



**MANUAL OF ACADEMIC REGULATIONS  
AND PROCEDURES 2025-26  
COLLABORATIVE TEACHING PROVISION  
(APPLICABLE FROM OCTOBER 2025)**

Academic Quality, Standards and Conduct

Student and Education Services

MARP 2025-26

## **CONTENTS**

<b>CP 1</b>	<b>DEFINITIONS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>CP 2</b>	<b>PRINCIPLES, GOVERNANCE, OVERSIGHT AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR COLLABORATIVE PROVISION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
CP 2.1	PRINCIPLES .....	4
CP 2.2	RISK EVALUATION .....	5
CP 2.3	OVERSIGHT AND MANAGEMENT.....	6
CP 2.4	FORMAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS .....	6
CP 2.5	COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENTS REGISTER .....	7
CP 2.6	PROVISION FOR DISENGAGEMENT AND TERMINATION.....	7
<b>CP 3</b>	<b>GOVERNANCE AND INSTITUTIONAL OVERSIGHT.....</b>	<b>7</b>
CP 3.1	COMMITTEES.....	7
CP 3.2	OFFICERS AND ORGANISATIONAL UNITS.....	8
CP 3.3	OPERATIONAL OVERSIGHT AND MANAGEMENT .....	9
CP 3.4	QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCEDURES.....	9
<b>CP 4</b>	<b>INVESTIGATION AND APPROVAL PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES....</b>	<b>10</b>
CP 4.1	OVERVIEW.....	10
CP 4.2	APPROVAL PROCESS .....	13
<b>CP 5</b>	<b>PARTNERSHIP AND PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT .....</b>	<b>16</b>
CP 5.1	MAJOR INTERNATIONAL TEACHING PARTNERSHIPS (ITPS) .....	16
CP 5.2	MAJOR REGIONAL TEACHING PARTNERSHIPS (RTPS).....	17
CP 5.3	MINOR EXTERNAL DELIVERY PARTNERSHIPS AND ACCESS AND ARTICULATION PARTNERSHIPS.....	17
CP 5.4	STUDY ABROAD/EXCHANGE.....	17
<b>CP 6</b>	<b>QUALITY ASSURANCE .....</b>	<b>17</b>
CP 6.1	COURSE DESIGN AND APPROVAL PROCESS .....	17
CP 6.2	PSRB ACCREDITATION .....	18
CP 6.3	RECRUITMENT AND ADMISSIONS .....	19
CP 6.4	ASSESSMENT .....	19
CP 6.5	PROGRAMME MONITORING AND REVIEW.....	21
CP 6.6	MINOR EXTERNAL DELIVERY, STUDY ABROAD/EXCHANGE, ACCESS AND ARTICULATION.....	21

<b>CP 6.7 OTHER QA PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>CP 7 PARTNERSHIP REVIEW.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>CP 7.1 MAJOR ITPS AND RTPS .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>CP 7.2 MINOR EXTERNAL DELIVERY ITPS AND RTPS, STUDY ABROAD/EXCHANGE, ARTICULATION AND ACCESS.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>CP 8 TERMINATION OF PARTNERSHIPS .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>CP 9 INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS AND DELIVERY ORGANISATIONS, SUPPORT PROVIDERS OR PARTNERS.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>CP 10 CERTIFICATES AND RECORDS OF STUDY.....</b>	<b>25</b>

**MARP 2025-26**  
**COLLABORATIVE TEACHING PROVISION**

**CP 1    DEFINITIONS**

- CP 1.1 Collaborative provision is defined by the University as any formal arrangement whereby the University engages in partnership with another organisation (or organisations) in order to:
- (a) enable access to programmes leading to the award of Lancaster University credit or Lancaster University qualifications through:
    - (i) **Access** programmes (1+3 at UG level, 1+1 at PGT level);
    - (ii) **Articulation** arrangements (2+2 and 2+3 at UG level);
  - (b) enable students to study at another HE institution or organisation and transfer back credit that will count towards a Lancaster award through **Study Abroad/Exchange** arrangements;
  - (c) deliver or validate whole programmes, or parts of programmes, leading to the award of Lancaster University credit or Lancaster University qualifications through **External Delivery/Validation** arrangements;
  - (d) to allow for split-site PhDs leading to Dual Degree awards.
- CP 1.2 More detailed information about the different types of partnership arrangements is available from Academic Quality, Standards and Conduct (AQSC).  
  
Full details of individual partnerships can be found in the University's Register of Collaborative Agreements which is maintained by AQSC. Please contact AQSC directly if you require access to the library of agreements.
- CP 1.3 Lancaster University is able to award the following types of qualifications through collaborative teaching partnerships.
- (a) A **Single Degree** is a degree awarded by Lancaster University only. Single degree awards are typically made where the collaborative partner, which delivers the programme, does not have its own degree awarding powers (for example UK FE colleges or overseas institutions which are comparatively recently established and have not yet been given degree awarding powers by their respective governments). The curriculum delivered by the partner may be (i) Lancaster University's curriculum, or (ii) the partner's curriculum.
  - (b) **Double Degrees** are two degrees awarded on successful completion of a programme of study which involves a period of study at a partner institution, followed by a period of study at Lancaster (or vice-versa), with credit from the Lancaster study being recognised by the partner institution towards the award of its own degree. On successful completion of the standard Lancaster degree programme, the student will receive the Lancaster degree award but will also

receive a degree from the partner institution on the basis of the credit awarded for the Lancaster programme and credit gained at the partner institution. The two awards are normally awarded on the basis of different bodies of work studied over a different period of time.

