QAA

Outcomes from Collaborative provision audit

Student representation and mechanisms for feedback

Sharing good practice

Summary

It is clear from the 30 Collaborative provision audit reports published between May 2005 and March 2007 that awarding institutions were fully aware both of the importance of providing students with opportunities to comment on their experience of collaborative provision and of the challenges involved in making student representation effective. In most cases, threshold expectations with regard to student representation were made clear to partner institutions when partnerships were agreed or collaborative programmes validated.

The most common form of student representation was membership of programme committees or boards of study. Although there was little evidence of collaborative provision students being strongly represented on committees of the awarding institution, membership of programme committees could provide a link with the quality assurance processes of the awarding institution, such as annual monitoring and review. The other formal mechanism for student representation was the student-staff consultative committee or forum. Although awarding institutions recognised the importance of securing formal arrangements for student representation, many were prepared to allow some flexibility to accommodate local conditions and cultural differences.

Link tutors, or equivalent liaison officers, often played a key role in the management of student representation. The reports provide several examples of joint initiatives between awarding institutions and their collaborative partners to improve student representation, although resource constraints and the distances involved meant that many of these initiatives, mostly concerned with offering training to student representatives, were at an early stage of development.

Although most of the students met by audit teams during partner visits were happy with the arrangements made for their representation, awarding institutions were frequently encouraged to enhance those arrangements by improving central oversight, particularly monitoring and review procedures.

Overall, the reports indicate that awarding institutions and their partners had established and were making effective use of processes to collect feedback from current students. Feedback opportunities were usually in the form of module or programme questionnaires or student satisfaction surveys, but sometimes more informal mechanisms were employed. These enabled students to comment directly on their experiences at the point of delivery, and assisted the awarding institution and its partners in reviewing, evaluating and enhancing collaborative provision. Awarding institutions were, however, occasionally reminded of the importance of reporting back to students on the actions taken as a result of the feedback they had provided. There was also scope for improvement in a number of institutions in the way in which student feedback information contributed to quality assurance processes.

Arrangements for collecting feedback from graduates and employers, and for making use of this in the quality assurance and enhancement of collaborative provision, were in general less well developed and often unsystematic. This is in line with the position in relation to institutions' internal provision, as noted in the paper *Student representation and feedback in Outcomes from institutional audit,* series 2. However, the expansion in the number of Foundation Degrees validated by awarding institutions and delivered by their partners had led to improved links with employers.

Preface

An objective of Institutional audit is 'to contribute, in conjunction with other mechanisms, to the promotion and enhancement of high quality in teaching and learning'. To provide institutions and other stakeholders with access to timely information on the findings of its Institutional audits, the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) produces short thematic briefing papers, describing features of good practice and summarising recommendations from the audit reports. Since 2005 these have been published under the generic title *Outcomes from institutional audit* (hereafter, *Outcomes*). The first series of these papers drew on the findings of the Institutional audit reports published between 2003 and November 2004, and the second on those reports published between December 2004 and August 2006.

According to the definition in the *Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education, Section 2: Collaborative provision and flexible and distributed learning (including e-learning)* (2004), **collaborative provision** denotes educational provision leading to an award, or to specific credit toward an award, of an awarding institution, which is delivered and/or supported and/or assessed through an arrangement with a partner organisation. The present series relates to the separate Collaborative provision audits which were conducted in 30 institutions between May 2005 and March 2007. A list of the Collaborative provision audit reports on which the series is based is available in Appendix 1 (page 14). It should be noted that Collaborative provision audits were carried out only in those institutions where provision was deemed to be sufficiently extensive and/or complex to warrant an audit separate from the Institutional audit; in other institutions, collaborative activity (where present) was incorporated into the scope of the Institutional audit. The present series does not draw on the findings of those Institutional audits in relation to collaborative provision; for further information about collaborative provision as examined by Institutional audits, see the papers *Collaborative provision in the institutional audit reports* in series 1 and series 2 of the *Outcomes* papers.

A feature of good practice in Institutional audit is considered to be a process, a practice, or a way of handling matters which, **in the context of the particular institution**, is improving, or leading to the improvement of, the management of quality and/or academic standards, and learning and teaching. *Outcomes* papers are intended to provide readers with pointers to where features of good practice relating to particular topics can be located in the published audit reports. Each *Outcomes* paper, therefore, identifies the features of good practice in individual reports associated with the particular topic and their location in the Main report. Although all features of good practice are listed, in the interests of brevity not all are discussed in this paper. In the initial listing in paragraph 4, the first reference is to the numbered or bulleted lists of features of good practice at the end of each audit report, the second to the relevant paragraph(s) in Section 2 of the Main report. Throughout the body of this paper, references to features of good practice in the audit reports give the institution's name and the number from Section 2 of the Main report.

