

**Form CP1: Proposal form for a new partnership or new location of delivery[[1]](#footnote-1)**

**This form is submitted by the Collaborative Partnerships Office for consideration by the Academic Planning Team[[2]](#footnote-2).**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proposed partner****(or approved partner for new delivery location)** |  |
| **Proposed award(s)** |  |
| **Academic Discipline/Institute/Academy linked to proposal** |  |
| **Outline of proposed collaboration and mode of provision, including language of delivery** |  |
| **Rationale for working with this partner (or rationale for new delivery location)** |  |
| **Relevance of the proposal to the University’s Strategic Plan and associated strategies** |  |
| **Does the partner have experience of delivering at the proposed level of provision? If not, how will this be addressed?****(n/a for new delivery location)** |  |
| **Potential benefits** |  |
| **Declaration of any conflict, or potential conflict,****of interest held by a member of staff at the University, or a wider stakeholder, in relation to the proposed partnership[[3]](#footnote-3)** |  |
| **Confirmation that the Institute/Academy has been consulted and supports the proposal** |  |
| **Summary of initial business plan provided by Finance** |  |

**An initial risk assessment is attached.**

**Name of Proposer:………………………………….**

**Signature:**

**Date....................................................................**

**PROPOSAL FOR COLLABORATION: INITIAL RISK ASSESSMENT**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area** | **Rating 1** | **Tick** | **Rating 2** | **Tick** | **Rating 3** | **Tick** |
| **Geographic Location of proposed partner** | UK |  | Europe |  | Rest of world |  |
| **County Economic Rating (Euler Hermes Medium-Term Rating)** | AA-A |  | BB-B |  | C-D |  |
| **Political/social climate of location (Amfori BSCI countries risk classification)** | Average rating 60-100 |  | Average rating 40-60 |  | Average rating 0-40 |  |
| **Safety of location (Drum Cussac security rating)** | No advise issued against travel in host country |  | Advice issued against travel in host country but not in/near region where proposed partner is based |  | Advice issued against all travel in host county  |  |
| **External academic regulatory requirements** | Has a national quality assurance agency with strong comparability with the UK |  | Has a national quality assurance agency with some comparability with the UK |  | Has no national quality assurance agency/has a quality assurance agency with limited comparability with the UK |  |
| **Freedom of speech Framework** (Reporters without Borders Freedom Index) | Average rating 0-25 |  | Average rating 25-36 |  | Average rating 37-100 |  |
| **Partner status** | Publically funded UG and PG/ university |  | Publically funded UG only |  | Privately funded |  |
| **Nature of link** | Off-campus |  | Franchise  |  | Validation  |  |
| **Student language** | English/Welsh first language |  | UK based English 2nd language |  | OS English 2nd language |  |
| **Proposed language of delivery** | English/Welsh |  | Bilingual – English and other language |  | Other language |  |
| **Award level** | Level 4 |  | Level 5-6 |  | Above Level 6 |  |
| **Previous knowledge of partner (by UWTSD)** | Previous relationship with the University |  | Existing relationship with UW or another Welsh HEI |  | No previous knowledge |  |
| **Centres for delivery** | One centre – UK  |  | More than one centre – all UK |  | One or more centres – OS |  |
| **Initial view of partner staffing** | Stable and well provided |  | Relatively small and/or possible issues about turnover |  | Unknown, or potentially more serious issues |  |
| **Initial view of partner resources** | Large and well resourced |  | Small but well resourced |  | Unknown, or potentially more serious issues |  |
| **Subtotals** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | x1= |  | x2= |  | x3= |

**TOTAL SCORE**......................................

**OVERALL LEVEL OF RISK: Low risk: 15-29; Medium risk: 30-36; High risk: 37-45**

**APT checklist (as per 9.5.3 of the AQH)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The Academic Planning Team will be seeking evidence of the following attributes in prospective partners to inform its decision:** | **Yes**  | **No** | **Further information required**  |
| Academic culture and values closely aligned, at institutional and programme levels, to those of the University |  |  |  |
| Well-defined and credible academic development aspirations which cohere with those of the University |  |  |  |
| Desired provision in one or more areas of academic interest which are cognate with those offered within the University |  |  |  |
| Desired provision which does not pose a conflict of interest with an existing collaborative partnership |  |  |  |
| Demonstrable academic achievements in the field of scholarly activity |  |  |  |
| Capability of delivering programmes at the level of the proposed provision |  |  |  |
| The potential to create a partnership which is capable of delivering clear academic benefits for the University |  |  |  |
| An initial business plan demonstrating that the partnership has the potential to generate financial benefit to the University |  |  |  |

1. New programme provision for existing partners should be proposed via form PV1. Approval of a new location of delivery is for where existing partners wish to deliver an already validated programme in a new location. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A checklist for APT is provided at the end of this form [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. It is important to declare any interest that could be linked to the potential partnership that staff, or members of their family, may have that might give the appearance of a conflict, even where no actual conflict exists. This could include financial interest or non-financial interest benefit or advantage, such as the enhancement of an individual’s career, education or professional reputation or access to privileged information or facilities.  [↑](#footnote-ref-3)