- (c) **Dual (or Triple) Degrees** are two (or three) degrees, one awarded by each partner institution with degree-awarding powers, on successful completion of programmes delivered through the collaborative teaching partnership. The programmes may be designed (wholly or in part) and delivered (wholly or in part) by staff at the partner institution(s). However, in order to ensure it can properly discharge its responsibility both for the quality of the educational experience given to students and also for the standard of the Lancaster degree award, Lancaster University expects to have significant input into programme design (including assessment strategies and methods) and also to be involved in assessment procedures (including participation in examination boards) and through the appointment and deployment of External Examiners. At the end of the prescribed programme of study two (or three) separate degree awards are made to students who have succeeded in meeting the academic criteria stipulated. One degree is awarded by Lancaster University and one awarded by each partner institution. Each award is granted on the basis of the same body of work, studied over the same period of time, and the same assessment regime and on the recommendation of a joint examination board in which both or all partners participate. Separate degree certificates are issued by each partner institution but there is a single joint transcript which makes explicit the nature of the collaboration and the location of delivery.
- (d) **Joint Degrees** are awards made under an arrangement whereby Lancaster and another awarding body (or bodies) jointly develop and deliver a single programme leading to a single qualification awarded jointly by both (or all) participants. There is a single joint degree certificate and a single joint transcript. In June 2011 Lancaster University revised its Charter and Statutes to include a specific and explicit power to award joint degrees in partnership with other organisations.

## **CP 2 PRINCIPLES, GOVERNANCE, OVERSIGHT AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR COLLABORATIVE PROVISION**

### **CP 2.1 PRINCIPLES**

- CP 2.1.1 The University gives consideration to entering into a collaborative teaching partnership with another organisation where the partnership is in the strategic interests of both parties and where the partnership will be to the demonstrable mutual benefit of both the University and the partner institution(s).
- CP 2.1.2 The University's formal procedures for the establishment and management of collaborative teaching partnerships (including the various stages of the formal due diligence and partnership approval process (see CP 4 below), management oversight, and arrangements for operational management, monitoring and review) are agreed at institutional level by the Collaborative Provision Oversight Committee (CPOC) and Senate, and are subject to regular review and updating in the light of experience and changing circumstances.

CP 2.1.3 Procedures are designed to ensure that there are adequate safeguards in place against financial impropriety or conflicts of interest that might compromise academic standards or the quality of learning opportunities. For example, in both the partnership approval process and in the periodic partnership review process, consideration of strategic alignment, finances and the business case must be conducted separately from consideration of the academic proposal, approval of academic provision and scrutiny of processes for the management of quality and standards.

## **CP 2.2 RISK EVALUATION**

- CP 2.2.1 The degree of risk determines the level and detail of scrutiny undertaken before a formal partnership agreement can be signed; the level of approval needed for the partner and the partnership, the process for approving academic provision leading to the award of Lancaster qualifications and/or credit; and the nature and structure of the management, oversight, monitoring and review arrangements for the partnership once it is established.
- CP 2.2.2 **Access, Articulation, Study Abroad/Exchange** partnerships are normally considered to be low risk (although they might be assessed as medium risk depending on the location or the particular circumstances of the proposed partner).
- CP 2.2.3 Small-scale **External Delivery/Validation** partnerships, i.e. those limited to one or two programmes, are generally considered to be medium risk and are managed and operated at departmental/faculty level. These arrangements are then monitored at faculty level but reviewed periodically by the University. Occasionally the nature or the location of the partner might mean that a small-scale partnership is judged to be high-risk and that it therefore needs to be managed, monitored and reviewed at institutional level.
- CP 2.2.4 Partnerships involving large-scale **External Delivery/Validation** delivery of provision leading to Lancaster degree awards, i.e. institutional-level, multi-faculty partnerships where the partner delivers a range of programmes leading to the award of Lancaster University qualifications, are normally considered to be intrinsically higher risk because of the scale, nature and/or location of the partnership. For this reason these major partnerships are managed, monitored and reviewed at institutional level although they are operated on a day-to-day basis primarily at departmental/faculty level.
- CP 2.2.5 Some partnerships include elements of more than one of the above collaborative teaching arrangements. These are managed at the level appropriate for the highest risk element.
- CP 2.2.6 In summary, the assessment of risk is informed by the extent to which the University has direct control over factors with the potential to affect:
- (a) the quality of educational provision and the student experience;
  - (b) the standards of the academic awards made by the University;
  - (c) the University's reputation and standing;
  - (d) the University's financial sustainability; and

- (e) the governmental, legal and regulatory framework and environment in the partner country and the extent to which this will influence the partnership and might change the standing of the partnership.
- CP 2.2.7 More information about the levels of risk associated with different types of partnership arrangement is available from AQSC.

**CP 2.3    OVERSIGHT AND MANAGEMENT**

- CP 2.3.1 Structures and processes for the oversight and management of collaborative provision and the level of devolved responsibility are determined in negotiation with partner organisations during the initial approval process, on the basis of risk evaluation and risk management, and as appropriate for the strengths and circumstances of each partner. Arrangements are open to re-negotiation and revision as an individual partnership develops and matures and/or the partnership environment changes.
- CP 2.3.2 Whatever the arrangements, and regardless of what specific responsibilities and authority have been devolved to a partner, the University recognises that:
- (a) it has ultimate responsibility for Lancaster University awards or credit;
  - (b) collaborative provision is the responsibility of the University, and not any constituent part(s);
  - (c) every effort must be made to ensure that all teaching, learning and assessment undertaken through collaborative provision, and the degrees awarded, are academically equivalent to the University's internal provision.

**CP 2.4    FORMAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS**

- CP 2.4.1 The University requires a formal, legally-binding partnership agreement, called a Memorandum of Agreement (MoA), to be signed before the commencement of any of the collaborative partnership arrangements described above. MoAs are designed to protect the students enrolled on programmes delivered under the partnership agreement and also to protect the University's position in terms of its obligations and liabilities and to protect its name and reputation. MoAs clarify the terms of the agreement, the rights, responsibilities and obligations, constraints, financial arrangements, and set out the terms on which the agreement can be terminated. MoAs are institutional-level agreements, signed by an officer with delegated authority from Senate. The Director of Strategic Planning and Governance (or nominee) must approve the form and content of all such agreements before they can be signed.
- CP 2.4.2 For other types of collaboration, for example those which do not lead to a Lancaster University award or granting of credit and which incur no legal or financial liability for the University, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) or Letter of Intent, both non-legally binding agreements, may be sufficient. A MoU or Letter of Intent is also likely to be required at an early point in negotiations relating to a medium or high risk partnership, to be superseded by an MoA at the conclusion of the approval process. MoUs and Letters of Intent still have to be signed at institutional level and the Director of Strategic Planning and Governance (or nominee) must approve the form and content of all such agreements before they can be signed.

