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Introduction:

Scope

J1: Whilst the University engages with a range of external partners and agencies (work placements, access and progression compacts with feeder institutions, student exchanges and study abroad units for example), this section of the Handbook is concerned only with the collaborative delivery of studies which lead to University for the Creative Arts awards by approved external partner institutions.

The purpose of the processes described herein is to ensure that the University enters into appropriate collaborations with partners and that, once approved, these partnerships operate effectively.

This section describes the University’s processes for approving, annually monitoring and five yearly re-approving Institutional Collaborative Partners.

Principles

J2: The University is responsible for the academic standards of all awards granted in its name: the University’s principles are:

(i) The academic standards of awards involving collaborative provision must be equivalent to those of comparable awards delivered at the University and must be appropriately aligned to UK referents.

(ii) The quality of student learning opportunities and experiences on collaborative programmes should enable students to achieve the appropriate academic standards for the specified learning aims

(iii) There must be systems in place to support the management and administration of the courses to be franchised or validated (including sound and effective quality assurance and academic liaison systems)

J3: All UCA awards delivered within a partnership arrangement are subject to the same quality assurance arrangements as those delivered directly by UCA and detailed in other sections of UCA’s Quality Assurance Handbook (QAH). This section ‘J’ details the specific arrangements that pertain only to collaborative awards. Please refer to the QAH for further information about quality assuring collaborative provision with respect to: Validation (Section C), Changes to Courses (Section E), Annual Academic Monitoring (Section F), External Examiners (Section G), Periodic Review (Section H) and Definitive Course Documentation (Annex 5).

External Definitions of Partnership Models:

J4: QAA Definitions

The University primarily uses the QAA definitions of partnership models to describe the different collaborative activities in operation with different partners. The QAA definitions below define, and are used in, the contract UCA has with the collaborative partner (the Partnership Agreement, template J8).
Franchised Provision
A franchised course is an existing (or sometimes, modified) UCA course which has been approved ('franchised') for delivery by an external partner.

Validated Provision
A validated course is a new course designed by the partner, using UCA protocols (and often in collaboration with UCA), which is then approved ('validated') by UCA as being of sufficient quality and standard to lead to a UCA award, for delivery by that partner.

Articulation Agreement
A formal agreement where UCA recognises the credit rating of a named qualification of another partner institution creating the opportunity to transfer credit and enable student entry from the named institution with advanced standing to a course, leading to a UCA award.

This differs from a Progression Agreement as the student is not required to undergo a separate and individualised application / interview for entry as admission is automatic and based upon the course completed at the partner institution (provided the student meets any UKVI requirements for admission).

Dual Award (or Double Award)
The granting of separate awards (and certificates) for the same programme by two degree-awarding bodies who have both contributed to the development and delivery of the programme of study leading to them (students achieve a degree from the partner institution and a degree from UCA).

Joint Awards
An arrangement under which two or more degree-awarding bodies together provide a programme leading to a single award made jointly by both, or all, participants. A single certificate or document (signed by the competent authorities) attests to successful completion of this jointly delivered programme, replacing the separate institutional qualifications.

QAA Revised Quality Code: ‘Joint degrees, including joint PhDs, have the additional complexity of having to mesh together the partner institutions’ policies, requirements and academic regulations. Sufficient time should be allowed to agree these during the approval stages of the partnership and the course; finalised arrangements should be specified in the formal written agreements for each partnership and each course. More detailed types of review may be necessary to ensure regulatory and quality assurance process alignment.’

UCA is not constitutionally permitted to enter into a Joint Award.

Contractual Relationships:

The models below describe different contractual relationships between the University, the students registered for its awards and the partner. These relationships inform aspects of the Partnership Agreement between UCA and the partner institution, typically in the following ways:
The Partner holds full contractual responsibility for the Student
The student has a direct contract with the partner institution. The partner operates its own Student Terms and Conditions (approved by UCA at Institutional Approval). It is responsible for delivery of the approved course(s), associated resources, student admissions, fee collection and statutory returns (as appropriate). UCA retains responsibility for monitoring the quality of the delivery and outcomes, the Boards of Examiners and certification. Students do not normally have access to UCA centralised resources and are not members of the UCA Students’ Union. This model may be applied to either a validated or franchised provision (see QAA definitions above).