It should be emphasised that the features of good practice mentioned in this paper should be considered in their proper institutional context, and that each is perhaps best viewed as a stimulus to reflection and further development rather than as a

model for emulation. A note on the topics to be covered in the *Outcomes from Collaborative provision audit* series can be found at Appendix 2 (page 16). These topics do not match directly the topics of *Outcomes* series 1 and 2, given the different nature of the provision considered by Collaborative provision audit, though there is some overlap between the titles in the three series.

Although QAA retains copyright in the contents of *Outcomes* papers they can be freely downloaded from QAA's website and cited with acknowledgement.

Introduction

1   This paper is based on a review of the outcomes of the 30 Collaborative provision audit reports published between May 2005 and March 2007 (see Appendix 1, page 14). It is apparent from the reports that the student learning experience was an important focus in Collaborative provision audit. References to the topic occur primarily in Section 2 of the reports, where the reporting template provided to members of audit teams makes explicit mention of 'Feedback from students, graduates and employers' and 'Student representation in C[ollaborative] P[rovision]'.

2   The audit reports describe and analyse the arrangements made by awarding institutions for student representation in partner institutions and for the establishment of feedback links from students, graduates and employers. Audit teams have the opportunity to meet members of the student representative bodies of awarding institutions; they also meet students during visits to partner institutions.

3   Overall, the arrangements made by awarding institutions in relation to student representation and feedback links appear to be sound, with those students met by audit teams expressing satisfaction with the opportunities provided to make their voices heard. However, only a small number of features of good practice was identified in this area, and this was exceeded by the number of recommendations.

Features of good practice

4   The Collaborative provision audit reports contain the following features of good practice relating to student representation:

- the active encouragement given to achieve effective student representation in partner organisations, particularly through student membership of programme committees [Nottingham Trent University, paragraph 188 (v); paragraph 97]

- the partnership between the University and the University of Plymouth Students' Union to improve student representation in its collaborative provision [University of Plymouth, paragraph 195 (iv); paragraphs 103 and 166].

5   The Collaborative provision audit reports contain the following features of good practice relating to feedback links from students, graduates and employers to partners and awarding institutions:

- the creative approach to gathering student feedback on collaborative programmes which employs both formal and informal processes to elicit information directly from students as well as indirectly through the partner organisation [University of Derby, paragraph 146 (iv); paragraph 81]

- the establishment by the School of Management of its School Advisory Board, the membership of which includes senior external academic peers, practitioners and alumni from programmes offered through collaborative provision [University of Bradford, paragraph 231 (fourth bullet point); paragraph 117]

- the effectiveness of the University's management of employer links for informing curriculum development and enhancing students' learning opportunities [Kingston University, paragraph 205 (iii); paragraph 108].

Themes

6   A consideration of the features of good practice and recommendations relating to student representation and feedback links in the collaborative provision reports suggests that the following broad themes merit further discussion:

- arrangements for student representation
- forms of student representation
- the role of students' unions
- effectiveness of student representation arrangements
- feedback from students
- feedback from graduates and employers.

Arrangements for student representation

7   It appears from the Collaborative provision audit reports that awarding institutions were fully aware of the importance of providing students studying at partner institutions with opportunities to comment on their experience. Threshold expectations with regard to student representation were made clear to partners in a variety of ways. In several cases the requirement for partners to develop a student representation system was discussed as part of approval procedures, and arrangements were confirmed at validation or included as part of partnership agreements. In one case the audit team found that the awarding institution's threshold expectations for the student representation system in its partner institutions were set out in a handbook for collaborative provision, and operational arrangements were codified in an annex to the contract of collaboration. In another case, however, the awarding institution was asked to consider making its threshold requirement for student representation explicit in procedure manuals to ensure that its expectations were clearly communicated to partner institutions. In the interests of achieving consistency in the approach taken by validation panels, another awarding institution was recommended to issue more specific guidance to partners on its expectations for student representation.