CP 2.4.3 Templates for different types of agreement are available from AQSC or from Governance. These teams will advise on the completion of MoAs/MoUs.

## **CP 2.5 COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENTS REGISTER**

CP 2.5.1 Once formal approval for a collaborative teaching partnership has been granted, and the agreement signed by both/all parties, collaborative teaching agreements (MoA and MoU), together with headline information about each partnership, are uploaded onto the University's Collaborative Agreements Register. The Register is managed by the AQSC team in Student Based Services and is accessible by staff of the University on request.

## **CP 2.6 PROVISION FOR DISENGAGEMENT AND TERMINATION**

CP 2.6.1 In case any party to an agreement decides to withdraw from the arrangement or terminate the agreement, the standard MoA template used by the University includes clauses setting out the grounds for termination and the consequences of termination for each partner. These clauses specify the respective obligations of each partner in order to ensure that students enrolled on programmes delivered under the partnership arrangement are able to complete their programmes of study if they wish to do so.

CP 2.6.2 Upon termination of a collaborative teaching agreement, no new students will normally be admitted to any programme covered by the agreement. The University will also negotiate a separate "teaching out" agreement with the partner(s) to protect the interests of students already registered on programmes and to ensure that every effort will be made by all partners to ensure that students are able to complete their programme. A template teaching out agreement is available on request from AQSC.

## **CP 3 GOVERNANCE AND INSTITUTIONAL OVERSIGHT**

### **CP 3.1 COMMITTEES**

CP 3.1.1 **Senate** is the University body with ultimate responsibility for ensuring that the standards and quality of the University's collaborative provision are equivalent to those of the University's own internal programmes. Senate discharges its responsibility in accordance with the approved Schedule of Senate Delegation and agreed procedures for the management and oversight of collaborative provision.

CP 3.1.2 The main sub-committees of Senate involved with collaborative provision are:

- (a) the [Collaborative Partnership Sub-Committee \(CPSC\)](#) with responsibility, on behalf of Senate, for developing and monitoring policies and procedures relating to collaborative provision and for ensuring that these are implemented, and for ensuring that collaborative partnerships are established and managed in line with agreed policies and procedures, identifying issues which may have strategic, policy or operational implications for the University;
- (b) the [Education Committee](#). A sub-committee of the Education Committee is the [Academic Standards and Quality Committee \(ASQC\)](#) with responsibility for ensuring that there are comparable academic standards and equivalent educational experience across the University's programmes and also for approving academic regulations of all taught and research degree programmes.

- CP 3.1.3 The International Strategy Implementation Group (**ISIG**) is responsible to the Vice-Chancellor for co-ordinating the operational elements of the University's existing international partnerships and for identifying new opportunities.
- CP 3.1.4 **Faculty Teaching Committees** approve proposals for programmes to be delivered in the University's International Teaching Partnerships (ITPs) and in considering any such proposals, ensure that proposed programmes and contributory modules leading to Lancaster University qualifications, wherever delivered, are equivalent to corresponding programmes delivered at Lancaster, are aligned with the criteria set out in section CP 1.3 above, with other Lancaster University requirements contained in this chapter and also with UK HE sector benchmarks and requirements. Where there is good reason for variation this must be approved by Senate or the relevant body or officer with delegated authority from Senate.
- CP 3.1.5 The Collaborative Provision Teaching Committee (**CPTC**) has an equivalent role to the University's in-house Faculty Teaching Committees, to oversee the quality assurance dimensions of the University's major Regional Teaching Partnerships (RTPs).

## **CP 3.2 OFFICERS AND ORGANISATIONAL UNITS**

- CP 3.2.1 The Vice-Chancellor has nominated specific senior officers to be responsible for different areas of collaborative provision. For example:
- (a) the Deputy Vice-Chancellor is responsible for overseeing the University's regional collaborative strategy and for exploring possible new developments, and exercises oversight of the Head of AQSC in terms of the operational management of the University's major Regional Teaching Partnerships (RTPs) and other collaborative teaching arrangements;
  - (b) the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (International), in conjunction with the Director of Recruitment, Admissions and International Development (RAID), is responsible for overseeing the University's international collaborative strategy and for exploring possible new developments, and they work with the Head of AQSC and the Strategic Planning and Governance team to ensure that effective operational management of the University's ITPs is deployed.
- CP 3.2.2 AQSC is responsible for maintaining oversight of the University's management of collaborative provision. It ensures that:
- (a) the agreed quality assurance framework for collaborative teaching provision is implemented;
  - (b) new partnerships are subject to the relevant approval procedures;
  - (c) each partnership has an appropriate agreement (MoA or MoU);
  - (d) the University's Register of Collaborative Provision Agreements is maintained;
  - (e) different types of partnerships are conducted and managed in line with agreed procedures and the terms of the individual agreements;

- (f) an annual review of each major External Delivery partnership MoA is undertaken to check that the partnership is being conducted in accordance with the agreement;
- (g) agreed quality assurance procedures for individual partnerships are applied and followed;
- (h) reviews of partnerships are conducted at appropriate intervals and that appropriate support for such reviews is provided.

