are provided to them. The handbooks must also detail such areas as entitlements, links to student regulations, complaints and appeals procedures, supervision arrangements, legal, health and safety issues, and responsibilities of both the University and placement provider. Information is also provided in pre-placement/de-briefing meetings with the relevant teaching staff;
  - xvii. the students are provided with appropriate information during the induction period and information is contained within the student/programme handbook(s);
  - xviii. a complaints and grievance procedure is firmly in place for dealing with issues regarding staffing, resources and other matters surrounding the delivery of a programme leading to an award from the University of Surrey;
  - xix. students are issued with a transcript, which stipulates the validating University, award title and classification, modules, credits, level and results.

## Collaborative provision – approval process map