Forms of student representation

8   The audit reports show that the most common arrangement for formally allowing the 'student voice' to be heard was via student membership of programme committees or boards of study. One audit team identified as good practice the encouragement given by the awarding institution for the development of effective student representation in partner institutions. This was achieved particularly through student membership of programme committees. The team also acknowledged the fact that collaborative provision presented particular challenges in ensuring that student concerns were brought to the attention of the awarding institution. Although it was noted in several reports that there was little evidence of collaborative provision students being strongly represented on committees of the awarding institution, membership of programme committees provided a link with the quality assurance procedures of the awarding institution, such as annual monitoring and periodic review. One audit team particularly noted the use made of student representatives in

the periodic review and re-validation process, whereby partner institutions in the UK were asked to nominate a student representative to join the review panel. Another team found evidence of student representation in programme review; meetings took place with student representatives and students' views were taken seriously in developing programmes.

9   Student-staff consultative committees were another formal mechanism for student representation mentioned in the audit reports. In one collaborative partnership, where such committees were the primary means of achieving student representation, the audit team found some variation in their operation. In another institution where there was an expectation that student-staff liaison committees would be set up at partner institutions, the awarding institution noted in its self-evaluation document that the committees worked well 'in some areas'. The management of student-staff liaison meetings in another institution, where they were the usual arrangement for student representation in collaborative provision, varied according to the nature of the partnership; normally the meetings were managed by staff of the partner institution, but in the case of overseas provision the direct involvement of staff of the awarding institution was routine and the establishment of an annual cycle of meetings was a requirement of the awarding institution. Meetings of higher education forums held in partner institutions and attended by representatives of the awarding institution were said in another report to provide a key mechanism for student feedback. Another institution intended to extend to collaborative provision a system of faculty forums, where all student representatives in a faculty met with the dean to identify common themes arising from student-staff consultative committees, although the audit team considered that the impact on more remote collaborative provision was likely to be limited.

10   It appears from the audit reports that, although awarding institutions recognised the importance of securing formal arrangements for student representation, many were prepared to allow some flexibility to accommodate local circumstances and, in the case of overseas collaborations, cultural differences. It is noted in some reports that the relatively small scale of some collaborative arrangements facilitated the development of less formal systems for the collection of student opinion. Audit teams heard from awarding institutions that the small student groups in many collaborative partnerships allowed regular communication between students and staff, and that relatively informal modes of student representation could operate as effectively as more formal arrangements. In particular, informal contacts could be more appropriate in the case of overseas collaborations where cultural issues might limit student involvement in more formal representative arrangements.

11   Link tutors, or equivalent liaison officers, often had a key role to play in the management of student representation. Several reports note that students saw link tutors as offering an additional channel to ensure that their views were represented to the awarding institution. In some cases, link tutors were required to attend meetings of programme committees or student panels and to take forward the issues raised there; in one case academic advisers from the awarding institution met students without partner staff being present. One audit team was presented with examples where link tutors had effectively presented student requests to appropriate members of the staff of the awarding institution. In another report, the meetings of link tutors with students during visits to partner institutions contributed to the identification of a feature of good practice.

The role of students' unions

12   It is clear from the reports that institutions are increasingly working with their students' unions to improve the position in relation to student representation in collaborative partnerships. The partnership between an awarding institution and its student representative body in working to improve student representation in collaborative provision was identified in one audit report as a feature of good practice. A significant feature of the partnership was the appointment by the students' union of a partner College Coordinator, funded by the university, to liaise with collaborative provision students and staff, and to improve student representation and the provision of student union facilities [University of Plymouth, paragraph 195 (iv); paragraphs 98 and 103]. There are other examples in the reports of partnerships between awarding institutions and their students' unions to improve student representation in collaborative provision, often by extending to partner institutions initiatives originally designed to increase on-campus participation. Several audit reports note that, although students' unions were willing in principle to extend links to collaborative provision students, there were significant constraints in the form of limited resources and the distances involved. This may explain why many of the initiatives noted in the reports which focused on the involvement of students' unions in the representation of collaborative provision students were found to be either at an early stage of development or progressing slowly.