### **CP 3.3 OPERATIONAL OVERSIGHT AND MANAGEMENT**

- CP 3.3.1 Responsibilities for partnership management vary according to the type, nature and maturity of individual partnerships. The University ensures that MoAs specify its responsibilities and authority as the Degree Awarding Body and, where appropriate, include Schedules which detail the division of responsibility and authority. See CP 2.4.1 above for further information about MoAs and other types of agreement.
- CP 3.3.2 **Access, Articulation, Study Abroad/Exchange** partnerships, normally considered to be low risk (although they might be assessed as medium risk depending on the location or the particular circumstances of the proposed partner), are managed and monitored at departmental and faculty level with support and review provided by the International Office.
- CP 3.3.3 Partnerships involving smaller scale **External Delivery/Validation**, i.e. those limited to one or two programmes, are considered to be medium risk and are managed at departmental level (or at faculty level where more than one department is involved), monitored at faculty level and reviewed periodically at institutional level. If the nature or the location of the partner means that a small-scale partnership is judged to be high-risk it will be managed, monitored and reviewed at institutional level.
- CP 3.3.4 Partnerships involving **External Delivery/Validation** involving the large-scale external delivery of provision leading to Lancaster degree awards are considered to be high risk and are managed, monitored and reviewed at institutional level although they may operate primarily at departmental/faculty level. Each of the University's major External Delivery [ITPs](#) and [RTPs](#) is overseen by a **Partnership Management Group (PMG)**.
- CP 3.3.5 Partnerships which include more than one of the above are managed at the level appropriate for the highest risk element.

### **CP 3.4 QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCEDURES**

- CP 3.4.1 The University has integrated its quality assurance procedures for collaborative teaching provision with its procedures for in-house provision to ensure consistency of approach. These procedures are designed to ensure that programmes leading to the award of Lancaster qualifications, wherever they are delivered:
  - (a) are positioned at an appropriate level and take account of *The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications Degree-Awarding Bodies in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* (FHEQ), and relevant UK credit frameworks, Subject Benchmark statements and any other nationally agreed relevant external benchmarks and

guidance, including Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements;

- (b) take account of the context within which the partner institution is operating and, in the case of ITPs, any government and legal requirements in the partner country and local credit frameworks and other benchmarks and of national HE regulatory or quality assurance body requirements;
- (c) offer academic standards and quality of educational experience equivalent to corresponding programmes at Lancaster;
- (d) align with Lancaster University expectations and requirements, involve appropriate external input and meet UK HE sector benchmarks and expectations.

**CP 3.4.2** The main quality assurance procedures for collaborative provision are:

- (a) the initial investigation and approval of partners and partnerships (academic and legal/governance issues);
- (b) the approval and quality assurance of provision giving access to/articulating with programmes leading to Lancaster awards;
- (c) the approval and quality assurance of provision leading to Lancaster awards, including:
  - (i) programme and module design, development and approval;
  - (ii) evaluation and review of provision leading to Lancaster awards;
- (d) the regulation of assessment including the use of external examiners;
- (e) the collection and use of student feedback;
- (f) arrangements for the periodic reviews of partners and partnerships.

## **CP 4 INVESTIGATION AND APPROVAL PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES**

### **CP 4.1 OVERVIEW**


**CP 4.1.1** Approval procedures are designed to accommodate the differing degrees of complexity, difficulty and risk inherent in different types of collaborative arrangement and also partner-specific circumstances.

**CP 4.1.2** The level of scrutiny and investigation will vary according to the type of partnership arrangement, and also the nature and location of the partner, but the approval process for any type of collaborative teaching provision, whether access, articulation, study abroad/exchange or remote delivery, should involve an assessment of the following:

- (a) whether the proposed partnership aligns with the University's strategic interests and with faculty and departmental strategies;

- (b) whether the partnership model and specific arrangements are viable, appropriate and manageable;
- (c) the partner's reputation and academic standing;
- (d) the partner's financial standing;
- (e) the partner's governmental, legal and jurisdictional environment and Higher Education regulatory environment, framework and structures including its degree awarding powers, where relevant;
- (f) whether there is market demand and an appropriate recruitment pool of potential students with the necessary qualifications and sources of funding;
- (g) the marketing and recruitment capability of the partner;
- (h) whether relevant provision is at the appropriate level, whether there is a good curriculum match with Lancaster provision, and whether assessment and moderation arrangements are appropriate;
- (i) whether academic staff in the proposed partner are appropriately qualified and experienced;
- (j) whether teaching and learning facilities and resources (including library and IT) are of the required standard;
- (k) whether the proposed partner deploys appropriate quality assurance procedures for:
  - (i) programme design, development and approval;
  - (ii) the monitoring and review of teaching;
  - (iii) the regulation of assessment;
  - (iv) the granting of awards;
- (l) the proposed arrangements for the day-to-day operational management of the partnership;
- (m) the proposed arrangements for institutional oversight and management at Lancaster and the partner;
- (n) the proposed arrangements for periodic review of the partner and partnership.

**Figure 1 Decision Making Process for New Partnerships**



CP 4.1.3 An evaluation of the level of risk inherent in any proposed partnership must be made during this initial evaluation as this will determine the appropriate process to be

followed. Each stage of the process may lead to re-evaluation of the risk level of the proposed partnership. Details of the criteria for assessing risk and the due diligence procedures are available from AQSC.

## **CP 4.2 APPROVAL PROCESS**

- CP 4.2.1 The initial idea/proposal for a new collaborative teaching partnership arrangement can emanate from a variety of different sources within the University. Wherever the idea originates, all relevant parties who will be involved in the proposed partnership must be consulted in the preliminary stages of consideration, during which an evaluation of the proposed partner institution and partnership must be conducted to establish:
- (a) alignment with the University's overall Strategic Plan and any relevant strategies at departmental and faculty level;
  - (b) that the partner is in good standing academically, legally, financially, and politically;
  - (c) that the partnership does not present a significant risk to Lancaster University nor conflict with existing Lancaster University partnerships;
  - (d) whether there is any significant financial investment or risk for the University.
- CP 4.2.2 If, following this initial evaluation, a decision is taken to go ahead with the proposed partnership, depending on the associated complexity and risk, the appropriate approvals procedure will commence.
- CP 4.2.3 Where the partnership proposal is commercially sensitive in nature and/ or a non-disclosure agreement is required prior to commencement of the approval process, an alternative to the initial review process outlined above, using a sub-group of Senate, may be determined by the Chair of Senate. Any alternative review process will use the same principles of evaluation as for the standard review process. Final approval, however, can only be given once all stages have been completed and all parties duly consulted.