UCA holds full contractual responsibility for the Student but subcontracts delivery to a partner
The student has a direct contract with UCA and is bound by UCA Terms and Conditions. The partner is responsible for delivery of the approved course(s) and associated specialist resources. UCA retains responsibility for the admissions process (in collaboration with the partner), fee collection and statutory returns (as appropriate) monitoring the quality of the delivery and outcomes, the Boards of Examiners and certification. Students will have access to centralised UCA resources and will be members of the UCA Students’ Union. This model can only apply to franchised provision (see QAA definitions above).
Approving a new Partner:

**J6: Flowchart 1 – Approving a new Partner**

- Initial discussion / negotiation with potential partner
- Partner has potential
- Complete J1 Business Case, J2 Due Diligence and prepare J3 Risk Matrix for submission to Academic Strategy Development Group (ASDG).
- Consideration given by ASDG and J3 Risk Matrix assessed / amended as fit
- ASDG approves and risk categorized as low
- QAE commences the Institution Approval and Course Validation Process (Section C of QAH / C2 for TNE partners)
- QAE convene Institutional Approval and Course Validation Event
- Panel approves with conditions
- Partner submits responses to conditions. QAE draft contract
- Conditions met and approved by Chair of Institutional Approval and Course Validation panel. Partnership Agreement signed.
- Partner not appropriate
- Notify proposed partner that UCA does not wish to proceed
- ASDG requests more information & defers consideration of new partnership pending that information
- ASDG approves but risk categorized moderate
- E&FC approves
- Board of Governors E&FC receive Due Diligence, Business Case and Risk Matrix
- Panel Rejects
- Institution not approved and UCA ceases process
- Further information/evidence required, deadline set and a reconvened Institutional Approval and course validation event required
- Significant further info
J7 The following processes for approving a new partner apply to partners wishing to operate franchise, validation or dual awards.

Processes to be followed for Articulation Agreements with Partners are ‘lighter touch’ than those outlined below (J8 – J11). Please refer to Annex 1 for an overview of Articulation Agreements and associated process.

J8 – Table Detailing Committee Approval Processes and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>TNE</th>
<th>UK-based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 - Initial Discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial discussions held with potential partners to consider whether the partner is suitably aligned with UCA’s vision and strategic plan and to articulate what the benefits and strategic drivers are for working with the proposed partner. Discussion to ascertain the nature of the partnership that is to be pursued (definitions in J3 and J4 above).</td>
<td>Director of International Studies (in liaison with link HoS’)</td>
<td>Lead Head of School¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steer provided by relevant members of the Leadership Team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision made as to whether to progress to business case and due diligence stage based on following factors: Financial Reputational Mission alignment</td>
<td>Director of International Studies</td>
<td>Lead Head of School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If it is felt that there is not an appropriate fit and that the proposed collaboration would not enhance UCA’s academic provision notify potential partner that UCA shall not proceed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 2 – Business case and Due Diligence - securing approval to proceed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>TNE</th>
<th>UK-based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The following forms prepared in consultation with the potential partner and accompanied by supporting documentation as required:</td>
<td>Director of International Studies (with input from HoS’ for academic / curriculum content and impact)</td>
<td>Lead Head of School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1 Business Case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2 Risk Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3 Due Diligence Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of the completed forms to Academic Strategy Development Group (ASDG).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals considered by ASDG (J1 and J3) and appropriateness of the proposed Risk Matrix (J2) confirmed or amendments made as fit.</td>
<td>Academic Scrutiny Group</td>
<td>Academic Scrutiny Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Where the proposed partner involves courses in more than one School the DVC (Academic) will nominate a Head of School to act as Lead Head of School for the proposal.
The following potential outcomes could arise further to consideration by ASDG:

(i) ASDG approve proposal to proceed and Risk Matrix is low. ASDG has power of final approval and the University may proceed with next stage of Institutional approval and course validation.

(ii) ASDG approve proposal to proceed and Risk Matrix is moderate / high. The proposal and Forms J1, J2 and J3 are referred to the Board of Governors Employment & Finance Committee (E&FC) for approval.

(iii) ASDG require further information and requests the proposal comes back to ASDG at a later date for reconsideration.