13   There are several references in the audit reports to the role of students' unions in providing training for student representatives in partner institutions. In most cases this was a matter of extending in-house training for student representatives to collaborative provision. In some cases training events or training materials were on offer but the take-up was dependent on proximity to the awarding institution's campus. In one case, however, student representatives met by the audit team in a partner institution were unaware that they could receive training from the students' union. An audit team found that, although appropriate training packs and web-based information were available, student representatives showed little awareness of training opportunities. In this case, the awarding body was encouraged to bring forward plans by the students' union to work closely with link tutors to ensure that student representatives were aware of the training materials and had access to them. Another team considered it appropriate for training opportunities organised by the students' union for on-campus student representatives to be extended to representatives in collaborative partners, even if only those from neighbouring institutions were able to take advantage of these opportunities.

Effectiveness of student representation arrangements

14   It is apparent from the audit reports that awarding institutions were aware of the importance of ensuring that appropriate arrangements were in place in partner institutions to enable students, either directly or through their representatives, to comment on their learning experience. However, reports also noted that achieving effective student representation in collaborative provision presented considerable difficulties. Among the challenges identified by awarding institutions were: part-time students with heavy domestic or professional responsibilities, distant postgraduate

research students, and cultural differences affecting student-staff relations. Recognising the particular challenge of ensuring that the voice of students in collaborative provision reached the awarding institution, one audit team identified as a feature of good practice the active encouragement given by the awarding institution to the achievement of effective student representation in partner organisations. In other cases where the awarding institutions were fully aware of the difficulties involved and were attempting to overcome them, audit teams encouraged them to continue their efforts to develop and disseminate good practice in student representation, even if this involved achieving a balance between formal and informal arrangements. One audit team considered that an awarding institution had exercised 'appropriate firmness and flexibility' to ensure that student representation took place, regardless of cultural contexts.

15   Audit teams had the opportunity during partner visits to meet students on collaborative programmes; the teams found that, in the majority of cases, students were happy with the arrangements made for their representation, and had experienced no difficulty in making their voices heard and ensuring that their concerns were addressed. It was, however, the area of effective oversight that attracted the most recommendations for consideration or action from teams. Concerns were expressed in some reports about the effectiveness of the monitoring and review systems for student representation arrangements. In one case the team concluded that, although the arrangements enabled the student voice to be heard, central oversight was not sufficiently proactive or focussed; in another case, the awarding institution appeared to be unaware of departures from its formal system of student representation in some partner institutions, since monitoring tended to focus on the use of feedback from student representation, rather than on the arrangements for representation themselves.

16   Although one audit team found several examples of good practice in relation to student representation by partner institutions, it concluded that the awarding institution did not have the information available from validation, monitoring and review to give it confidence that arrangements for student representation were adequate in all cases. It was suggested that another awarding institution should consider strengthening the transparency with which the arrangements for student representation were defined and examined within its quality assurance procedures. Although another team was satisfied that the awarding institution had established appropriate mechanisms for the representation of students in partner institutions and had supplemented them with opportunities to raise matters directly with staff, it recommended that the institution should continue to examine ways of enhancing participation in student representation activities. An awarding institution which had begun reviewing its student representation arrangements following a recommendation in an Institutional audit report was reminded of the importance of including collaborative provision in the review to ensure that students studying for its awards with its partners, either in the UK or overseas, benefitted from representation arrangements comparable to those available to students on its own campuses.

Feedback from students

17   Consideration of the Collaborative provision audit reports indicates that the two main purposes of collecting feedback from students were: to enable current students to give feedback to the partner institution on their experiences and concerns, and to assist the awarding institution and its partners in the longer term review, evaluation and enhancement of collaborative provision. One awarding institution acknowledged in its self-evaluation document that gathering formal student feedback in collaborative provision was 'complex and challenging', and that the primary concern should be the establishment of 'an active dialogue' with students and staff in partner institutions about the health of its programmes. Another audit team was told by the awarding institution that, while formal student representation was valuable, 'regular dialogue with students' was at the core of its commitment to the enhancement of the student experience. Feedback was, however, an area in which only one feature of good practice was identified and which attracted several recommendations for consideration or action.

18   It appears from the audit reports that the collection of student feedback was usually the responsibility of the partner institution and mainly took the form of module and programme evaluation questionnaires. In some cases, audit teams found that partner institutions were able to tailor the questionnaires to suit the type of student involved and local conventions; in others, the awarding institution required partners to use a common module evaluation questionnaire to enable comparison between programmes and delivery sites. In the interests of consistency, and in order to produce useful data, one awarding institution was encouraged to develop a more integrated system of collecting student feedback by questionnaire. Similarly, another was recommended to formalise arrangements for student feedback at module level so that the experience of particular groups of students (for example, those studying part time) could be captured and evaluated. Although the audit team considered that one awarding institution was generally successful in its efforts to gather student feedback from its partners, it was nevertheless recommended to provide clearer guidance on the contents of questionnaires in order to ensure the systematic and uniform collection of feedback.