### **Low/medium risk partnerships**

- CP 4.2.4 For Access, Articulation and Study Abroad/Exchange arrangements and also for minor External Delivery Partnerships, the initial evaluation and investigation process might be conflated into one single exercise following which the proposal will go before relevant University committees: the relevant Faculty Policy and Resources Committee(s), the relevant Faculty Teaching Committees and then the Collaborative Provision Oversight Committee (for approval on behalf of Senate). The MoA can only be signed once institutional approval has been given by CPOC. In summary:
- all departments involved must agree  
*and*
  - Faculty PRCs and Faculty TCs must approve  
*before*
  - CPOC can give final approval on behalf of the University (although approval in principle might be sought from CPOC prior to consideration by faculty TCs/PRCs)
- only then*

- can the MoA be signed (although drafting work should have started during the investigation process).

### **High risk partnerships**

- CP 4.2.5 For major External Delivery ITPS and RTPs, a Project Group is established to oversee the investigation and approvals process, usually chaired by a Pro-Vice-Chancellor or other senior officer. Approval in principle is required from Senate and Council after the initial evaluation. The University Management Advisory Group (which advises the Vice-Chancellor) will also be consulted prior to Senate and Council.
- CP 4.2.6 Once approval in principle has been given, the Project Group must carry out a full investigation which must include a formal financial and legal due diligence assessment. At this stage, it might be necessary to sign an agreement (usually MoU but a Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) might also be needed) to govern the relationship during the investigation stage. During this investigation process the University must establish that it has the legal powers to carry out what it undertakes to do under the partnership agreement and, likewise, that the proposed partner has the legal powers to do what it undertakes to do. It is particularly important that in respect of any partnerships which deliver programmes leading to the award of more than one degree by different degree awarding bodies, every effort must be made to ascertain at the outset that the intended partner(s) has/have the legal and regulatory capacity to grant degree awards alongside any degree(s) awarded by Lancaster.
- CP 4.2.7 The University must also ascertain:
- (a) what the national general legal framework and national or regional qualifications frameworks of the intended partner(s) are and whether these could have implications for the standards and standing of Lancaster awards;
  - (b) that the proposed arrangements will allow Lancaster to exercise its responsibility for ensuring that its academic standards are maintained, irrespective of the requirements of the partner;
  - (c) that the proposed partner has appropriately qualified staff to teach to the level of the programme;
  - (d) that the proposed partner has sufficient facilities and learning resources to enable students to achieve the learning outcomes and required achievement levels on the proposed programme(s).
- CP 4.2.8 The full set of questions which form the basis of investigations is available from AQSC.
- CP 4.2.9 In practice, the investigation might take the form of a series of iterations with interim evaluations. However all questions must be answered satisfactorily before final approval for the proposed partnership can be given, before the MoA can be signed and before the partnership can commence. In summary:

#### approval in principle

- departments involved must agree  
*and*

- Faculty Policy and Resource Committees (PRCs) must agree  
*and*
- approval in principle required from CPOC/Senate/Council (with input from UMAG)  
*before*  
completion of full investigation
- overseen by Project Group with progress reports to UMAG/CPOC/Senate/Council as required  
*before*  
final approval
- approval of provision by department, Faculty Teaching Committees  
*and*
- approval by Faculty PRCs  
*and*
- approval by CPOC/Senate/Council (with input from UMAG)  
*before*
- MoA can be signed (although drafting work should have started during the investigation process).

CP 4.2.10 Occasionally, depending upon timing and other circumstances, the order in which different University bodies consider proposals for approval may vary but final approval can only be given once all stages have been completed and all parties have given their approval: relevant department(s), Faculty Teaching Committee(s) (for all provision); CPOC, Senate and Council (for institutional approval of the partner and partnership). Only then can MoA be signed.

CP 4.2.11 Advice on aspects of any proposed partnership is available as follows:

Issue	Advice available from:
Partner reputation and academic standing, fit with Lancaster strategy	International Office (and British Council), Deputy V-C, PVC International,
Partner legal status and degree awarding powers	AQSC/Governance
Partner financial standing	Finance Office

Student body: recruitment pool, qualifications, funding sources	Recruitment, Admissions and International Development (RAID)
Marketing and recruitment capability and arrangements	RAID, Communications and Marketing
Programmes: level, curriculum match, assessment and moderation	AQSC, Student and Programme Administration
Staffing	International Office, HR/OED
Quality Assurance mechanisms	AQSC
Learning resources	Library, ISS, OED

## CP 5 PARTNERSHIP AND PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT

### CP 5.1 MAJOR INTERNATIONAL TEACHING PARTNERSHIPS (ITPS)

- CP 5.1.1 Each Lancaster-validated programme which leads to the award of a Lancaster University degree and which is delivered by an ITP at the partner's site (whether wholly by ITP staff or jointly by ITP and Lancaster staff) is linked to the appropriate academic department at Lancaster with designated staff at module, programme and faculty level, managed alongside in-house provision. AQSC can advise on the appropriate contacts.
- CP 5.1.2 There is a Partnership Management Group (PMG) for each ITP that meets every six to eight weeks. Each PMG is chaired by the PVC (International) and membership includes senior University officers and key staff from academic departments, Faculties and professional services who are involved with managing the partnership.
- CP 5.1.3 PMGs consider:
- (a) planning and strategy for the short to medium term;
  - (b) reports from the Partnership Director and Faculty ITP Directors;
  - (c) marketing and recruitment including progress against targets;
  - (d) quality and standards issues;
  - (e) IT, Library and infrastructure issues;
  - (f) staff development activities and funding;
  - (g) student number updates and financial analyses.

