# Requirements for Periodic Collaborative Review

## 1. Periodic Collaborative Review Framework

1.1 The framework detailed here is based on the full review of high risk provision, such as franchise. The scale and nature of the review framework may vary depending upon the type of collaboration and the level of risk involved.

1.2 Periodic Collaborative review of School-based provision is a two-part process, which includes:

a. Institutional review;

b. Review of the operation of the collaboration.

1.3 **Institutional Review** assesses whether the partner continues to be appropriate to deliver or jointly deliver an NTU award. This process allows the University to establish whether the initial criteria for institutional approval continue to be met.

1.4 Institutional review focuses upon two specific criteria:

a. strategy and context for collaboration;

b. procedures for the maintenance and enhancement of quality and standards.

1.5 These criteria are assessed through a number of methods:

a. consideration of the partner's Reflective Analysis Document, produced by the partner in preparation for the review, or the jointly prepared School and partner Reflective Analysis Document for joint and dual degrees;

b. a commentary undertaken by the Centre for Academic Development and Quality (CADQ) prior to the event using evidence provided by the School and the partner in an electronic repository of information;

c. discussion with members of the partner and the School senior management during a Development and Approval Group (DAG) review panel event, which takes place either at the partner or at NTU depending upon the type of provision and the type of review.

1.6 **Review of the operation of the collaboration** assesses the effectiveness of the operation of the Collaborative Operational Document (formerly Collaborative Framework Document) to ensure that the quality and standards of the course, and of the student learning opportunities, are maintained.

1.7 Review of the collaboration focuses upon a range of criteria which are aligned to the Collaborative Operational Document, and the initial approval criteria.

1.8 These aspects are considered through a number of methods:

   a. consideration of the School's Critical Appraisal Document, produced by the School in preparation for the review, and the Partner's Reflective Analysis Document;

   b. a commentary undertaken by CADQ prior to the event using evidence provided by the School and partner in an electronic repository of information;

   c. discussion with the partner and School course teams during a review event which takes place either at the partner or at NTU depending upon the type of collaboration and the type of review.

1.9 As most School-based collaborative provision is based on an existing NTU course, or on a jointly designed course, the course itself is reviewed through the School's normal processes for course review. This process ideally takes place before a periodic collaborative review.

## 2. Review criteria

2.1 For institutional review, the following criteria and indicative factors are used by the DAG review panel to determine outcomes.

| Criteria | Factors |
|---|---|
| **1. The strategy and context for collaboration continues to be appropriate** | The collaboration remains valid in terms of the partner's and School's mission and strategy |
| | The course continues to be located in an appropriate departmental / faculty / school context |
| | Applications or conversions are as target |
| | Entry criteria are appropriate |
| | The partner's strategy for teaching and learning remains appropriate |
| **2. Procedures for the maintenance and enhancement of quality and standards continue to be appropriate** | Governance arrangements for the oversight of the provision are operating effectively |
| | Management and administrative support for the course continues to be in place |
| | The partner's strategy for the development of learning resources operates effectively |
| | The partner facilitates appropriate staff development, including staff research, scholarship and professional practice |
| | Appropriate student support facilities continue to be available, including |

| | counselling and pastoral support |
| --- | --- |
| | Mechanisms for problem resolution between the Centre and the School operate effectively |

2.2 For review of the operation of the collaboration, the following criteria and indicative factors are used by the DAG review panel to determine outcomes.

