**Guidance BG(ii)**

**The Liaison Document**

**Collaborative Partner:**

**Date prepared/updated:**

This document is designed to describe the specific liaison arrangements that are in place for the awards described below. The template provides a series of headings to be addressed and includes a set of questions designed to prompt discussion and agreement between the partner and the managing faculty of the detailed arrangements that will support the collaboration and the student learning experience. Where relevant, an indication of the timing of activities should be included. The Liaison Document should be reviewed annually to ensure that it continues to accurately describe liaison arrangements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **This arrangement leads to the award(s) of:**  Please list the awards covered by this arrangement |  |
| **The managing Faculty/Faculties is/are:** |  |
| **The provision described in this Liaison Document is:**  Please indicate whether the provision is (delete as appropriate) | Franchised/Validated/Double/Joint/Dual Degree (see Section B for definitions) |
| **The type of collaborative provision described in this Liaison Document is:**  For advice on the categories of collaborative provision please see BG(vi) in the AQSH or contact Quality Assurance and Enhancement for further clarification. | Please select the type of activity from the following:   * Provision returned in KU’s HESES population (students pay fees to KU (including via SLC)) * Provision returned in the partner’s HESES population (students pay fees to partner (including via SLC)) * Provision offered at a provider partner in the UK where students pay full fees but are not eligible for student loans * Provision offered to international students at a partner based overseas and included in KU’s HESES population as non-funded * Provision offered to international students at a partner based overseas and not included in KU’s HESES population |
| **Tuition fees**  Please specify:  who is responsible for setting tuition fees  who is responsible for collecting tuition fees  who is responsible for outstanding fee and subsequent debt |  |
| **Roles and Responsibilities**  List the key individuals involved in the collaboration, including the Course Leader/Liaison Officer at KU and corresponding Course Leader/Liaison Officer at the partner, and an outline of their main responsibilities in relation to the collaborative partnership |  |