**CP 5.2 MAJOR REGIONAL TEACHING PARTNERSHIPS (RTPS)**

- CP 5.2.1 There is a Partnership Management Group for each major RTP which meets at least four times a year to discuss emerging issues and priorities and to agree 3-5 year business plans for validation and re-validation events. Other issues discussed include curriculum strategies, student recruitment, staffing issues, policies and procedures. The PMGs are chaired by the Head of AQSC. The University's Collaborative Provision Teaching Committee (CPTC) is responsible for monitoring all partnership and programme management issues. Any systemic quality and standards issues identified through annual monitoring and periodic review are dealt with at the PMG and referred to the CPTC as required. The AQSC team work closely with staff at the colleges in respect of all quality and standard and partnership issues and the day to day operation of the partnership.
- CP 5.2.2 AQSC is responsible for day-to-day liaison with the RTPs over policy, procedural and operational matters, functioning as a partnership office, with a nominated member of staff assigned to each RTP. The University appoints a Programme Consultant to each RTP programme or suite of linked programmes. Members of AQSC and Programme Consultants regularly visit partner sites and represent the University on College quality assurance committees and assessment boards.

**CP 5.3 MINOR EXTERNAL DELIVERY PARTNERSHIPS AND ACCESS AND ARTICULATION PARTNERSHIPS**

- CP 5.3.1 Minor External Delivery Partnerships and Access and Articulation partnerships are managed by the academic department or relevant International Office (central or faculty) which initiated the relationship.

**CP 5.4 STUDY ABROAD/EXCHANGE**

- CP 5.4.1 Study Abroad/Exchange partnerships are managed by the relevant International Office (central or faculty) working with key academic and administrative contacts at the partner institution.

**CP 6 QUALITY ASSURANCE**

**CP 6.1 COURSE DESIGN AND APPROVAL PROCESS**

**International Teaching Partnership (ITPs)**

- CP 6.1.1 Proposals for new or modified programmes, and for new or modified contributory modules, are first considered by the relevant PMG. The PMG considers whether the proposed provision is in line with the agreed academic strategy for the partnership, whether Lancaster has the subject expertise to validate the proposed programmes, whether the partner has the capacity to deliver them to the required standard and whether there is a recruitment pool of qualified applicants. Subject to PMG approval in principle, the partner is invited to submit detailed proposals. These are considered by the relevant Lancaster Faculty ITP Director in consultation with departmental Link Tutors and then routed through the University's standard in-house course approvals process at departmental, faculty and institutional level. This ensures that provision is scrutinised by the same bodies and individuals that consider and approve proposals for in-house provision, against similar criteria. Where programmes delivered by, and at, ITPs lead to

Dual or Double Degree awards, the Lancaster programme and module approval process has to be co-ordinated with the partner's internal course approval processes. The University agrees the sequence and timing on a partner-by-partner basis.

### **Regional Teaching Partnerships**

- CP 6.1.2 Proposals for new programmes are first considered by the relevant PMG as set out above for ITPs. The PMG will consult with academic staff at Lancaster as appropriate. Once approval in principle has been given, programme proposals are taken through the respective College's internal validation procedures, which include an initial academic approval stage involving the University, followed by close scrutiny of detailed proposals through the respective College committees and culminating in a validation event. These internal processes have been strengthened and refined over the years, with the full support of the University, as both Colleges have worked to develop their capacity for managing standards and quality.
- CP 6.1.3 The University appoints the validation (and re-validation) panels, which are chaired by a University academic and include other University staff and (from the start of 2015-16) at least one external advisor. Details of the process are contained in the documentation produced by AQSC.

### **Minor External Delivery ITPs and RTPs**

- CP 6.1.4 Programmes and modules leading to Lancaster awards to be delivered elsewhere are approved through the University's standard course approval procedures via the relevant Lancaster department(s) and Faculties.

### **Articulation, Access and Study Abroad/Exchange**

- CP 6.1.5 Curriculum matching is carried out during the partnership approval process by relevant academic departments, with input from the relevant International Office (central or faculty), in order to ensure that:
- (a) students admitted to Lancaster from Access and Articulation partners will be appropriately prepared academically when they join their chosen Lancaster degree programme;
  - (b) outgoing Study Abroad/Exchange students will be appropriately prepared academically when they join their chosen degree programme in the partner institution and also when they return to Lancaster after their period of study elsewhere to re-join the Lancaster degree programme.

- CP 6.1.6 The alignment of curricula in partner institutions is reviewed as part of the Annual Teaching Review (ATR) and Periodic Quality Review (PQR) processes in the light of student performance and feedback.

### **CP 6.2 PSRB ACCREDITATION**

- CP 6.2.1 When making arrangements to deliver a programme with others, the University discusses the relevance and implications of professional, statutory and regulatory body (PSRB) accreditation for programmes to be validated by Lancaster and leading to Lancaster University degree awards. For programmes not yet accredited that might be eligible for

accreditation by a PSRB (in the UK or elsewhere), the University discusses the procedure and timing for seeking accreditation, where this is agreed by all parties to be desirable. Where an existing programme is already accredited by a PSRB, Lancaster discusses the implications for curriculum content, delivery and assessment. The University makes every effort to ensure that the status of the programme or award in respect of PSRB recognition is made clear to prospective students.

### **CP 6.3 RECRUITMENT AND ADMISSIONS**

#### **Major External Delivery ITPs and RTPs**

- CP 6.3.1 The University ensures that the partnership agreement (MoA) and agreed quality assurance procedures set out the arrangements for the admission and registration of students, including the division of responsibilities between the partners. The partner's recruitment and admissions processes are required to comply with the University's admissions policy, practices and procedures – although they may differ as appropriate for local circumstances, they must meet with the University's underlying principles. The relevant PMG is responsible for monitoring recruitment and admissions activities for partnership programmes.

#### **Minor External Delivery ITPs and RTPs, Study Abroad/Exchange, Articulation and Access**

- CP 6.3.2 Admissions criteria (and progression criteria in the case of outgoing Study Abroad/ Exchange students) are discussed and agreed by departments with advice from Admissions and/or the International Office during the partnership approval process and kept under review in the light of student performance.

