CPC1**: Detailed information on a proposal to deliver provision in partnership with another organisation.**

This template has been designed to formally record the detail of a proposal to deliver provision in partnership with another organisation. It provides the nominated coordinator with a mechanism to record the outcome of a reflective desk-top assessment of potential academic risks relating to the delivery of the proposal by the proposed partner.

1. **Nominated coordinator contact information:**
2. **Programme leader contact information:**

(Only required if not the nominated coordinator. If not yet confirmed please state this here)

1. **The proposed partner.**

*(Name of organisation, full address, email, telephone number, web address)*

1. **Named point of contact at the proposed partner.**

*(Name of individual(s) at the partner organisation who have been involved in discussions to date)*

1. **Date CPC0 noted by the Collaborative Provision Committee:**
2. **Note of significant changes from proposal outlined in CPC0.**

*(Change to proposed programme, mode of delivery, delivery model, proposed start date, etc. If no significant changes please state this here)*

1. **Target approval and implementation timescale.**

*(Proposed start date, internal scrutiny date, sign-off process complete, proposed date for approval event)*

1. **Outline of proposal (delete as appropriate):**

**A proposed new partner organisation** (Complete CPC1 Sections 9 to 26)

**Proposed new provision** (Complete CPC1 Sections 17 to 26)

*By signing a CPC1 deans of school are verifying that:*

* *there is a sufficient level of demand for the proposed provision*
* *the proposed partner has appropriate learning resources to support the delivery of the academic proposal*
* *the proposal will be developed to mitigate against any academic risk identified by the nominated coordinator*
* *the school will provide sufficient resource to support the continuing development of the proposal.*

**Dean of School: Date:**

**Detailed information on a proposal to deliver provision in partnership with another organisation.**

The nominated coordinator should retain all evidence used to inform the reflective desk-top assessment of a proposed partner organisation as this may be required by the academic approval panel to verify the suitability of the proposed partner organisation

**FOR NEW PROPOSED PARTNER ORGANISATIONS ONLY**

1. **Summary of governance arrangements.**

*(Ask for copies of constitution, articles of association or similar; academic regulations, student appeal and complaint procedures, etc)*

1. **Rationale for working with this organisation.**

*(Link proposed partner mission to University and school strategic and operational plans, include any existing collaborative provision, rationale for working with a proposed new partner, etc)*

1. **Summary of partner quality and standards processes.**

*(Ask for information on processes for setting and maintaining academic standards and for enhancing the quality of student learning – for example, developing, approving, monitoring and reviewing higher education provision; reports resulting from any external academic quality audit or review activities)*

1. **Summary of partner learning, teaching and assessment strategy.**

*(Ask for information on higher education learning, teaching and assessment strategy)*

1. **Summary of partner student support arrangements.**

*(Ask for information on academic support, pastoral support, student representation, provision of social and recreational facilities)*

1. **Summary of partner provision of learning resources.**

*(Ask for information on strategic approach to allocating learning resources, information technology, library, specialist equipment, etc)*

1. **Summary of partner provision of information technology.**

*(Ask for information on the proposed partner’s information policy, for example, operating system (XP, Windows 7, etc), default language settings, access to applications and web browsers, access to University online services (Student Portal, password manager, email, Moodle, Turnitin, Elluminate, library search, eJournals, eBooks, etc), extent of wireless connectivity, security measures (password access to desktops, secure data storage, etc), availability of compatible software (MS Office, Adobe Reader, etc), connecting guest laptops.*

1. **Any other relevant partner information.**

*(Higher education prospectus, promotional material, etc)*

**FOR ALL PROPOSED PROVISION**

1. **Detailed information on delivery model.**

*(Mode of delivery, responsibilities for face-to-face delivery, use of local tutors, etc)*

1. **Proposed learning, teaching and assessment methods.**

*(Extent of compatibility with University learning, teaching and assessment methods, extent of compatibility with subject benchmark expectations, responsibility for maintaining integrity of assessment process, etc)*

1. **Proposed student support arrangements.**

*(Extent of compatibility and equity with Edinburgh-based student learning experience, personal development tutor support, pastoral support, careers advice and guidance, etc)*

