Annex O

Appendix Di: Academic Risk Assessment of Proposed Partnership

**[Insert name of institution and country]**

**With respect** **to [insert type of agreement]**

The Academic Risk Assessment is completed with reference to a particular activity with a proposed partner. A separate Academic Risk Assessment should be undertaken for each individual activity/agreement proposed. The Academic Risk Assessment should be considered in conjunction with the Country Risk Assessment.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A. COMMUNICATION |  |
|  |  |
| **** 1. **English Language** **proficiency of team directly involved in activity at proposed partner institution** |  |
| Native level/N/A if communication/instruction related to partnership model is not intended to be in English. | 0 |
| Intermediate level | 2 |
| Elementary level | 3 |
|  |  |
| **** 2. **English Language** **proficiency of administration team at proposed partner institution** |  |
| Native level | 0 |
| Intermediate level | 2 |
| Elementary level | 3 |
| B. CHARACTERISTICS OF PROPOSED PARTNER | |
| **** 1.  **Educational culture of proposed partner (in terms of academic and administrative structures)** |  |
|  |  |
| Highly commensurate with UK Quality Code | 0 |
| Commensurate with UK Quality Code | 2 |
| Partially commensurate with UK Quality Code | 3 |
| Not commensurate with UK Quality Code | 3 |
|  |  |
| ** 2.  Type of proposed activity –** Please refer to the [typology](https://www.kent.ac.uk/education/regulatory-framework/codes-of-practice-for-taught-courses#annex-o): |  |
| Progression Agreements not involving advanced standing | 1 |
| Memorandum of Understanding | 1 |
| Formal Overseas Staff Exchange Agreements (Non-Erasmus) | 1 |
| Incoming only Study Abroad Agreement | 1 |
| Articulation arrangements | 2 |
| Non-Erasmus European and International Exchange Agreements | 2 |
| Course Delivery Support Partner | 2 |
| Co-supervision of research degrees | 3 |
| Standalone Module Delivery Provider | 3 |
| Course Delivery Provider | 3 |
| Dual award | 3 |
| Joint award | 3 |
| Validated Institution | 3 |
| Other – please describe |  |
| ** 3. Proposed partner’s capacity to enhance Kent’s reputation (with reference to Institution’s ranking and general reputational standing)**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Strong potential to enhance Kent’s reputation | 0 | | Some potential to enhance Kent’s reputation | 0 | | No/limited potential to enhance or damage Kent’s reputation | 1 | | Potential to damage Kent’s reputation | 4 | |  |
| C. QUALITY ASSURANCE **** 1.**Control of Outcome Standards *(in addition to external examiner scrutiny)*** |  |
| N/A Proposed partnership does not entail student assessment (e.g. staff mobility or student exchange) | 0 |
| All assessment set and marked (or second marked) by UoK | 0 |
| Most assessment set and marked (or second marked) by UoK | 2 |
| Assessment shared | 2 |
| Most assessment delegated to partner | 3 |
| All assessment delegated to partner | 3 |
|  |  |
| **** 2.**The Partner’s** **Quality Assurance systems (1)** |  |
| Clearly Defined | 0 |
| Partially Defined | 2 |
| Poorly Defined | 3 |
| Very Poorly Defined | 4 |
| **** 3. **The Partner’s Quality Assurance systems (2)**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Very robust | 0 | | Robust | 1 | | Adequate | 2 | | Weak | 3 | | Very Weak | 4 |  D. EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED PARTNER ****   1. **The Partner’s prior experience of collaboration with the  University** |  |
| At this academic or higher level | 0 |
| At lower academic level | 1 |
| None | 2 |
| ****    2. **The University’s first-hand experience of the Partner (visits to partner)** |  |
| N/A No Kent students or staff will attend Partner | 0 |
| University staff regularly visit Partner (reports on file) | 0 |
| University staff have visited Partner on one or limited number of occasion(s) (reports on file) | 1 |
| University staff have never visited Partner/no visit reports on file | 2 |
|  | |
| ****     3. **The Partner’s prior experience of collaboration with other UK HEIs** | |
| At this academic or higher level | 0 |
| At lower academic level | 1 |
| None | 2 |
|  | |
| ****     4.**The Partner’s prior experience of collaboration with HEIs outside UK** | |
| At this academic or higher level | 0 |
| At lower academic level | 1 |
| None | 2 |
| ****    5. **The Partner’s** **familiarity with Subject Area** | |
| Large amount of expertise in subject area | 0 |
| Expertise in subject area | 1 |
| Limited expertise in subject area | 2 |
| No expertise in subject area | 4 |
|  |  |
| ****     6. **The Partner’s** **HE course profile for our students** | |
|  | |
| N/A as not sending students to partner | 0 |
| Much experience of delivering similar courses | 0 |
| Some experience of delivering similar courses | 1 |
| No experience of delivering course | 3 |
| E. THE PROPOSED COURSE | |
| ****    1. **Student support** | |
| N/A as not sending students to partner | 0 |
| Very comprehensive student support services | 0 |
| Comprehensive student support services | 1 |
| Fairly comprehensive student support services | 2 |
| Fairly limited student support services | 3 |
| Limited student support services | 4 |
| Very limited student support services | 4 |
|  | |
| F. THE UNIVERSITY’S CAPACITY TO ‘TEACH OUT’ THE COURSE SHOULD THE PARTNER WITHDRAW The University must ensure that adequate contingency plans are in place should the Partner withdraw. The following aspects should be considered:  ****     1.**Location of the students** | |
| N/A No Kent students involved in proposed activity | 0 |
| University of Kent campus | 2 |
| University of Kent European Centre | 2 |
| UK | 3 |
| Europe | 3 |
| Overseas (outside Europe) | 3 |
| ****     2.**The University of Kent’s** e**xpertise in Subject Area** | |
| N/A No students involved in proposed activity | 0 |
| Large amount of expertise in subject area | 0 |
| Some expertise in subject area | 1 |
| Limited expertise in subject area | 2 |
| No expertise in subject area | 3 |
| 3. **Licensing issues**  (Some countries require ministerial permission or a specific licence to be sought before certain collaborative activity can be pursued. If a licence be required, there are implications should the Partner withdraw) | |
| Licence not required to execute proposed activity | 0 |
| University required to hold licence to execute proposed activity in Host Country i.e. as delivering body or as awarding body. | 3 |
| Partner required to hold licence to execute proposed activity in jurisdiction, therefore if they were to withdraw, a new partner/university would be required to obtain a licence to continue delivery in the jurisdiction. | 3 |
| Both partner and University required to hold licence (as explained above) to execute proposed activity in Host Country | 3 |
| G. THE PROPOSED COURSE | |
| ****     1. **Collaborative ‘history’ of activity (the University’s experience of undertaking proposed activity)** | |
| Established model for partnership activity at Kent | 0 |
| Established model on campus only | 2 |
| New course/activity | 3 |
|  |  |
| ****     2. **HEQF level** |  |
| Level 3 or no credits attached to course(s) | 0 |
| Level 4, 5, 6 | 1 |
| Level 7, 8, 9 | 2 |