(iv) ASDG rejects the proposal. The lead department will be responsible for communicating the decision not to proceed to the proposed partner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 3 - Institutional Approval and Validation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once approval has been secured (by either ASDG or E&amp;FC dependent on risk level) QAE will receive notification to commence the Institutional and Course Validation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional approval (see J9 below) and Validation (see J12 below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where appropriate, the Institutional Approval Event <em>may</em> be held on a separate and earlier date than the Course Validation Event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Agreement and Annexes are negotiated and signed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Approval Event**

**J9:** The Institutional Approval Event discusses the suitability of the proposed partner and explores further with senior staff from the proposed partner any issues arising from the due diligence report, business case (and pre-event visit report for TNE partners).

The event for UK partners will normally include a tour of central resources (Library, IT) and note accessibility of these resources to all students. For TNE partners these central resources will have been explored during the pre-event visit and reported on in the pre-event visit report. The purpose of the event is to assess the suitability of
the proposed institution (not to consider individual courses) and confirm terms of the Partnership Agreement.

The panel will note which credit framework the proposed institution intends to adopt: if the partner institution will be using UCA’s CCF no approval is required; if the partner institution wishes to use its own framework then this will be considered in full at the first Course Validation for that partner institution and a condition of that first Course Validation must be that Course Approval is subject to Academic Board’s approval of the framework.

The panel will note which form of contractual relationship the partnership will operate under (see J5 above). If the Partner holds full contractual responsibility for the Student the panel will receive and approve the student Terms and Conditions.

Location
TNE: normally held at UCA (virtual attendance by partner)
UK: normally held at the partner institution

Panel Membership (UCA)
Member of UCA Leadership Team (Chair)
Head of QAE (or nominee)
Director of Finance (or nominee, as required)
Director of Academic Services (or nominee, as required)
Other senior staff (as appropriate to the collaborative partner in question)

Also in attendance
The Chief Executive and senior staff from the partner must be available to meet with the panel (Partner)
Head of UCA School/Department responsible for oversight of delivery
Academic staff member(s) that will be responsible for academic support and development (link HoS for instance) (UCA)
Head of International Studies (for TNE provision)
QAE (Clerk)

J10: Following the Institutional Approval a report will be written summarising the main findings, outcomes and recommendations. The panel may outline the following outcomes:

(i) Institution approved for collaborative partnership
(ii) Institution approved subject to conditions set by panel to be met in a specified timeframe
(iii) Further information / evidence required (deadline will be set and panel will be required to reconvene).
(iv) Institution not approved and UCA ceases process with proposed partner

J11: QAE should communicate the outcome of the Institutional Approval Event to the proposed partner institution and provide the Institutional Approval Report. Once the terms of Institutional Approval have been met and confirmed, UCA and the partner institution can proceed to sign the Partnership Agreement.
J12 Standard University Course Validation processes apply and will be implemented by QAE. See Section C of the Quality Assurance Handbook. For UK based provision the validation event will normally be held at the partner institution. For TNE provision, there is a separate process for pre-event visits to the partner to ascertain facilities and student outcomes/experience followed by a UK based validation event (see Section C2 of the QAH).

Contractual Arrangements

J13: Partnership Agreements are normally negotiated in the period between due diligence and Institutional Approval and based upon the finances as agreed in the J1 Business Case. Once Institutional Approval has been granted the draft Partnership Agreement can proceed to be signed by UCA and the partner institution (see J8 Partnership Agreement template). Partnership Agreements are established for an agreed period of time, but normally no longer than five years (it is usual practice for the initial Partnership Agreement post Institutional Approval to be for three years initially).

J14: The fees associated with the operation of the partnership are reviewed annually at the Executive Partner Meeting (Spring each year) and are documented in Appendix 1 of the Partnership Agreement. Appendix 1 is therefore annually updated for the upcoming academic year following the agreement reached at the Executive Partner Meeting. The notes of the Executive Partner Meeting are received by the Leadership Team.

J15: Should any additional courses that would lead to a UCA award be approved for the partner, Appendix 2 of the Partnership Agreement would require appropriate revisions.
Periodic Institutional and Course Review

J16: Flowchart 2 – Periodic Institutional Review

Institutional Re-Approval

J17: Each collaborative partnership will undergo Institutional Re-approval at least every five years (it is usual practice for the first Re-approval to occur three years after initial Institutional approval). As indicated in paragraph J26 below, concerns raised via annual monitoring in forms J4 and J5 could instigate earlier convening of an Institutional Re-approval event. A Re-approval visit follows the same format as the initial Institutional Approval in terms of purpose and constitution (see paragraph J9 above).