1. **Provision of learning resources.**

*(Requirement for and availability of learning resources, information technology, library, specialist equipment, etc)*

1. **Summary of provision of subject specific information technology.**

*(Ask for information on the availability of information technology to support the delivery of the proposed provision, for example, networked computer suites, data projectors, whiteboards, etc).*

1. **Provision of administrative support.**

*(Responsibility for in-country and Edinburgh-based administrative requirements)*

1. **Monitoring arrangements.**

*(Responsibility for monitoring effectiveness of teaching delivery after each delivery period)*

1. **Progress in developing the business case.**

*(Progress in developing an indicative business case, outline of the proposed financial model, etc)*

1. **Academic risk assessment.**
2. Having completed the evaluative desk-top assessment of potential academic risks relating to delivering the proposal in partnership with the proposed partner the nominated coordinator must complete the attached academic risk assessment matrix.
3. Where an element of medium risk has been identified the nominated coordinator must provide Collaborative Provision Committee with a proposed plan to address the identified risk should CPC1 be approved.
4. Where an element of high risk has been identified the implication is that this is likely to affect adversely the University’s reputation and standing. In such cases the nominated coordinator must provide a plan of action and an implementation timescale which sets out clearly how the identified risk will be managed and the University’s reputation and standing protected. Without such a plan it is highly unlikely that Collaborative Provision Committee will approve a CPC1.
5. It is imperative that all subject specific matters are identified and addressed by the programme team before the involvement of an external academic peer at the formal academic approval event. As such the programme team is responsible for ensuring that:

* all subject specific matters are identified and discussed with the proposed partner as early in the process as is feasible (availability of relevant publications, equipment, laboratories, appropriately qualified staff, etc)
* in cases where required learning resources will not be in place at the time of the formal approval event a timetable must be agreed with the proposed partner for ensuring that these are in place before any places are offered to student

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **LOW RISK** |  | **MEDIUM RISK** |  | **HIGH RISK** |  |
| **Country of delivery** | UK. |  | Non-UK but an approved country of delivery within the University’s Internationalisation Strategy. |  | Non-UK and in a country which is not included in the University’s Internationalisation Strategy. |  |
| **Partner** | UK or existing partner organisation. |  | New partner but in an approved country of delivery within the University’s Internationalisation Strategy. |  | New partner and which is not included in the University’s Internationalisation Strategy. |  |
| **Status of partner** | Degree awarding powers. |  | Public funded educational establishment. |  | Non-educational or privately funded organisation or establishment. |  |
| **Quality assurance mechanisms** | Clearly defined and accredited within a national system. |  | Clearly defined institutional-wide system involving a level of peer review. |  | No evidence of a clearly defined institutional wide system to monitor quality and standards. |  |
| **Staff experience and qualifications** | Academic staff qualified to at least the level of the proposed award and have relevant teaching experience. |  | Not applicable. |  | Academic staff not qualified to the level of the proposed award and/or do not hold an appropriate teaching qualification. |  |
| **Contact with partner to date** | Visited by proposed programme leader. |  | Visited by school or subject representative and email contact with proposed programme leader. |  | Visited by University faculty or school representative but no contact with proposed programme team. |  |
| **Student English language proficiency** | First language. |  | Second language but taught in English through secondary-level education. |  | Second language with no previous teaching delivery in English. |  |
| **LTA strategy to be implemented for this proposal** | Aligned and comparable to an existing University-approved LTA strategy. |  | Compatible with an existing University-approved LTA strategy. |  | A proposed new LTA strategy. |  |
| **Availability of learning resources** | At least equivalent to Edinburgh-based learning resources. |  | Below University expectations and some minor investment required before students can be enrolled. |  | Below University expectations and substantial investment required before students can be enrolled. |  |
| **Low risk total (x1)** | |  | **Medium risk total (x2)** |  | **High risk total (x3)** |  |

* **TOTAL SCORE: OVERALL INDICATION OF RISK:**
* **Low risk**: = or <12 with no HIGH RISK identified. **Medium risk**: 18 or less with one element of HIGH RISK. **High risk**: >18 with more than one element of HIGH RISK.