| Criteria | Factors |
| --- | --- |
| **Communication** | Arrangements for informing the partner about changes to the course (and vice versa) are effective |
| | Arrangements for informing the partner about changes to NTU policy (and vice versa) are effective |
| **Governance** | A course committee or equivalent is in place and operates effectively |
| **Monitoring of standards** | Annual monitoring and reporting is effective and contributes to course development |
| | Comparability of standards at NTU and the partner are monitored and action is taken accordingly |
| **Teaching and learning** | The collective expertise, experience and availability of the teaching team means that students experience a quality of teaching that enables them to meet learning outcomes |
| | Teaching staff have engaged in professional development, research and scholarship activity which has had an impact on the course |
| | Course materials are supplied to the partner to ensure effective delivery of the course, where applicable |
| | Access to NOW and NTU electronic library is facilitated |
| **Assessment** | Students are adequately supported in assessment to enable them to demonstrate learning outcomes |
| | Feedback on assessment allows students to develop |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Moderation of assessment takes place and is effective in ensuring that standards are maintained |
| | Mechanisms for agreeing the details of assessment are operating effectively |
| | There is appropriate consideration of extenuating circumstances and academic irregularities |
| **External critical perspectives** | Arrangements for external examining operate effectively |
| | External examiner reports are considered, shared between the School and the partner and contribute to development of the course |
| | A collaborative academic lead is appointed, visits the partner and completes a report |
| | The collaborative academic lead report is considered by the course committee and the School Academic Standards and Quality Committee (SASQC) and contributes to the development of the course |
| | Other external critical perspectives are sought and used to inform course development |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Student journey** | Admissions, enrolment and registration processes are operating effectively |
| | Boards of Examiners are operating effectively |
| | Student progression and achievement is monitored and contributes to course development |
| | Student progression and achievement is good, is comparable to NTU home students and benchmarks well to partner or discipline expectations |
| | Graduate outcomes have improved over the period or have been maintained at an appropriate level |
| **Academic appeals and complaints** | Academic appeals and complaints are managed appropriately |
| **Student support** | Induction of students takes place |
| | Arrangements for academic and pastoral support are effective |
| | Language support is available for students whose first language is different to that of the course delivery and assessment |
| | Appropriate transitional support is in place where students transfer between institutions |
| **Learning resources** | Physical and electronic resources continue to be appropriate for effective delivery of the course |
| | Access to NTU resources is facilitated effectively where appropriate |
| **Staff development** | Appropriate staff induction takes place |
| | Staff development is provided by the School or joint staff development takes place |
| | Ongoing staff development is provided by the partner, including peer review |
| **Student engagement** | Students are engaged with quality management processes, such as course committees or equivalent |
| | Student feedback is sought and acted |

| | |
|---|---|
| | upon at the course level |
| **Marketing and promotion** | Mechanisms for approving and monitoring marketing and promotion materials are operating effectively |
| **Information for students** | Student handbooks are produced and contain relevant information |
| | Arrangements for providing students with information about their award(s) are effective |

## 3. Documentation for review

3.1 The partner's Reflective Analysis Document and the School's Critical Appraisal Document are central to the Periodic Collaborative Review process.

3.2 For joint and dual degrees, it might be more appropriate for the partner and the School to jointly produce one Reflective Analysis Document. Where this is the case, the partners should determine the most appropriate criteria for this from those set out below.

3.3 The following sections set out the requirements for the partner's Reflective Analysis Document and the School's Critical Appraisal Document:

### Partner's Reflective Analysis Document

■ The Reflective Analysis Document's key role is to demonstrate to the panel how the partner ensures that the criteria set out in the review framework are being met.

■ It is important that the Reflective Analysis Document is a genuinely self-evaluative document that provides a critical analysis of the review criteria.

■ The partner might find it helpful to structure the Reflective Analysis Document around the institutional review criteria and indicative factors set out in the section above.

■ The document should be evidence-based. Statements made must be supported by evidence provided in the electronic repository. Where reference is made to evidence in the repository, this needs to be clearly identified.

■ A final role of the Reflective Analysis Document is to provide information about good practice. When considering the evidence being used to support the claims being made, the partner should ensure that examples of particularly good, or innovative practice are included.

## School's Critical Appraisal Document

- The Critical Appraisal Document's key role is to demonstrate to the panel how the School ensures that the criteria set out in the review framework for operation of the collaboration are being met.