19   Several awarding institutions were found by audit teams to supplement formal systems of collecting student feedback with informal means, especially where there were close working relationships between academic staff and small numbers of students. Sometimes staff of the awarding institution collected feedback from students during their visits to partner institutions, and in some cases link tutors had a role to play in collecting feedback and relaying it back to the awarding institution. An audit team identified as a feature of good practice 'the creative approach to gathering student feedback on collaborative programmes that combined formal processes such as standard questionnaires with informal methods of eliciting information by means of day-to-day contact with teaching staff'. Another awarding institution, however, was recommended to adopt a more rigorous approach to its systems for gathering module feedback while 'continuing to acknowledge the strength of localised (and sometimes informal) mechanisms for gathering student feedback at partner institutions'.

20   There are several references in the audit reports to the extension of an awarding institution's student satisfaction surveys to cover students in collaborative provision. A tailored version of a student perception questionnaire had recently been extended by one awarding institution to undergraduates in collaborative provision, thus allowing comparisons to be made between partner institutions. It was noted in one report that annual student perception questionnaires had proved useful to both the awarding institution and its partners in gauging student opinions on their learning experience. In one case the audit team found that the response rate from students in partner institutions was low; the awarding institution was encouraged to continue to seek ways to improve it, and also to extend the survey to overseas partners. One awarding institution encouraged partners who undertook their own satisfaction surveys to ensure that these included collaborative provision students, but the team found that the outcomes of such surveys were not always shared with the awarding institution. In preparation for the Collaborative provision audit, a students' union, with the support of the awarding institution, had undertaken a survey of the views of partnership students, and the outcomes had informed the student written submission; the audit team considered that there would be a clear benefit in repeating this exercise.

21   Although it is clear from the audit reports that awarding institutions were, for the most part, making effective use of student feedback in their quality assurance processes, this area did attract some recommendations for action. One awarding institution was encouraged to strengthen the ways in which it was able to satisfy itself of the quality of the programmes leading to its awards by making more effective and consistent use of the outcomes of student feedback. Another was encouraged to review the ways in which student feedback data was presented in annual monitoring reports in order to produce more useful information and to allow easier comparison of data. One audit team found that the awarding institution did not always make full use of the detailed student feedback collected by its partner institutions, and suggested that more systematic communication of the feedback by collaborative partners could further enhance an already broadly effective system.

22   Most of the students met by audit teams during partner visits were satisfied with the opportunities open to them to provide feedback on their learning experience, but there are several examples in the audit reports of students receiving little or no response from the awarding institution on the feedback they offered. None of the students met by one audit team was aware of receiving any feedback on the outcome of student satisfaction surveys, and the awarding institution was encouraged to explore with its partners ways in which that quality loop could be closed. When one team found that students who had provided feedback by means of questionnaires were not always clear about what action had been taken in response, it recommended a more rigorous approach to ensuring that the outcomes of feedback were fed back to students. Another team took the view that programme committees were not a reliable channel for communicating to students the actions resulting from their feedback; the awarding institution was therefore recommended to adopt a broader approach to sharing details of feedback with students on collaborative programmes, and to the reporting of progress on action being taken as a result of that feedback.

Feedback from graduates and employers

23   It is clear from the audit reports that systems for collecting feedback from graduates and employers in collaborative provision are less developed than those for gathering feedback from current students. Only two features of good practice were identified in the reports, and there were several recommendations for consideration or action that relate to feedback from both graduates and employers.

24   There are few examples in the audit reports of the systematic collection and effective use of feedback from graduates in collaborative provision. One audit team found evidence of graduate feedback in a range of annual monitoring reports; another identified as a feature of good practice the inclusion on a school advisory board of alumni from programmes offered through collaborative provision. Most teams, however, could find little evidence of engagement by awarding institutions with collaborative provision graduates, apart from the development of alumni databases or the use of informal contacts made through alumni associations. One awarding institution was encouraged to seek feedback from graduates on the extent to which their learning experiences might have affected their employability.