| **Policies and processes** | **Arrangements agreed for this partnership** |
| --- | --- |
| **Access to Resources**  Student access to KU resources will depend on the nature of the arrangement. Discussions should have taken place with the partner prior to approval to determine this access and will be reflected in the Institutional Agreement. You should describe here whether students will have access to:   * Canvas * Borrowing rights in KU Libraries (only available for students returned in KU HESES return) * Access to KU electronic resources (only available for students returned in KU HESES return) * KU ID card (only available for students returned in KU HESES return) * Any other provision that has been negotiated as part of the course set up and agreed with relevant University departments   Unless students studying at the partner institution are returned in the University’s HESES return access to resources are limited to Canvas only (see BG(vi). |  |
| **UKVI Compliance**  Describe the arrangements to ensure compliance with any UKVI requirements for the institution (Sponsor Licence); Students (Visa) |  |
| **Admissions**  The University retains responsibility for approving the criteria for admission. The University is responsible for stipulating who has responsibility for decisions on admissions and the management of the admissions process.  In the case of joint, double or dual awards, partners determine which of them is responsible for the management of the admissions process (or how responsibilities are shared) and the obligations of respective parties are recorded in the written agreements.  Describe the arrangements for admission for this provision. This should address the following:   * Who will be responsible for the admissions process for this provision? * Do students apply via UCAS? If yes, is this via the partner or via KU? * Do students apply directly to the course(s)? If yes, is this to the partner or KU? * Who is responsible for making offers to students? * The arrangements for the consideration and approval of requests for the Recognition of Prior Experiential or Certificated Learning * Who will be responsible for dealing with appeals on admissions decisions? |  |
| **Enrolment**  Describe the arrangements for enrolling both new and continuing students. This should include:   * Whether students complete KU or partner enrolment forms * The arrangements for data transfer between partner and KU to facilitate enrolment where students have completed partner enrolment forms * How student module choices are recorded at KU |  |
| **Transition of students on 2+1 arrangements**  In a number of instances students transfer from a partner institution to the University to complete their award.  Where this is the case, please indicate the arrangements to manage the transition:   * Preparation for the transfer (including, for example, module selections) * Induction * Enrolment |  |
| **Induction & Transition - Students**  Describe the arrangements in place for student transition into HE, induction to the institution, the course, the support that will be available to them, the resources that will support their learning and the expectations of studying in HE. It should be clear what will be provided by the partner and by the University. Clear indication should be given of who will provide course and module handbooks.  Will there be any induction or ‘welcome back’ activities for continuing students? Please describe. |  |
| **Attendance Monitoring**  Describe the arrangements for monitoring student attendance and, for reporting non-attendance for Student Route sponsored students to ensure compliance with UKVI requirement. |  |
| **Preparation of assessments (coursework and examinations)**  Who will be responsible for designing assessment tasks?  If this is to be done by the University, describe how any local contextualisation will be taken into account?  If this is to be done jointly – explain how this will be done?  If this is to be done by the partner, please describe the faculty scrutiny processes that will be in place to agree the assessment?  Describe how assessments will be submitted, e.g. via Canvas or other alternative VLE |  |
| **Marking and Moderation of Student Work**  The University requires the use of anonymous marking, where it is practical to the type of assessment. It is anticipated that partners also utilise anonymous marking as appropriate.  Describe:   * the arrangements for the creation of local marking criteria. * the arrangements for the creation of a common understanding of marking criteria and standards * the arrangements for anonymous marking * Who will undertake first marking?   The University also requires that PG dissertations and research projects are double blind marked – marked separately by two members of staff who do not confer until they have made an initial judgement. The markers then agree one common mark. Where agreement cannot be reached a third marker will be used.  The University expects all work to be internally moderated, i.e. a sample of marked work is reassessed by another member of staff in order to ensure that the first marker has applied the marking criteria appropriately and fairly. The size and nature of the sample is defined by the University. The arrangements for the moderation of student work will depend on the nature of the collaboration i.e. franchised or validated.  Describe the arrangements for the moderation of student work – this should include:   * How the moderation process will be administered * Who will undertake the moderation activity * How the moderation process will be recorded   The arrangements for dealing with significant differences of outcome in the moderation process |  |
| **Feedback on Assessment**  It is University policy that all coursework must be returned to students within 20 working days. It should be accompanied by clear feedback which makes reference to how students have performed against the published marking criteria and indicates what students can do to improve their work. To ensure legibility and ease of access, all summary feedback must be typed or voice-recorded. Additional hand-written annotations on scripts can be used where appropriate.  Feedback must also be provided on examination performance, although scripts are not returned. |  |
| **Examinations**  The organisation and management of formal examinations will depend on the type of collaboration. For franchised provision, examinations must be scheduled at the same date and time in each location, or students must be set a new exam paper.  Describe:   * whether examinations will be held at the partner or KU * How examination dates will be set |  |
| **External examiner scrutiny of draft assessments**  It is a KU requirement that external examiners are provided with the opportunity to comment on both draft coursework and examinations prior to any student attempting them. The arrangements will differ depending on the nature of the collaboration.  Describe who will be responsible for:   * Sending draft assessments to the external examiner (via secure means) * Considering and responding to external examiner comments |  |
| **Mitigating Circumstances and Extensions**  Describe how formal claims for mitigating circumstances will be considered and communicated to students and assessment boards |  |
| **Academic Misconduct**  Describe how cases of academic misconduct will be investigated between the University and the partner.  Describe the use of Turnitin or other alternative plagiarism detection software. |  |
| **Assessment Boards**  The arrangements for assessment boards will depend on the nature of the collaboration. See UG (AR02) or PG (AR03) regulations for further details.  Describe the following:   * The arrangement of pre-boards if these are used; * Where the PAB will be held - if at the partner, please indicate composition including the arrangements for PAB external examiner attendance (all PABs are generally held on-line, only exceptionally will they be held on-site; if required please discuss with RASC) * Responsibility for setting assessment board dates * Who will be responsible for the production of marks and the preparation of paperwork for boards * Who will clerk the boards * How assessment board decisions will be communicated to students and by whom * How samples of work will be made available to the external examiner |  |
| **Appeals**  KU regulations apply. |  |
| **Fitness to Practice (where applicable)**  Describe how cases of student fitness to practice (either disciplinary or health/disability) will be dealt with and by whom. |  |
| **Placement Learning (where this is a feature of the provision)**  Describe the arrangements for the organisation of placement learning where this is intended to take place. This should include:   * How placements will be approved and monitored * The preparation of students for placement learning * The preparation of placement learning providers * Arrangements for dealing with * placement breakdown or complaints   In each case indicate whether it is the University or the partner who is responsible. |  |