- It is important that the document is a genuinely self-evaluative document that provides a critical analysis of the review criteria.

- The School might find it helpful to structure the Critical Appraisal Document around the criteria and indicative factors set out in the review of the operation of the collaboration section above.

- The document should be evidence-based. Statements made must be supported by evidence provided in the electronic repository. Where reference is made to evidence in the repository, this needs to be clearly identified.

- A final role of the Critical Appraisal Document is to provide information about good practice. When considering the evidence being used to support the claims being made, the School should ensure that examples of particularly good, or innovative practice are included.

3.4 The School and the partner are required to submit electronic repositories containing key evidence as part of the review documentation. These repositories will be used to support statements made in the Reflective Analysis and Critical Appraisal Documents and will inform the CADQ commentary that will be provided to the DAG review panel.

3.5 A separate repository is required from the Centre and from the School, except for joint and dual degrees and joint delivery arrangements where one repository may suffice.

3.6 The following documents are indicative of what might be included in each of the repositories. These should represent current plans and strategies. Where reports and committee papers are included, these should include the last full three years of documentation. Please note, not all of these will be applicable, particularly for joint delivery where there is minimal input from the partner and for joint and dual degrees. Where this is the case, documents are not required to be submitted.

## Partner's repository

| Folder | Subfolders/documents |
|---|---|
| **A. Reflective Analysis Document** | A1. Reflective Analysis Document |
| **B. Plans and reports** | B1. Updated Centre Document |
| | B2. Academic and Strategic Plans |
| | Any other relevant reports/plans |
| **C. Governance committees** | For example, committees related to decision making, standards and quality, |

| | |
|---|---|
| | learning and teaching, staff-student liaison committees – as appropriate |
| | Joint decision making committee minutes should be provided |
| **D. Staff Development** | D1. Staff development events |
| | D2. Peer review |
| | D3. Staff research |
| | D4. Staff induction |
| | Any other staff development activity |
| **E. Student Surveys** | E1. Student surveys and associated action planning |
| **F. Course related documentation** | F1. Course committees or equivalent |
| | F2. Board of Examiners meetings |
| | F3. External examiner reports |
| | F4. Course standards and quality reports |
| | F5. Student outcome data and analysis of these |
| | F6. Course handbooks |
| | F7. Module handbooks |
| | F8. Evidence of appeals and complaints managed by the Centre |
| | F9. Evidence of moderation of assessment |

### School's repository

| Folder | Subfolders/documents |
|---|---|
| **A. Critical Appraisal Document** | A1. Critical Appraisal Document |
| | A2. Updated Collaborative Operational Document |
| **B. Course Documentation** | B1. Course specification(s) |
| | B2. Module specifications |
| | B3. Evidence of any changes made to the course over the approval period, and how these were rolled out to the partner |
| **C. Reports** | C1. Interim course reports and course development plans |
| | C2. Interim School report |
| | C3. Outcomes of Periodic Course Review |
| | C4. Collaborative academic lead reports |

| | |
|---|---|
| **D. Committees** | D1. School Academic Standards and Quality Committee minutes, where the collaboration was considered |
| | D2. Course committee minutes, NTU home committee where the collaboration was considered |
| **E. Staff development** | E1. Staff development provided at the partner |
| | E2. Staff development provided for School staff |
| | E3. Joint staff development events |
| | E4. Collaborative academic lead engagement log |
| **F. Teaching, learning and assessment** | F1. Course materials and assessment briefs provided to the partner |
| | F2. Marking criteria provided to the partner |
| | F3. Evidence of management of complaints and appeals submitted to NTU |
| | F4. Evidence of moderation where the language of delivery is not English |
| | F5. Collaborative academic lead engagement log |
| **G. Quality management** | G1. Evidence of comparative data analysis |
| | G2. Evidence of consideration of external examiner and collaborative academic lead reports and associated action planning |
| | G3. Collaborative academic lead engagement log |
| **K. Information** | K1. Evidence of the sign off of marketing and promotional materials |
| | K2. Any information for students provided by the School, including induction, handbooks, etc. |

## 4. Review process

4.1    The scale and location of the review is dependent upon the type of collaboration and the level of risk involved in the arrangement. This will be agreed jointly by CADQ and the School based upon a risk analysis of the provision.

