

**COLLABORATIVE PROVISION QUALITY MONITORING**

**PERIODIC PARTNER REVIEW**

1. **PERIODIC PARTNER REVIEW OVERVIEW**

Central to the academic mission of Canterbury Christ Church University is collaborative provision offered with various partners (organisations and institutions). As an awarding body, the University has a responsibility for ensuring the award and the student experience meet stated standards and OfS conditions of registration.

* 1. The aim of the Periodic Partner Review (PPR) is to provide timely assurance to the University that the responsibilities of all parties are being met and that the partnership provision continues to be in accordance with the agreed levels as contained in the approved planning documents and the operational handbook.
	2. The PPR should holistically and coherently focus on each partner and all its activities undertaken as part of the partnership with the University, drawing on all the data relevant to the partnership.
1. **SCOPE OF THE REVIEW**
	1. Across the University there are various partnerships, for example, partnerships involving placements, work-based learning, and apprenticeships are, in the main, are overseen by the faculty offering the relevant courses and monitoring reports submitted to University committees. Research partnerships across the University are overseen by the Research & Enterprise Committee.
	2. This document focuses on collaborative partnerships in the following categories:
* Franchise
* Articulation Agreements
* Validation
* Dual/Joint Awards
	1. The collaborative partnerships identified in 2.2 above are diverse in terms of size and focus. Additionally, some partner provisions are confined to one faculty (either within one school or across different schools) while some are multi-faculty.
	2. The PPR covers the activities across a given partner and will align to the University governance structures.
1. **CURRENT MONITORING**
	1. The current partner level monitoring includes, a range of annual high-level reports providing a summary of partnership activity with some course level trends and annual financial reports.
	2. As part of quality monitoring, the University has recently introduced the following:
		1. Annual Partnership Performance Plans, reporting to Partnership Performance Sub-Committee (PPSC).
		2. Course Performance Plans (CPP) monitoring indicators at course level and reported to the Board of Studies.
	3. In the current monitoring, there appear to be gaps in the following areas:
		1. Obtaining information on the effectiveness of a partner cumulatively and especially obtaining feedback that could inform the renewal of the MoA.
		2. The effectiveness of operational processes across a partnership.
		3. Consistency within a whole partnership, especially in multi-faculty partnerships – as current processes are generally school/faculty based.
		4. Where some of the review activities are reported/monitored – for example, where Finance might conduct insurance checks.
	4. It is proposed that the PPR will address the gaps identified (3.3 above) and will provide a more cumulative overview of a partnership performance prior to MoA renewal dates.
2. **PERIODIC PARTNER REVIEW**

After a period of operation of a partnership, it is important that consideration is given to whether a partnership continues to be appropriate to the University’s vision, mission and strategy; is viable; meets the OfS required thresholds and remains reliable in terms of legal, academic and reputational factors. Therefore, a PPR is required to ensure the continued quality and value of the partnership.

* 1. **Objectives**
		1. The objective of the PPR is to provide an opportunity for cumulative reflection on the partnership with the results feeding into enhancement activities and the MoA renewal process.
		2. The review will draw together all the different aspects of the partnership, providing holistic and coherent focus on, student academic experience, teaching delivery and operational processes.
		3. The periodic review will be based on a thorough reflection of a cumulative period, drawing on information and data from the following:
* The outcomes of the high-level annual reports and enhancement activities as contained in the annual Partnership Performance Plans.
* The Course Performance Plans.
* The agreement as stipulated in planning documents and the operational handbook.
* Outcome of any external quality processes (for example where PSRBs are involved).
* Operations of student academic administration processes.
* Any changes in the circumstances of the partner – financial, management, mission, registration etc.
* Any proposed strategic developments of the partnership.
	1. **Timing of the partner review**
		1. The periodic partner review will take place 18 months prior to MoA renewal. This period will allow an opportunity for any developments to take place prior to commencement of discussions on renewal of MoA.
		2. At the beginning of an academic year, a schedule will be developed to cover all reviews to be undertaken within the academic year.
		3. The exact timing of the review will take into consideration any PSRB requirements and specific partner context such as partnerships offering education courses, factoring school holiday impacts.
	2. **Process**
		1. The PPR will be coordinated by QSO in collaboration with respective partner team (IPAD/UKPAU) and the FDQs from the appropriate faculty.
		2. In preparation for the PPR, the respective partner team (CCCU and partner) will complete a partnership self-reflection exercise culminating in completion of the PPR template, which will serve as the PPR report. The team will also assemble other evidence in the form of documents and data pertinent to the partnership.
		3. QSO will convene the panel to undertake the review. The panel composition and sign off will be as detailed in section 4.4 (below).
		4. The panel will consider the PPR, other documents and data. During a brief meeting, the panel will hold discussions with the partner team responsible for compiling the PPR, staff involved with the partnership (CCCU and partner) and student representatives.
		5. At the end of the above meeting, the Chair of the panel will complete the PPR outcomes report template and provide this to the partner team.
		6. The IPAD/UKPAU partner team will discuss the outcomes report respective partner and provide a response.
		7. The PPR and outcomes report will be submitted to the FPPE, PPSC for monitoring and to ASC.
		8. The outcomes report and response will feed into the MoA renewal.
	3. **Role players**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Review Activity** | **Responsibility** |
| Overall oversee the developments toward the Periodic Partner Review. | Head of IPAD/Head of UKPAU |
| Coordinating the Periodic review, convening the panel.  | QSO - QSO Assistant Director and Quality Officers |
| Coordinating the periodic self-reflection exercise. | IPAD/UKPAU representative responsible for the partnership/ Academic Link Tutor/Faculty Director of Partnership or equivalent. |
| Reflection on all aspects of the partnership life cycle. | Partnership team:Respective IPAD/UKPAU responsible for the partnership.Academic Link Tutor/Faculty Director of Partnerships.Course Director/Subject Chair.Partner representativeAcademic Link tutors and academic staff involved with the partnership (depending on the partnership). |
| Provision of partner specific information on operational process, student support etc. | Academic Link Tutors/Faculty Director of Partnerships.Partner representative. |
| Approval/sign off, of the review panel | Respective SMT and IPAD/UKPAU |
| Panel members (selected from) | FDQs (from another faculty), FDL&T (or LTE representative), senior operational services staff (Registry staff)/faculty registrar (from a different faculty), student representative and QSO representative. |
| Panel chair | SMT member, Senior staff, HoS from another faculty. |

* 1. **Documents**

The Periodic Review will be based on the following documents:

* + 1. All the Annual Partnership Performance Plans, including evidence of implementation of enhancement activities and link tutor reports.
		2. Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) and any variations.
		3. All Course Performance Plans, Board of Studies reports, student feedback.
		4. Student outcomes data.
		5. A self-reflection narrative compiled by the partnership team using the PPR template (PPR report).
		6. Reports on student academic support (data to include, Exceptional Circumstances (EC), Temporary learning Agreements (TLA), academic misconduct and, extensions and deferrals).
		7. Relevant partner development documents and course documents.
		8. Documents highlighting any changes to the partnership over the review period.
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