J18: The following forms are submitted for Institutional Re-approval:
  J6 Business Case for Renewal
  J7 Partner Performance Summary Report

QAE will work with the Head of School/Department and partner to complete and submit Form J6 Business Case for renewal and form J7 Partner Performance Summary Report. The latter requires submission of similar documentation to that received for the initial due diligence. The purpose of this report is to enable the Institutional Re-approval panel to assess whether the general conditions for the partnership, at an institutional level, are still being met and to take note of any changes to circumstances of the partner in the last five years. The report will draw upon the evidence provided and on the individual Institutional Annual Monitoring Reports for the last five years. If there are any recurring or unresolved issues with the partnership QAE will highlight them in form J7.
J19: Prior to the Institutional Re-approval event the J6 Business Case for Renewal, J7 Partner Performance Summary Report and financial data pertaining to the University’s relationship with the partner will be received by ASDG and any issues requiring exploration at the event itself will be highlighted.

J20: Following the Institutional Re-approval a report will be written summarising the main findings, outcomes and recommendations. The panel may outline the following outcomes:

- (i) Confirm that the Institute be re-approved for a further period of time (normally five years)
- (ii) Institution re-approved subject to conditions set by panel to be met in a specified timeframe
- (iii) Further information / evidence required (deadline will be set and panel will be required to reconvene)
- (iv) Institution not re-approved and UCA decides to terminate partnership and agree a ‘Running out Agreement’

J21: QAE should communicate the outcome of the Institutional Re-approval event to the partner institution and provide the Institutional Re-approval Report. Once any terms of Institutional Re-approval have been met and confirmed, UCA and the partner institution can proceed to drafting of an updated Partnership Agreement for signing by the two parties.

### Periodic Course Review

Periodic course review (the process by which thorough scrutiny is given to a course including consideration of the quality performance data relating to that course over the period since the last periodic review) is detailed in section H of the QAH. Periodic Review events may be held at the partner institution or via video conferencing. In addition to the course documentation required for UCA course periodic review events partner periodic review events must receive the Link Liaison Document.

### Cost of institutional approval, validation and periodic review

J22 The costs of institutional approval, validation and any subsequent institutional re-approval and periodic review will be agreed in advance and recovered from the prospective partner.
### Existing Collaborative Partner extending provision

**J23** The following process should be followed where an existing partner wishes to extend its UCA approved provision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1 - securing approval to proceed</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TNE</td>
<td>UK-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following forms prepared in consultation with the partner:</td>
<td>Director of International Studies (with input from HoS' for academic / curriculum content and impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J10 Partner Proposal to extend provision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of the completed J10 to Academic Strategy Development Group (ASDG).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposals considered by ASDG.

The following potential outcomes could arise further to consideration by ASDG:

- **(i)** ASDG approve proposal to extend provision risk is low. ASDG has power of final approval and the University may proceed with next stage of course validation.
  - Clerk to ASDG
  - Clerk to ASDG
- **(ii)** ASDG approve proposal to extend but feel the risk is moderate / high. The J10 is referred to the Board of Governors Employment & Finance Committee (E&FC) for approval.
  - Clerk to ASDG
  - Clerk to ASDG
- **(iii)** ASDG require further information and requests the proposal comes back to ASDG at a later date for reconsideration.
  - Director of International Studies
  - Lead Head of School
- **(iv)** ASDG rejects the proposal. The lead department will be responsible for communicating the decision not to extend provision to the partner
  - Director of International Studies
  - Lead Head of School

#### Stage 2 – Course Validation

Once approval has been secured (by either ASDG or E&FC dependent on risk level) QAE will receive notification to commence the Course Validation process.

- Clerk to ASDG or Clerk to E&FC

#### Course Validation (see J12 above)

- QAE

Terminating a Collaborative Partnership

J24: The decision by UCA to end a collaborative partnership can only be made by the Leadership Team, and in accordance with the terms of the signed Partnership Agreement. This may be in response to issues arising from the annual Institutional monitoring process, the Institutional re-approval process or from any other avenue (for example, contractual issues, quality failings or poor student experience or recruitment).