# Scoring summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Question** | **Score** |
| 1. **Communication** | | |
| 1 | English language proficiency of team directly involved in activity at partner institution |  |
| 2 | English language proficiency of administration team at partner institution |  |
| 1. **Characteristics of proposed partner** | | |
| 1 | Educational Culture of proposed partner (in terms of academic and administrative structures) |  |
| 2 | Partnership model |  |
| 3 | Proposed partner’s potential to enhance Kent’s reputation |  |
| 1. **Quality Assurance** | | |
| 1 | Control of outcome standards |  |
| 2 | The Partner’s QA system (1) |  |
| 3 | The Partner’s QA system (2) |  |
| 1. **Experience of proposed partner** | | |
| 1 | The Partner’s Prior experience of collaboration with the University |  |
| 2 | The University’s first-hand experience of the partner |  |
| 3 | The Partner’s prior experience of collaboration with other UK HEIs |  |
| 4 | The Partner’s prior experience of collaboration with HEIs outside UK |  |
| 5 | The Partner’s familiarity with Subject Area |  |
| 6 | The Partner’s HE course profile |  |
| 1. **Student support** | | |
| 1 | Student support |  |
| 1. **Capacity to ‘teach out’** | | |
| 1. | Location of students |  |
| 2. | University’s expertise in Subject Area |  |
| 3. | Licensing issues |  |
| 1. **The proposed course** | | |
| 1 | Collaborative ‘history’ of the course |  |
| 2 | HEQF level |  |
| **Academic Risk Assessment score** | |  |