### **CP 6.4 ASSESSMENT**

- CP 6.4.1 The University agrees assessment regulations with each partner (RTPs and ITPs) and ensures that they are comparable with those that apply at Lancaster. Any differences have to be justified by the partner and agreed by the University and reported to Senate. In determining the assessment regulations for partnership programmes, the University has adopted the following principles:

- a) Where the partnership arrangement is for a Single Lancaster University degree to be awarded then the partner is expected to follow the standard Lancaster University assessment regulations.
- b) Where the partnership arrangement is for Dual or Triple Degree awards (i.e. one degree from Lancaster and one degree from the partner where one programme of study is followed) Lancaster will agree assessment regulations which differ from the standard Lancaster assessment regulations in order to allow the partner to stay in line with the home country's conventions, as long as these variations do not compromise the standard and quality of Lancaster validated programmes and degree awards.
- c) Where the partnership arrangement is for Double awards to be made (i.e. where separate consecutive programmes of study are followed, leading to one degree from the Lancaster University and one degree from the partner) Lancaster

University's assessment regulations will apply to the Lancaster programme of study.

- CP 6.4.2 Separate assessment regulations which apply to partnership programmes are available online for [Regional Teaching Partnerships](#) and [International Teaching Partnerships](#).

### **International Teaching Partnerships (ITPs)**

- CP 6.4.3 Because the ITPs do not operate within the UK HE environment, the University has also developed additional policies, procedures and guidance in the following areas:

- (a) to facilitate assessment moderation, a mechanism for submitting and tracking assessment tasks for scrutiny by Lancaster staff and marked work for moderation by Lancaster staff is available together with guidance;
- (b) the appointment and role of External Examiners (with the same approval process as for External Examiners for in-house programmes);
- (c) the composition and conduct of Exam Boards (aligned to in-house arrangements and procedures).

- CP 6.4.4 The University appoints, inducts, briefs and pays [External Examiners](#) for partnership provision and determines their role and functions.

### **Regional Teaching Partnerships (RTPs)**

- CP 6.4.5 The University agrees assessment policies and procedures with its RTPs which are in line with the University's in-house arrangements (and which are set out in the approved study and assessment regulations for each College) in relation to:

- (a) assessment moderation (scrutiny of assessment tasks and moderation of assessed work);
- (b) the composition and conduct of Exam Boards (with University staff participating).

- CP 6.4.6 Nominations for External Examiner appointments for RTPs are considered in the same way as nominations for in-house programmes, through the Faculty Teaching Committee equivalent (the CPTC) followed by institutional approval by the University Academic Dean. The University's [standard guidelines](#) apply.

- CP 6.4.7 The University agrees with its partners assessment requirements for the components or programmes being assessed in order to maintain its academic standards. Lancaster determines with the partner the division of assessment responsibilities and the assessment regulations and requirements which apply. These will necessarily differ from partnership to partnership. Where the assessment regulations differ from Lancaster University regulations, these are separately approved by ASQC.

- CP 6.4.8 Procedures for setting assessments and the marking and moderation of these vary from partnership to partnership. Detailed information is set out in the quality assurance handbooks.

- CP 6.4.9 All partners, UK and international, are responsible for administering award boards. The University has representation on award boards for all external delivery partnerships and approves the outcomes leading to an award of the University.

## **CP 6.5 PROGRAMME MONITORING AND REVIEW**

### **International Teaching Partners (ITPs)**

- CP 6.5.1 The University requires its ITPs to carry out ATRs and the resulting reports are considered by the relevant Lancaster link department as part of their ATR process. This allows ITP provision to be considered by link departments, Faculty committees and ASQC alongside in-house provision. Additionally a summary of issues raised in the ITP reports is produced for consideration by ASQC and CPOC. The University requires its ITPs to carry out ATRs at the same time as at Lancaster (between July and October for UG programmes). Sunway University conducts its ATRs on a slightly different cycle as their academic year is a calendar year. The University's ATR report template is adapted for each individual ITP to take account of local terminology, the relevant academic cycle and any additional local requirements.
- CP 6.5.2 ITP activities and provision are also considered when Lancaster link departments undergo PQR. Again, this allows ITP provision to be considered alongside in-house provision.

### **Regional Teaching Partnerships (RTPs)**

- CP 6.5.3 The two major RTPs conduct their own Annual Programme Review (APR) process. The procedure is agreed by the University and there is input from University staff. A summary of all APRs in each College is considered by the CPTC every year and also by the ASQC.
- CP 6.5.4 The two major RTPs have also implemented their own respective PQR processes which have been approved by the University.

## **CP 6.6 MINOR EXTERNAL DELIVERY, STUDY ABROAD/EXCHANGE, ACCESS AND ARTICULATION**

- CP 6.6.1 These arrangements are included in the ATRs of the relevant Lancaster department(s).

## **CP 6.7 OTHER QA PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES**

- CP 6.7.1 For the large regional partnerships (Blackpool & The Fylde College and Blackburn College) quality handbooks and guidance documents are available. These are intended for use by college staff and relate to policies and procedures for partner college programmes validated by the University.
- CP 6.7.2 Partnership handbooks for each major External Delivery partnership are reviewed and published annually by AQSC.
- CP 6.7.3 The guidance documents and the handbooks cover the processes set out in CP 6.1 above.
- CP 6.7.4 In addition, Lancaster requires its five major ITPs and two major RTPs to have in place processes and procedures which are aligned to those at Lancaster in the following areas:

- (a) the selection, appointment, induction, support and development of academic staff involved in the delivery and assessment of Lancaster-validated programmes leading to Lancaster degrees;
- (b) the practice of peer evaluation;
- (c) the collection and evaluation of student feedback;
- (d) student engagement in QE processes.

