REVIEW OF COLLABORATIVE PROVISION ARRANGEMENTS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| UoB College | *Completed by CP* |
| UoB School | *Completed by CP* |
| Programme Lead | *Completed by CP (if known)* |
| UoB Collaborative Programme Officer(s) (CPO) or other Academic Programme Leaders | *Completed by CP* |
| UoB Administrative Contact(s) | *Completed by CP (if known)* |
| Qualification and Title of Award/Mode of Delivery | *Completed by CP* |
| Start Date and End Date of Agreement | *Completed by CP* |
| Type of Taught Collaborative Provision Arrangement | *Completed by CP* |
| Full Name of Collaborative Organisation | *Completed by CP* |
| Collaborative Organisation Programme Leader(s) |  |
| Collaborative Organisation Administrative Contact(s) |  |
| Other key staff (please specify roles and responsibilities) |  |
| How has the collaborative organisation been involved in the completion of the form |  |
| If the programme(s) is accredited by a professional, regulatory or statutory body, please provide details |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SECTION A: Strategic Aims and Due Diligence Documentation to be appended:   * The current Legal Agreement. | |
| A1. Overview of the collaborative arrangement | *Please provide a brief background note about the collaborative arrangement, including details of the programme delivered. This will provide some contextual information to the reviewers.* |
| A2. Fit with the strategy at School, College and University level | *Links to the College Compact; “Birmingham 2030”, and international strategy* |
| A3. Briefly outline the aims of the collaboration. | *Please outline both the original aims of the collaboration as well as the aims to be achieved in the future.* |
| A4. Please evaluate how successful the arrangement has been to date.  What issues have been identified and remain unresolved?  What improvements can be made? | *Have both parties fulfilled their responsibilities as indicated in the legal agreement (i.e. with respect to the management of the programme, the information provided to students and prospective students, the implementation of the complaint procedure, are the resources available adequate etc.)?* |
| A5. Due diligence | *CP to provide relevant information in conjunction with the School.*  *Information to be provided for due diligence purposes will be tailored to each individual arrangement in line with the risk-based approached adopted by the University for collaborative provision arrangements.* |
| A6. Are there any current or pending disputes concerning the organisation which may produce negative publicity and/or may impact upon the collaboration? | *CP to provide some information together with the School* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SECTION B: Financial Viability of the arrangement and Resources of the Collaborative Organisation Documentation to be appended:   * Any available financial information to show whether costs have been covered. * The Schedule or the relevant extract from the current legal agreement detailing the financial arrangements | |
| B1. Have the financial arrangements specified in the Agreement been sufficient to at least cover the costs of all parties?  If costs have not been met, please identify the reason (e.g. reduced student intake) and whether any increase or decrease in fees is essential if the collaboration is to continue. | *Please provide evidence that the evaluation of the financial arrangement has been carried out with input from the College Accountant.*  *Please consider, for example, whether variations in the minimum/maximum numbers of student recruited has had an impact on the viability of the programme or caused resources implications.* |
| B2. Does the School have adequate staff/time to service the arrangement and to provide a Collaborative Programmes Officer where applicable (over-reliance on an individual member of staff should be avoided in both UoB and the organisation)? |  |
| B3. Is the programme financially viable? | *Please ensure that the costs that are not usually borne by the School/College are taken into account (i.e. Library costs, special adjustment required for Taught or Research Student Administration, services provided by Student Support etc.)* |
| B4. Are the organisation’s resources still sufficient to discharge effectively its part of the proposed arrangement? | *For example, is the current level of academic staffing for the programme, including the staff/student ratio?*  *Have any issues been identified with regard to: Health and Safety; support available to students (counselling, learning support, language support, tutor and welfare support, support for disabled students etc.); Career advice; teaching accommodation; physical and digital learning resources (e.g. library and computing facilities) etc.*  *For some collaborations, it may be appropriate to require sight of the latest collaborative organisation’s Equality and Diversity policy.* |
|  |  |
| B5. Please provide a proposal of the new financial arrangements to be included in the new legal agreement. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SECTION C: Management of the Relationship Documentation to be appended:   * Membership and ToR of the committee/steering group/programme management group responsible for the management of the collaboration. | |
| C1. Who is responsible for the management/oversight of the collaboration? | *Is there a formal committee, management group or programme management group?*  *If there is no formal committee/group, what alternative arrangements exist for managing the collaboration? (is there a liaison person in the School who coordinates communication etc. with the collaborative organisation?)* |
| C2. To what extent has the committee/steering group been successful in managing the collaboration? | *If applicable, please refer to the legal agreement.*  *If not, please describe whether the current arrangements have been successful.* |
| C3. In addition to the meetings of the committee/steering group, are there any other opportunities to communicate/discuss matters with the collaborative organisation and/or make joint decisions? | *Are there more informal ways in which communication is maintained and decisions are made?* |