J25: Once the Leadership Team has confirmed that UCA wishes to end a collaborative partnership QAE will write to the partner notifying them of the decision and commencing the process for UCA and the partner institution to negotiate in good faith a ‘Running-out Agreement’ within thirty days of the agreement to terminate (see section 28 of the Partnership Agreement template J8 for details of what the Running-out Agreement should include).
Ongoing Quality Assurance

Management of collaborative partnerships at course level

J26: All collaborative courses have a named UCA link tutor and a named partner Course Leader to oversee the day to day operation of the course. They are also supported by the UCA Collaborative Provision Manager who has oversight of the quality assurance procedures and protocols governing the collaboration.

J27: Details about the operation of individual courses offered with collaborative partners must be described in the course Link Liaison Document which is normally presented and approved at validation. The course Link Liaison Document is subsequently annually updated and approved alongside the course annual academic monitoring report (see template J9 for Link Liaison Document).

The Link Liaison Document contains specific detail on the key committee structure for the collaboration (including Board of Examiner details), assessment (including assessment feedback form, internal verification form), staff development and student feedback.

J28: Flowchart 3 – Annually Monitoring a Partner
**Course Level Annual Academic Monitoring**

**J29:** Courses offered with collaborative partners, are subject to the same quality assurance processes that govern the operation of UCA courses and these processes are outlined in the UCA Quality Assurance Handbook. Course annual academic monitoring is detailed in section F of the QAH; due to the complexity of collaborative provision in some cases a bespoke annual monitoring template is drafted and agreed at validation as part of the Link Liaison Document.

**Annual Institutional Monitoring Report**

**J30:** In October each year (after completion of the course annual academic monitoring process in September) QAE will complete form J4 Collaborative Partner Institutional Annual Monitoring Report for each of the University’s collaborative partnerships. This process is separate and distinct from the course annual academic monitoring process (see section F Annual Academic Monitoring).

**Annual Executive Partner Meetings**

**J31** The University holds an Executive Partner Meeting (EPM) for each collaborative partner attended by senior staff from both UCA and the partner institution. This senior group meets annually, normally during the Spring of each year and is concerned with strategic management issues relating to the partnership. The EPM is chaired by a member of the Leadership Team and considers contractual issues (including finances, course operation and liaison, resources, recruitment and marketing and staff development). The Institutional Annual Monitoring report (J4) is considered at this senior meeting.

**Oversight across Collaborative Provision**

**J32:** QAE also compiles form J5 Overview Report on Collaborative Partners for the academic year to accompany the individual Institutional Annual Monitoring Reports. The Overview report and Institutional Annual Monitoring Reports are then submitted to Academic Quality Committee for consideration. Form J5 contains the updated UCA Collaborative Provision register and AQC will annually approve the register for publication.

Following consideration of the overview report and individual reports AQC may:

(i) Approve reports, noting any issues as appropriate that should be addressed and will be tracked through the following years Institutional Annual Monitoring and at the Executive Partner Meeting (EPM). QAE will write to the partner enclosing a copy of the report and drawing their attention to areas that require addressing. It will also form an agenda item at the Executive Partner Meeting

(ii) Require an Institute Re-approval Event if appropriate. QAE will contact the partner and make arrangements for the visit

(iii) Recommend to Academic Scrutiny Group that the University should withdraw from the partnership

Form J5 Overview Report on Collaborative Partners is included as an Annex of the Quality Report which is provided to the Board of Governors annually during
November of each year.
Annex 1 - Overview of Articulation Agreement processes

Definition
Articulation is a formal agreement where UCA recognises the credit rating of a named qualification of another partner institution creating the opportunity to transfer credit and enable student entry from the named institution with advanced standing to a course, leading to a UCA award.

This differs from a Progression Agreement as the student is not required to undergo a separate and individualised application / interview for entry as admission is automatic and based upon the course completed at the partner institution (provided the student meets any UKVI requirements for admission). Progression Agreements are overseen by the Head of Admissions.