| **Provision delivered or assessed in a language other than English**  There is a general expectation that programmes of study leading to a KU award will be delivered and assessed in English. Permission to deliver or assess a programme in language other than English must be approved by Academic Council.  If the provision in question is to be delivered or assessed in a language other than English describe:   * The external examiner arrangements. * The processes for the University to approve and moderate all assessment in a language other than English * The arrangements for the translation of material if required. |  |
| **Assessment – Any other arrangements applicable to this partnership** |  |
| **Certificates and the HEAR**  Kingston University will always be responsible for the production and distribution of award certificates to students. KU will advise all students registered on KU awards of the need to register for the Higher Education Achievement Record (HEAR). |  |
| **Awards Ceremonies**  Indicate whether students will be invited to KU ceremonies or whether there will be local events (or both). (Ensure that this matches the requirements in the Institutional Agreement.) |  |
| **Student Complaints**  Indicate the informal mechanisms that will be used to deal with Student Complaints.  Student complaints will be referred to the partner in the first instance to look at under their own complaints procedure, if they have one. If, once the partner’s procedure has concluded, the student remains unhappy with the way in which their complaint has been considered, and, if the complaint relates to the academic standards and/or quality of their learning opportunity, the student can refer their complaint to the University for consideration at Stage 2 of KU Student Complaints Procedure.  If the partner does not have a complaints procedure, students will still be referred to contact a relevant member of staff at the partner institution to explore a possible early resolution to their complaint. If the issue cannot be resolved through early resolution, students may submit a Stage 2 - Formal Complaint to the University.  Stage 2 complaints will be considered by an Investigator appointed by the University with relevant input from both the Kingston University Liaison Officer and Partner Liaison Officer. |  |
| **Student disciplinary**  It is between KU and the partner to decide whose procedures should apply.  Where the misconduct takes place on partner premises, the partner institution’s disciplinary procedures will normally apply.  KU to be notified of the outcome in case of major or gross misconduct. |  |
| **Student Feedback**  Describe the mechanisms in place to facilitate feedback from students on their experience. This should include the use of early and any other forms of student questionnaire at module or course level and the organisation of Student Voice Committees (or their equivalent) |  |
| **Student Representatives**  Describe how course representatives will be selected and prepared for their role. |  |
| **Student support and the Personal Tutor Scheme**  It is an expectation that the principles of the University’s Personal Tutor Scheme should be adopted by KU collaborative partners. It will be up to individual partners, in consultation with the KU faculty, to determine how best to deliver this support to students and for validation panels to determine the suitability of proposed local arrangements.  Describe the following:   * The arrangements for the provision of the personal tutor scheme * The arrangements for the provision of welfare, counselling and other support * Throughout describe where responsibility lies for the provision of support. |  |
| **Course Administration**  Describe the ways in which administrative arrangements will support liaison between the partners. |  |
| **Liaison Arrangements**  Describe in broad terms how this will be managed.  Describe types of visits that could be required of the ULO or PLO, for instance visits to potential employers for marketing and placement purposes.  In the case of franchise arrangements in which modules will be delivered by the partner, the University and possibly other partner institutions, describe the arrangements for on-going liaison between module leaders.  Describe in broad terms how subject level liaison will be achieved. |  |
| **Kingston Continuous Enhancement Process (KCEP)**  The course(s) will be subject to the University’s standard KCEP processes (including the completion of MEPs and CEPs and periodic Substantive Reviews).  Particular attention should be given to provision that runs across multiple partners and the arrangements in place for the cross-partner comparison of standards.  Describe the arrangements for the production of MEP and CEPs:   * Who will complete MEPs? * Who will complete CEPs? * Who will be responsible for reviewing reports in relation to institutional level issues such as resources? * How will partners receive feedback on their MEP/CEP? * Who will manage the Substantive Review arrangements |  |
| **External Examiners**  As the awarding body, the University is responsible for the appointment, induction and payment of external examiners, including those for collaborative provision. For franchised provision, the external examiner(s) will typically be the same as for the in- house provision, to enable comparability of standards across provision. For validated provision, a dedicated external examiner will usually be appointed.  External examiner reports for both franchised and validated provision should be considered by the Head of School (or equivalent).  Describe the arrangements for:   * The nomination of external examiners * The arrangements for local induction * How external examiner reports will be shared with the partner * Who will be responsible for the day- to-day liaison with external examiners * External examiner visits to the partner * How external examiner reports will be shared with students |  |
| **Liaison with Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs)**  If the provision is accredited by a PSRB describe the following arrangements (these may differ between a franchise and validated course):   * Day to day liaison with the PSRB * Responsibility for the organisation of visits or inspections * Responsibility for responding to the outcomes of PSRB visits/inspections * Arrangements for notifying the University of the outcomes of PSRB visits/inspections |  |
| **Course and Module Modifications**  The processes for modifications to KU awards delivered by partner organisations is the same as those for provision delivered at the University. For franchised provision the managing faculty is normally responsible for initiating modifications to courses and leading on the preparation of paperwork in order to have them approved. For validated provision the partner organisation is normally responsible for initiating modifications and for liaising with the managing faculty to prepare the relevant paperwork for the modification to be considered. |  |
| **Executive Committee(s)**  An Executive Committee, as defined in the Institutional Agreement should be established. This committee should meet annually to review the operation of the partnership. (See OG(xiv) for Terms of Reference, membership and standard agenda items for the Executive Committee).  Articulate who is responsible for the organisation of the Executive Committee, including production of paperwork, clerking etc. |  |
| **Published Information**  The University has a responsibility to ensure the accuracy of all public information, publicity and promotional activity relating to provision offered by partners that leads to a KU award (see Guidance BG(v) in the AQSH).  Please describe the arrangements for faculty oversight of information published by the partner that pertains to KU awards. This relates to marketing material (in all forms) and student handbooks (course and module).  In this section, also describe approaches to other marketing activities the ULO or PLO might undertake, for instance direct marketing activities with employers to ensure progression routes. |  |
| **Staff development**  Please describe how the staff development requirements of partner staff involved in the delivery of KU provision will be identified, acknowledged and carried through |  |
| **Any other responsibilities**  Please include additional responsibilities which reflect specific aspects of the liaison, for instance additional duties related to managing a consortium arrangement; working with employer mentors and monitoring placements for foundation degrees, etc. |  |