| C4. How is the management of the relationship envisaged for the future? | *Is the current membership/ToR of the steering group to remain the same? Frequency of meetings?* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SECTION D: Monitoring of Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Documentation to be appended:   * The action plan of the previous collaborative provision review showing how recommended actions have been followed up. * The most recent handbook and any information provided to students relating to their studies * A copy of the latest version of the programme specification and details of exemptions from the University Regulations (if applicable). * Copies of the Summary Sheets of External Examiners’ Reports and the School’s responses for the last three years. * A template of the students’ feedback questionnaire and any available summary reports on questionnaires’ findings. * A sample of minutes for any Staff/Student Committees’ meetings, together with follow up actions from the last three years. * A brief summary of any academic appeals and formal student complaints submitted in the last three years. * Any external quality monitoring reports and details of follow-up action. For example, professional body accreditation reports or QAA reports. | |
| D1. UG and PGT programmes  Please provide a comprehensive critical analysis on the performance of the programme based on the data for:   * Recruitment * Progression (i.e. 1st and 2nd year non-continuation, where applicable) * Non-completion * Achievement * Employability | *Please refer to Annual review reports of the past 3 years to inform your response and provide relevant examples and/or (for UoB programmes only) extract data from* <https://tableau.bham.ac.uk/>*.*  *Does the data raise any concerns? If so, what actions have been taken to address them?*  *For programmes where the majority, or the entirety, of the teaching is carried out by the collaborative organisation, please make a comparison of this data with students on any similar programmes delivered within the School.*  *(Any ongoing or new actions should be included in the action plan)* |
| D2. What have been the key issues raised by the External Examiner(s) in the past 3 years?  If there have been concerns, how have these been addressed?  What examples of best practice/educational enhancement have been identified by the External Examiner(s)? | *Please refer to the External Examiner(s)’ reports / report summary sheets of the past 3 years to inform your response / provide evidence.* |
| D3. Students  *For programmes where a substantial proportion of the teaching is carried out by staff in the collaborative organisation (i.e. validation programmes)*  What opportunities students are offered to contribute to the development of their academic experience and their programme?  Please provide information on and an evaluation of:   1. the student’s feedback system 2. the student’s representation system 3. Personal tutoring and student support/welfare | 1. *How is feedback collected? Is the system effective? How active is the engagement of students in quality management processes and how well does the collaborative organisation responds to issues raised and/or suggestions of enhancement? Examples?* 2. *How is the system organised? Is it effective? Is there a mechanism to feedback to the students about actions taken to address concerns/suggestions raised at students’ meetings? Are students given the opportunity to access External Examiners’ reports? For UoB students, are there direct links to the Guild of Students? Are there any issues that should be addressed? Are students included in the membership of the collaborative organisation’s committee* *responsible for academic governance and learning and teaching governance?* 3. *How does the Personal Tutoring system work? How are students supported? Are there any issues that should be addressed?*   *(Any ongoing or new actions should be included in the action plan)* |
| D4. Please provide details of any other issues that may have emerged during discussions with staff at the collaborative organisations, from meeting with students and/or at Board of Examiners’ meetings.  Please provide details of how the issues have been addressed. | *(Any ongoing or new actions should be included in the action plan)* |
| D5. Staff at the collaborative organisation *For programmes where a substantial proportion of the teaching is carried out by staff in the collaborative organisation*  1. Are academic staff at the collaborative organisation appropriately qualified and deployed effectively to deliver the programme? 2. What opportunities are available for academic staff of the collaborative organisation for ongoing staff development? 3. What are the collaborative organisation’s procedures for peer review, and how is compliance evidenced?  *For all programmes*  1. Where the collaborative organisation is responsible for the assessment of students and is not predominantly a HE institution, how are staff in this role inducted and given ongoing support to ensure they carry out the role appropriately and in accordance with University policy and procedures? | *Is there a formal staff development policy in place?*  *Has the University/School contributed to the development of academic staff teaching on the programme?*  *Are staff at the collaborative organisation kept informed on good practice and changes to policy (with regard, for instance, extenuating circumstances, assessment feedback, personal tutoring, CoP on the supervision and monitoring progress of postgraduate researchers etc.)?* |
| D6. Work-based and Learning Placements:   1. If the arrangement includes placements organised by the collaborative organisation, what is the practice around visits? 2. What are the mechanisms for gathering feedback from students and from placement providers? 3. Have any issues been identified with the quality of the supervision and/or facilities provided by the placement providers? | *Please provide details for each of the questions together with an evaluation of the efficacy of the collaborative organisation’s placement system.* |
| D7. External Reviews:   1. Has the collaborative provision arrangement been subject to any external review (e.g. professional body accreditation) since the start of the Agreement?   If yes, please provide details about the outcomes. | *Please provide information about the professional accreditation body and the review that has been carried out.*  *Have any recommendations or identified issues being addressed?*  *Will there be a ‘follow up’ to the review?*  *When will the next review take place?* |