Process
Where it has been identified that a course would like to enter into an articulation agreement with another education provider the following needs to be undertaken in the order provided below:

(i) Mapping of key content and learning outcomes from proposed feeder course against the key content and learning outcomes of the stage(s) of UCA course that they are proposing students would receive credit for. This mapping is required to demonstrate that the partner course ensures students have met the required learning outcomes of the exempted levels and therefore will be able to successfully join the course with advanced standing. This mapping exercise must be approved by the Head of School / Department within which the identified UCA course sits and evidence of mapping and approval submitted to QAE;

(ii) Sampling of student work from the proposed feeder course. This sampling is undertaken to assess the level of the output of the students work to ensure that it meets the required level that the student would be awarded credit for. This sampling exercise must be approved by the Head of School / Department within which the identified UCA course sits and evidence of the sampling and approval submitted to QAE;

(iii) Identifying, further to the above mapping and sampling, whether there will be specific required entry criteria to be applied as part of the articulation agreement. For instance, the Head of School may decide that to qualify for articulation onto the UCA course the student would need to achieve a grade of 55% or above /or a merit overall in the feeder programme. Where the students first language is not English the standard entry criteria for English Language upon entry for the UCA programme in question must be applied.

(iv) Identifying whether there will be any limit placed upon the number of students that can be admitted per annum via the Articulation Agreement to the identified UCA course.

Once steps (i) – (iv) above have been completed and provided the Head of School / Department is reassured that named qualification of the partner institution will enable completing students to enter onto the identified UCA course with advanced standing the University may proceed to draft up a Partnership Articulation Agreement. This agreement will include clauses that require the partner to notify the University should there be any
changes to curriculum content, learning outcomes of their programme. The Agreement will be for a period of no more than five years and re-mapping of outcomes and an analysis of the success of students that entered via the articulation agreement will need to be undertaken prior to any decision to renew the articulation agreement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation / Procedure</th>
<th>Validated provision</th>
<th>Franchised provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Misconduct</td>
<td>UCA regulations usually apply</td>
<td>UCA regulations usually apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>The UCA standard entry criteria for the level of course normally applies unless otherwise agreed at validation and subsequently approved by Academic Board. Applications received and processed, offers made etc by partner. UCA usually approves APL applications (using UCA’s APL procedures)</td>
<td>The UCA standard entry criteria for the level of course normally applies unless otherwise agreed at validation and subsequently approved by Academic Board. Applications received and processed, offers made etc by partner. UCA usually approves APL applications (using UCA’s APL procedures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Academic Monitoring (course)</td>
<td>UCA AAM procedures, timeframe and templates apply</td>
<td>UCA AAM procedures, timeframe and templates apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>UCA regulations apply.</td>
<td>UCA regulations apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>UCA assessment feedback form used and UCA internal verification policy adopted</td>
<td>UCA assessment feedback form used and UCA internal verification policy adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>Certificates and transcripts produced by UCA</td>
<td>Certificates and transcripts produced by UCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boards of Examiners</td>
<td>Normally held at UCA, the Link Tutor of the course would attend the Link Schools Board of Examiners and would confirm the verification process has been completed.</td>
<td>Normally held at UCA, the Link Tutor of the course would attend the Link Schools Board of Examiners and would confirm the verification process has been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>The partner’s complaint policy is used in first instance, reverting to the UCA Student Complaints policy if a satisfactory conclusion cannot be reached.</td>
<td>The partner’s complaint policy is used in first instance, reverting to the UCA Student Complaints policy if a satisfactory conclusion cannot be reached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Documentation</td>
<td>UCA templates used</td>
<td>UCA templates used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>Enrolment takes place at partner</td>
<td>Enrolment takes place at partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Examiners</td>
<td>UCA External Examiner procedures and templates adopted. Partner may be involved in nominating proposed externals. A dedicated examiner will normally be appointed.</td>
<td>UCA External Examiner procedures and templates adopted. The external examiner will usually be the same as for the in-house provision to enable comparability of standards across the provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>Either partner or UCA fee</td>
<td>Either partner or UCA fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regulations (to be agreed)</td>
<td>regulations (to be agreed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction</td>
<td>Arranged by partner with approval from UCA</td>
<td>Arranged by partner with approval from UCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigating Circumstances</td>
<td>If CCF in use, then UCA regulations usually apply.</td>
<td>UCA regulations usually apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>Recruitment undertaken by partner</td>
<td>Recruitment undertaken by partner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>