25   There is more evidence for the collection and use of feedback from employers in relation to collaborative provision. One audit team, reporting on an awarding institution that had validated a large number of Foundation Degrees for delivery by partner institutions, identified as a feature of good practice the management of employer links to inform curriculum development and to enhance students' learning opportunities [Kingston University, paragraph 205 (iii); paragraphs 107 and 108]. Several other awarding institutions were found to have developed links with employers in the context of the quality assurance processes associated with Foundation Degrees. One awarding institution was invited to consider how to extend and formalise the collection of feedback from employers, particularly in the context of its Foundation Degree provision at partner institutions. Another, where employers were engaged in the development and delivery of Foundation Degrees in partner institutions, was encouraged to build on this good practice while a third was encouraged to adopt a more systematic approach to obtaining and reporting on feedback from employers at programme level, especially in relation to the student experience of work-based learning.

26   In several cases, audit teams noted that institutions had been recommended in recent Institutional audit reports to develop more systematic ways of gathering feedback from either graduates or employers, or from both. In line with the findings of the Institutional audit, one awarding institution was encouraged in its efforts to achieve routine employer liaison in respect of its collaborative provision. In its self-evaluation document, another awarding institution referred to the recommendation from an Institutional audit team that it should engage employers more closely in its quality management arrangements, and drew attention to the prominent part played by employers in the development and quality assurance of its collaborative provision; the collaborative audit team were able to confirm the existence of good links with employers, both formal and informal, which enabled immediate or rapid feedback. In several institutions, despite recommendations from Institutional audits, there was no evidence of any arrangements for the collection of feedback on collaborative programmes from graduates or employers. In these cases,

audit teams encouraged the institutions to develop 'a more explicit approach', 'further mechanisms' or 'more systematic methods' for collecting and using feedback from graduates and employers in collaborative provision. One awarding institution was recommended to review its strategies and processes in order to incorporate employer and graduate input; another was encouraged to develop 'a more consistent and proactive approach' to the gathering of collaborative provision graduate and employer feedback in the interests of informing itself better about the 'standard, quality and currency of its portfolio at each partner institution'.

Conclusions

27   Taken together, the 30 Collaborative provision audit reports published between May 2005 and March 2007 suggest that awarding institutions recognise the importance of ensuring that students studying for their awards in partner institutions have adequate opportunities for making their voices heard, either individually or through their representatives, and thus can contribute to the quality assurance and enhancement of their programmes of study. Also recognised are the particular challenges of achieving effective student representation in a wide variety of partner institutions, many of them overseas. There is evidence that many students' unions are beginning to play an active role in establishing links with students in partner institutions and are offering training to student representatives.

28   Awarding institutions also recognise the importance of collecting feedback from students in partner institutions, both on their programmes of study and on their general learning experiences. Several awarding institutions were, however, reminded of the importance of making effective use of student feedback in quality assurance procedures and of informing students of the outcomes of their feedback. In general, arrangements for the systematic collection, analysis and use of feedback from graduates and employers in collaborative provision are less developed than those which relate to current students, although the increase in the number of Foundation Degrees delivered in partner institutions has led to enhanced feedback from employers.

Appendix 1 – the Collaborative provision audit reports

2004-05

Middlesex University

Open University

2005-06

De Montfort University

Kingston University

Liverpool John Moores University

London Metropolitan University

Nottingham Trent University

Oxford Brooks University

Sheffield Hallam University

The Manchester Metropolitan University

University of Bradford

University of Central Lancashire

University of East London

University of Greenwich

University of Hertfordshire

University of Hull

University of Lancaster

University of Leeds

University of Northumbria at Newcastle

University of Plymouth

University of Sunderland

University of Westminster

University of Wolverhampton

2006-07

Bournemouth University

Staffordshire University

The University of Manchester

University of Bolton

University of Derby

University of Huddersfield

University of Ulster

The full reports can be found at www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews.

Appendix 2 - titles in *Outcomes from Collaborative provision audit*

Approval and review of partnerships and programmes

Frameworks, guidance and formal agreements

Student representation and mechanisms for feedback

Student support and information

Assessment and classification arrangements

Progression and completion information

Use of the Academic Infrastructure by awarding institutions and their partners

External examining arrangements in collaborative links

Learning support arrangements in partnership links

Arrangements for monitoring and support

Papers are available from www.qaa.ac.uk/outcomes.

QAA 375 11/10