**This risk assessment produced a risk score of xxx**

|  |
| --- |
| **Risk assessment score of X**  **Indicates a *low/medium/high* risk *(delete as appropriate)***  **Score brackets**  Low: 2 - 17  Medium: 18 - 29  High: 30 - 60 |

|  |
| --- |
| Following completion of this risk assessment, International Partnerships/Quality Assurance and Compliance Office (depending on who completes risk assessment) will confirm risk score to the Director of the Division proposing partnership. The Director of Division is asked to confirm approval for submission on partnership proposal following risk assessment.  **Confirmation that the Director of Division approves, after notification of risk score, submission of proposal for consideration for institutional approval**  **Director of Division signature:** |

# Scoring methodology

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Impact on University/University stakeholders** | **Examples of nature of risk for University** |
| 0 | None | N/A |
| 1 | Minor | No regulatory consequence  Does not involve outgoing student activity/award of Kent credit – no associated risk in relation to Kent award/CMA regulations  Lack of quality facilities (IT support etc) may cause delay in communications  Limited shortfalls of partner’s knowledge of subject area may require Kent to provide additional support but this would be limited. |
| 2 | Moderate | Communication may require language support, and/or additional resource (translation services)  Quality assurance regulations may differ and require negotiation in order for course to confirm to UK Quality Code  Assessment of prior learning required  Involves mobility of Kent students – potential of risk in relation to CMA regulations/ student satisfaction  Limited potential for variation in assessment  Familiarisation with partner required – potential risk relating to lack of knowledge of partner’s strategic direction etc  Lack of partner’s knowledge of UK HE may lead to delays in decisions being made.  Teaching staff at partner require significant training with resource implications for Kent  Limited risk to University’s ability to ensure a positive student experience, and to provide access to required student services  Teach out plans would have full Kent oversight; change of location may give rise to risk to student satisfaction  Shortfalls of partner’s knowledge of subject area may require Kent to provide additional support.  Knowledge and expertise of partnership model held by Kent; some adaptations required for proposed model |
| 3 | Major | Communication will require significant language support, and/or additional resource (translation services)  Quality assurance regulations differ significantly and will require extensive negotiation in order for course to confirm to UK Quality Code  Potential impact on Kent to fulfil CMA requirements  Involves award of Kent credit – potential of risk in relation to fulfilling UK Quality Code and student satisfaction  Significant potential for variation in assessment and consequent risk of student complaint  Potential difficulty in ascertaining partner’s quality assurance regulations and consequent risk to University’s ability to adhere to UK Quality Code.  Some risk to University’s ability to ensure a positive student experience, and to provide access to required student services  Teach out plans would require new partner to be sought and approved; change of location may give rise to risk to student satisfaction  Shortfalls of partner’s knowledge of subject area would require Kent to provide significant additional support.  Risk of regulatory consequences related to licence to operate  Knowledge and expertise of partnership model held by Kent; significant adaptations required for proposed model |
| 4 | Severe | Negative headlines in press  Significant threat to key business area  Significant regulatory consequence  Significant loss of University income as a result of negative press infringements  Significant difficulty in ascertaining partner’s quality assurance regulations and consequent risk to University’s ability to adhere to UK Quality Code.  Significant risk to University’s ability to ensure a positive student experience, and to provide access to required student services |