Collaborative Provision

The following relates to proposals for new collaborative courses of study, or new courses leading to dual awards or joint awards.

Outline Approval by the Business Case Committee

1. The University will consider proposals for new collaborative courses of study with Validated Institutions\(^1\) or leading to dual awards\(^2\) or joint awards\(^3\) only where the collaborative partner(s) have successfully completed the process of institutional approval set out in Annex O of the Code of Practice.

2. Proposals for new courses of study to be provided by or in conjunction with partner organisations approved as per Annex O must be considered by the University’s Business Case Committee.

3. All outline proposals made by Kent Schools for courses leading to a collaborative award should be made by means of the Business Case Committee Application using the template provided at Appendix E of Annex C of the Code of Practice. Should the decision of the BCC allow for the development in principle of the new course proposal, the School may proceed with the preparation of the business case as per the procedure and requirements set out in Annex C.

4. Outline proposals for new courses of study submitted by Validated Institutions or Partner Colleges may take the form used for such submissions within the respective collaborative partner institution, but must include the information required by the University as set out in Annex L to the Code of Practice. The outline proposal should first have been approved within the collaborative partner.

5. Dual or Joint Awards

5.1. Business Case Committee Applications for new courses leading to dual or joint awards should be submitted by the cognate or liaising School using the template provided at Appendix E of Annex C of the Code of Practice. The Application must include written confirmation from a representative of each collaborative partner setting out their indicative agreement to proceeding on the basis of the Application.

---

\(^1\) A Validated Institution is an institution which has received approval from the University of Kent to offer courses devised, delivered and assessed by the institution, but approved by the University for University of Kent credit and academic awards.

\(^2\) A collaboration leading to a dual award involves the development of a course of study that leads to the granting of separate academic awards by both the University of Kent and the partner institution.

\(^3\) A collaboration leading to a joint award involves the development of a course of study that leads to the granting of a single award by two or more collaborating partners.
5.2. Business Case Committee Applications to offer an existing University course leading to a **dual award or joint award** with a prospective new partner must also be submitted to the Business Case Committee for approval and must include written confirmation from a representative of each collaborative partner setting out their indicative agreement to proceeding on the basis of the Application. All such proposed new partners must first have satisfied the requirements for institutional approval set out in Annex O prior to the submission of the Application to the Business Case Committee.

5.3. For Validated Institutions, the proposal should include written confirmation that the proposal and accompanying business plan bear the Validated Institution’s and, where relevant, its parent organisation’s official approval. For Partner Colleges, the proposal should include written confirmation that the Partner College has undertaken an initial consultation with the appropriate cognate Division, and that the Division is supportive of the proposal.

5.4. The proposal will include evidence of an approved business plan and indicate that the collaborative partner will be responsible for providing resources and facilities sufficient to run the course.

5.5. The proposal will be submitted to the Quality Assurance and Compliance Office for approval by the University’s Business Case Committee. Following initial approval from the Business Case Committee, the proposal should proceed as per the approval procedure set out in Annex L of this Code of Practice.

6. **Memoranda of Agreement**

The University policies and procedures for collaborative provision require that an appropriate Memorandum of Agreement be drafted and signed by all parties concerned prior to the commencement of the course (at Kent, the signatory must be a member of the Executive Group). The drafting of the Memorandum can begin once outline approval is given by the Business Case Committee. The Course Approval Sub-committee will require confirmation that the Memorandum of Agreement has been signed in order to confirm final approval of the relevant course. The delivery of the course may not commence unless the agreement has been reported to the Secretary of CASC as signed by all parties and a copy of the signed agreement lodged with the Quality Assurance and Compliance Office. As a standing feature of the agenda of CASC meetings the secretary will update the Sub-committee on the status of any MoAs currently in preparation.

7. **Consideration of Courses Leading to Dual Awards or Joint Awards**

7.1 Following approval by the Business Case Committee for the development of a new course leading to a **dual award** or a **joint award**, a detailed

---

4 Kent has collaborative arrangements whereby some of its students undertake courses of study delivered by local FE Partner Colleges.
submission for the new course should be drawn up by the Course Curriculum Development Team in collaboration with the partner institution as per the requirements of Annex C section 4. Advance permission should be gained from the Chair of CASC where it is proposed that either the course specification or module specifications for the proposal should be submitted in the format required by the partner institution rather than as per the University’s templates.

7.2 In addition to the requirements of Annex C, the following matters must also be presented and considered:

i) An assessment of the capacity of the proposed partner institution to implement a quality assurance system consistent with the requirement of Annex O of Kent’s Code of Practice;

ii) An assessment of the infrastructure of support for student learning available at the partner institution;

iii) That the collaborative partner has engaged with its policies on accessibility and inclusive curricula;

iv) The CVs of the core academic staff to be involved in the delivery of the course at the partner institution(s);

v) A statement of the proposed cross-institutional support structures;

vi) Confirmation of the language(s) of instruction and assessment and whether, where applicable, the course of study meets the requirements of Annex O.

vii) An assessment of the compatibility of the regulatory framework of the partner institution with that of Kent; where necessary, specific conjoint regulations may be devised and approved by the parties;

viii) Adherence to Annex 4: Minimum Credit Requirements for Awards of the Credit Framework;

ix) The marking scheme and grade criteria agreed by Kent and the partner(s), including any proposed conversion scales for marks;

x) An indicative statement of content of the modules to be delivered by the partner and a comprehensive module mapping document indicating the course level learning outcomes to be met by the modules approved and provided by the Kent and the partner institution(s);

xi) A written statement from the appropriate representative of the partner institution(s) that it has read and is broadly satisfied with the proposal as submitted by the Kent school for approval. Where a proposal is subsequently revised, endorsement of such revisions by all contributing bodies is required. Final approval by the Course Approval Sub-committee (CASC) may be contingent on a report on the outcome of consideration of the proposal through the partner institution's own quality assurance systems being received.

7.3 Guidance on the detail of the above requirements can be obtained from the Quality Assurance and Compliance Office. In cases where a School is
looking to establish a new dual award or joint award course with a partner institution where Kent has already established such provision, the Quality Assurance and Compliance Office should be consulted as to which, if any, of the above requirements might not be necessary for the proposal in question.

7.4 Where, on the basis of the submitted proposal, it is considered necessary by Kent (i.e. by any one or more of the relevant bodies: the BCC, Division or CASC) or where it is a requirement of the partner institution or the relevant PSRB, a **conjoint course approval panel** may be established to consider the proposal in detail, which may include consideration of the materials set out in Annex C section 4. The University’s representative on such panels should normally include the relevant Divisional Director of Education and UG Student Experience or Divisional Director of Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience. Other staff, who should have not been involved in the development of the proposal, may also be nominated as required. The reports of such course approval events should be forwarded to CASC along with the course proposal for its final consideration.

7.5 Following approval of the course by CASC and the partner institution(s), the appropriate memorandum of agreement may be signed by designated senior representatives of the parties. The MoA must be signed prior to the commencement of the course.

7.6 Proposals to add a new partner institution to an existing dual award or joint award course must be forwarded via the Division to CASC for approval. Proposed partner institutions must first have successfully completed the process of institutional approval set out in Annex O.

7.7 **Amendments to Approved Courses leading to Dual or Joint Awards**

Where major changes are proposed to approved courses leading to dual awards or joint awards, including any which involve revision of the course aims and intended learning outcomes, the approval of such amendments by the Course Approval Sub-committee may be contingent upon confirmation from the partner institution that it has itself considered and is prepared to approve the proposed changes to the course.