4.2    For a full review, the partner should always be involved in the review event.

4.3    For an interim review, an internal panel will be held at NTU, and the partner is not required to be involved in this. The internal panel will review the range of evidence and make decisions about continued approval based on this. The internal panel

reserves the right to move to a full review where there are significant concerns about quality and standards.

# 5. Institutional review process

5.1 **Tour of facilities:** The partner should arrange a tour of the teaching and learning resources that are utilised by the students on the course(s). This would normally take place before the meetings with staff. The purpose of this is to establish whether these continue to be appropriate for the operation of the provision. This only takes place where the review is being held at the partner's premises.

5.2 **Meeting with the Senior Management** of the partner and the School to establish whether the review criteria are satisfied.

# 6. Process for the review of the operation of the collaboration

6.1 **Meeting with students** who have or are studying on the course(s) being reviewed. The purpose of this meeting is to give students the opportunity to express their views of the course(s). The meeting is a private meeting with DAG members and the confidentiality of student feedback is maintained.

6.2 **Meeting with the course team(s)** from the partner and the School. This session has an operational focus and allows discussion of the operation of the collaboration as specified in the Collaborative Operational Document.

# 7. DAG constituency

7.1 The DAG membership for a School-based collaborative provision review event is as follows:

- Chair from outside of the collaborating School;
- School Standards and Quality Manager or SASQC member from the collaborating School;
- one SASQC member, or an academic member of staff with collaborative experience, from a School other than the collaborating School;
- one or two external panel members;
- a CADQ senior standards and quality officer.

# 8. Outcomes

8.1 The DAG panel will make a decision about outcomes based on the extent to which the review criteria and therefore the University's criteria for approval of a School-based collaborative arrangement, continue to be met.

8.2 The review panel makes the following decisions about institutional review:

    a.   whether the partner satisfies the review criteria and therefore continues to satisfy the approval criteria;

    b.   the period for which further approval is given (between one and five years, based on risk indicated by the business evaluation, academic risk assessment and the findings of the review event);

    c.   required actions;

    d.   timescale for the production of an action plan to address any required actions;

    e.   recommendations;

    f.   commendations;

    g.   affirmations.

8.3   The review panel makes the following decisions about the outcomes of the review of the operation of the collaboration:

    a.   whether the review criteria are satisfied and therefore whether the approval criteria continue to be satisfied;

    b.   the period for which re-approval is given (this must be consistent with the period of institutional approval as a maximum);

    c.   required actions;

    d.   timescale for the production of an action plan to address any required actions;

    e.   recommendations;

    f.   commendations;

    g.   affirmations.

| Policy owner |
| --- |
| CADQ |

| Change history | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Version: | Approval date: | Implementation date: | Nature of significant revisions: |
| Sept 2016 | 30.09.16 | 01.10.16 | Refinement of review criteria and evidence requirements |
| Sept 2017 | 12.09.17 | 01.10.17 | Changes to outcomes of periodic collaborative review |
| Sept 2018 | 12.09.18 | 01.10.18 | None |
| Sept 2019 | 11.09.19 | 01.10.19 | None |
| Sept 2020 | 16.09.20 | 01.10.20 | None |
| Sept 2021 | 07.09.21 | 01.10.21 | Change of Supplement number from SB6 to SB4. |

| Equality Analysis | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Version: | EA date: | Completed by: |
| Sept 2016 | 04.09.16 | CADQ |
| | | |
| | | |