| D8. Programme Management   1. Who is responsible for programme management and development? (i.e. a management group, a liaison person in the School etc.) 2. To what extent has the committee been successful in managing the programme? | *How effective have the arrangements for managing the programme been?*  *Are any changes needed to improve how the programme is managed?* |
| D9. Programmes and Modules  *Programmes that lead to a UoB award must adhere to our rigorous standards of programme design, approval, and quality assurance, which guarantee a high-quality academic experience and meet the sector-recognised standards.*   1. Are the programme specifications and module specifications accurate and up-to-date? 2. What are the arrangements for student assessment, feedback, and progression?   *For dual/joint programmes*   1. How is UoB involved in monitoring and assessment/quality assurance of the modules and elements of the programme delivered by the collaborative organisation. 2. Please provide information on how the mark conversion system is working and whether any changes are required. | *Please provide confirmation that the programme specifications and module specifications have been checked to ensure that the content of the programme is:*   * *up-to-date* * *coherent (There is an appropriate balance between breadth and depth of content; subjects and skills are taught in an appropriate order and, where necessary, build on each other throughout the course; and key concepts are introduced at the appropriate point in the course content).* * *effectively delivered (means the manner in which it is taught, supervised and assessed (both in person and remotely) including, but not limited to, ensuring:*   *an appropriate balance between delivery methods, for example lectures, seminars, group work or practical study, as relevant to the content of the course; and an appropriate balance between directed and independent study or research, as relevant to the level of the course).*   * *provides educational challenge* * *requires students to develop relevant skills (including technical proficiency in the English Language)*   *In particular for dual/joint and validation arrangements, it is important that students are assessed effectively, and that each assessment is valid and reliable.*  *For example, the Annual Review of a dual/joint programme should be considered by a committee or management group of both institutions; the Exam Board (or equivalent) of the other institution should include a representative from UoB and vice versa, a report of the monitoring and assessment of the modules/programmes carried out by the collaborative organisation could be shared with UoB etc.* |

| SECTION E: Comments from the External Reviewer  The nominate External Reviewer should be an expert in the relevant discipline from another institution, professional body or industry, within the UK, and should not be the current or recent (last two years) external examiner for the programme.  The External Reviewer should be asked to review the completed Collaborative Provision review form and all supplementary documentation, including the expiring legal agreement, unless this is marked as ‘confidential’, and to provide comments on the efficacy of the arrangement; on the general management of the arrangement; on the student learning experience; on how successfully the academic standards are maintained and enhanced; and on any other issues that may arise from the review documentation. |
| --- |
|  |
| Name and date: |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SECTION F: Summary | |
| F1. In light of the information provided, what do you consider are the areas where improvement/development would be required if the Agreement is to be renewed? | *Issues identified should be listed in the Draft Review Action Plan together with proposed actions to address them.* |
| F2. Are there any other comments, issues, information not raised in this Self-Evaluation that should be drawn to the University’s attention? |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SECTION G: DRAFT REVIEW ACTION PLAN[[1]](#footnote-1) | | | | |
|  | Areas for Further enhancement | Proposed Action | Deadline(s) | Person/ Committee Responsible |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
| … |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SECTION H: Comments by the collaborative organisation | |
| H1. Additional comments (if any) |  |
| H2. To be signed by a senior representative from the collaborative organisation  I confirm that I have considered the completed Self-Evaluation Pro-forma, and on behalf of the [*insert collaborative organisation*] agree that we wish to renew our collaboration with the University of Birmingham, and will continue to provide the necessary resources to support the arrangement as agreed.  Name and Date: | |

| SECTION I: Discussions with other Offices required before submission to the Collaborative Provision Committee. Additional supporting documentation should be provided where appropriate. | |
| --- | --- |
| I1. College Business Partner | Recommendations/ Comments:  Name and Date |
| I2. College Planning Partner | Recommendations/ Comments:  Name and Date |
| I3. Birmingham Global (If applicable) | Recommendations/ Comments:  Name and Date |
| I4. Collaborative Provision | Recommendations/ Comments:  Name and Date |
| **Please note that the above comments must be completed before forwarding onto the Head/Director of Education/Quality in the School and CQAAC.** | |
| I5. School Leadership – Head of School in liaison with the person responsible for Quality within School, i.e. Director of Education or Head/Director of Quality  (If other Schools are involved in the delivery of the programme(s), comments and approval from each of the collaborating Schools should also be sought) | Recommendations/ Comments:  Name and Date |
| I6. College Quality Committee (This should only be completed by the Chair or their directly appointed nominee) | Recommendations/ Comments:  Name and Date |
| I7. College Board (This should only be completed by the Chair or their directly appointed nominee) | Recommendations/ Comments:  Name and Date |

1. Any recommendations made by the Collaborative Provision Committee following consideration of the review documentation will need to be included in the final version of the Action Plan, provided by the Collaborative Provision office following the CPC meeting, and approved at School and College level. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)