**CP 6.7.5 Access and Articulation** partnerships are monitored as follows.

- (a) Annual monitoring by department(s) must be undertaken, with regard to the performance on a Lancaster University degree programme of those students admitted from the access and articulation programme(s) concerned. Performance monitoring must be benchmarked against all students in a degree programme cohort and also against appropriate peer groups. Such annual monitoring should be reported as part of the regular Annual Teaching Review (ATR) process. Faculty Teaching Committee(s) and Policy and Resources Committee(s) should maintain a watching brief as part of the Annual Teaching Review (ATR) process.
- (b) Access and articulation programmes should be included within the relevant departmental Periodic Quality Review process.

**CP 6.7.6 Study Abroad/Exchange** partnerships will be monitored as follows.

- (a) Annual monitoring by department(s) must be undertaken, with regard to the performance of students admitted to the programme(s) concerned. Performance monitoring should be benchmarked against all students in a degree programme cohort and such annual monitoring should be reported as part of the regular Annual Teaching Review (ATR) process. Faculty Teaching Committee(s) and Policy and Resources Committee(s) should maintain a watching brief as part of the Annual Teaching Review (ATR) process. Any issues should be communicated to the Head of Study Abroad within the International Office.
- (b) An Annual Report by the International Office on the performance of Study Abroad/Exchange students is submitted in the Michaelmas Term to the University's Academic Standards and Quality Committee.
- (c) Exchange programmes should be included within the relevant departmental ATR and PQR processes.
- (d) New partnerships are typically reviewed by the International Office after the first two years of operation and, thereafter, shortly before the partnership agreement is due for renewal. Existing partnerships are also reviewed before the agreement is due for renewal.

## **CP 7 PARTNERSHIP REVIEW**

### **CP 7.1 MAJOR ITPS AND RTPS**

- CP 7.1.1 The University should undertake periodic reviews (usually every five to six years) of its major RTPs and ITPs which determine whether or not the partnerships will continue and on what basis. This is a two stage process.
- CP 7.1.2 Stage 1 considers strategic issues and relationship development including:
- (a) the partnership vision and future plans;
  - (b) the implications of any significant developments since last review and/or any known/possible imminent developments;
  - (c) the potential impact on the partnership of the partner's relationship with other organisations;
  - (d) the desired portfolio of degree programmes;
  - (e) marketing and recruitment strategies and processes.
- CP 7.1.3 Stage 2 considers quality management and enhancement arrangements including:
- (a) institutional framework/academic governance;
  - (b) quality assurance processes;
  - (c) institutional management of teaching and learning;
  - (d) the quality and availability of published information.
- CP 7.1.4 An [outline partnership review grid](#) developed by AQSC is available.

### **CP 7.2 MINOR EXTERNAL DELIVERY ITPS AND RTPS, STUDY ABROAD/EXCHANGE, ARTICULATION AND ACCESS**

- CP 7.2.1 **Minor ITPs and RTPs and Study Abroad/Exchange** partnerships will be reviewed on a regular basis in order to ensure that:
- (a) the arrangements are still meeting their original objectives in terms of the University's international strategy and/or opportunities for students;
  - (b) partners are still appropriate in terms of quality and reputation and offer students an equivalent high-quality experience;
  - (c) viable numbers of students are still interested in participating in the partnership arrangements;

- (d) the standard and quality of the provision leading to Lancaster University awards is appropriate.

Where it is determined that any of the above may not be happening, reference should be made to CP 8.

- CP 7.2.2 Study Abroad/Exchange arrangements should be reviewed periodically by the relevant International Office (central or faculty) to ensure continuing curriculum alignment with Lancaster provision and the performance of students when they return to Lancaster following a period of study elsewhere.
- CP 7.2.3 Access and Articulation arrangements are reviewed by departments and Faculties to ensure that the partners are still appropriate and still attracting students wanting to progress to study at Lancaster. Consideration is given to curriculum alignment with Lancaster provision and to the performance of students when they arrive in Lancaster after completing the feeder programme at the partner institution.
- CP 7.2.4 In all cases where the frequency of the partnership review is not stipulated in the MoA, the timing of reviews will be determined by the maturity and circumstances of the partnership. Any concerns raised by external examiners, PSRBs, students or by Lancaster link departments may trigger a review as might any significant changes in the partner's ownership, governance, management, organisational structure, academic mission or reputation and standing.

## **CP 8 TERMINATION OF PARTNERSHIPS**

- CP 8.1 The standard MoA template used by the University includes clauses setting out the consequences of termination for the partners. It specifies the respective obligations to ensure that students enrolled on programmes delivered under the partnership arrangement are able to complete their studies if they wish to do so in the event that any party to the agreement withdraws from an arrangement or that the degree-awarding body decides to terminate an arrangement. If such a circumstance arises, then upon termination of the agreement:
- (a) no new students should be admitted to any programme covered by the agreement;
- (b) the University must negotiate a detailed "teaching out" agreement with the partner(s) to protect the interests of students already registered on programmes and to ensure that every effort is made by all partners for students to complete their programmes and gain their degree awards. Wherever possible, this agreement should be in writing, signed by both partners, and should be attached to the MoA.

## **CP 9 INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS AND DELIVERY ORGANISATIONS, SUPPORT PROVIDERS OR PARTNERS**

- CP 9.1 The University must ensure that the division of responsibility for the provision of public information, and the production of publicity and promotional materials relating to learning opportunities that lead to Lancaster University awards is discussed and agreed with the partner(s). The relevant body (PMGs for major ITPs and RTPs, link departments

for minor ITPs and RTPs, the relevant International Office for Access/ Articulation and Study Abroad/Exchange) is responsible for reviewing such information annually and for continuous monitoring of material produced by the partner.

## **CP 10 CERTIFICATES AND RECORDS OF STUDY**

- CP 10.1 Responsibility and authority for awarding certificates relating to Lancaster University awards rests with the University. Where it is agreed that the partners can produce and issue transcripts relating to programmes leading to Lancaster awards, the University must approve the format and content of the transcript which must always record the name and location of the partner and the language of instruction and assessment if this is not English. Whenever possible (i.e. where it is not proscribed by the relevant regulatory authorities in the partner country), the certificate should record the name and location of the partner. When this is not possible the University must ensure that the degree certificate refers to the existence of the transcript.