**Annex L: Quality Assurance Procedures for Courses of Study at Validated Institutions and Partner Colleges Leading to University Awards**
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# Introduction

1. These procedures are to be used in connection with the quality assurance of courses of study delivered by Validated Institutions and Partner Colleges and which lead to the award of a certificate, diploma or degree of the University.
2. These procedures should be used by existing Validated Institutions and Partner Colleges. Prospective Validated Institutions must first complete the process of institutional approval as detailed in Annex O of the Code of Practice.
3. Note: Where the text states ‘School’ this should be understood to refer to ‘School’ or ’Department’ at the sub-divisional level, as appropriate.

# Approval of New Courses of Study and New Modules

## 2.1 Initial Development

 There should be consultation at an early stage with relevant University Division(s) with regard to all aspects of proposed new courses of study (for Validated Institutions this consultation should occur via the University’s Quality Assurance and Compliance Office - QACO). Validated Institutions, Partner Colleges and Academic Liaison Officers should ensure that the Director of Division (or nominee) is consulted during these discussions.

## 2.2 Submission to Business Case Committee - Outline Planning Approval

1. Validated Institutions and Partner Colleges must submit an outline proposal for approval by the University.
2. Outline proposals for new courses should attach the business plan approved within the partner institution, indicate that the partner will be solely responsible for providing resources and facilities sufficient to staging the course and take account of the following requirements:
3. Evidence of need and demand for the course as suggested by market research, to include projected student numbers;
4. How it is proposed that the course will be resourced. The internally approved business plan should be provided;
5. Any special resources required (e.g. staff, space, library, IT, learning technologies, training, timetable), and the implications for the partner of putting these in place;
6. The cover available in the partner institution if key parts of the course depend on an individual member of staff for their delivery;
7. A statement of which existing courses, if any, will be withdrawn as a result of the new proposal.
8. The outline proposal should first have been approved within the partner institution. The proposals should be passed directly to QACO. QACO will submit proposals to the University’s Business Case Committee (BCC) in order to provide oversight of the partner’s approval process, to check that the course is in-line with the University’s Strategy and to give final approval for the course proposal at University level. Partner College proposals should indicate whether the course is being put forward under a Franchised, Validated or Validated Plus arrangement.[[1]](#footnote-2)
9. Approval from the BCC will be sufficient to proceed with the development of the proposed curriculum and the production of course, module and other relevant documentation as set out at section 2.4.2 below. The Academic Liaison Officer should be consulted as necessary with regard to the development of the curriculum and production of relevant paperwork.

## 2.3 Submission to the School

1. Following BCC consideration detailed proposals for new Validated Institution and Partner College courses of study and new modules should be prepared in accordance with the requirements of Annex B: Approval and Withdrawal of Modules and Annex C: Approval and Withdrawal of Taught Courses of the University’s Code of Practice for Quality Assurance of Taught Courses.
2. Detailed proposals for new courses of study and new modules should first be approved within the Validated Institution or Partner College by the appropriate body. If it is satisfied that it is appropriate to do so, the Validated Institution should submit the proposal for a new course of study to the University. For Validated Institutions the submission should be made to QACO, which will liaise with the Academic Liaison Officer within the Validated Institution’s cognate School. If the Academic Liaison Officer considers the proposal to be satisfactory they will inform the appropriate Board of Studies, and recommend the course submission for approval by the relevant Division. For Partner Colleges, the submission should be made via the Academic Liaison Officer to the appropriate Board of Studies. If the Board of Studies considers the proposal to be satisfactory it will recommend it for approval by the relevant Divisional Committee. For Partner College courses where there is no cognate School, the proposal should be routed directly to the relevant Divisional Committee.
3. When making such course submissions Validated Institutions and Partner Colleges should ensure that the information required in section 2.4.3 below[[2]](#footnote-3) is submitted together with a report on the outcome of internal consideration of the course.

## 2.4 Divisional Consideration

1. For Validated Institutions, where, following its consideration of the course and module specifications, the Academic Liaison Officer is satisfied that it is appropriate to do so, QACO will submit the paperwork to the Divisional Director of Education/Graduate Studies and UG/PG Student Experience for approval. The Divisional Director of Education/Graduate Studies will have the discretion to determine whether they are able to approve the course on behalf of the Divisional Committee or whether a Panel is necessary. Where the proposed course is with an existing Validated Institution and within a subject area which the Validated Institution already validates with that partner, a Panel will not normally be necessary. Where the proposed course is with a new Validated Institution or within a new subject area with an existing Validated Institution or utilises new specialist resources/facilities a Panel will usually be necessary. Should it be deemed that a Panel is necessary, a Panel will be established to visit the Validated Institution and meet with staff in order to consider the course proposal in detail.
2. For Partner Colleges, following the Board of Studies, the School will upload the paperwork arising from the proposal onto CMAS for consideration by the appropriate Divisional Committee (i.e. Education and Student Experience Committee/Graduate Studies and Student Experience Committee). The Divisional Committee will have discretion to determine the need for a Panel and the constituency of the Panel. Where the proposal contains non-cognate provision, and/or provision in a subject area where the College has not previously had provision, it will be the expectation that normally a visit will take place. Where it is determined that a Panel is not required, the Divisional Committee should consider the submission via CMAS in the standard way.
3. The documentation required to be provided to such panels by the Validated Institution or Partner College is:
* the proposed agenda for the visit
* rationale for the proposal
* course specification
* module specifications
* module mapping document
* staff management structure and CVs of core teaching staff
* statement of available physical resources
* self-assessment of the infrastructure of support for student learning and student welfare
	+ - * the relevant extract of the Student Voice Forum minutes that notes the student discussion of the proposed course specification (see Annex M: Student Evaluation section 5.10)
* requirements of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (where applicable)
* reports from any previous stages of the approval process, where available.
1. Such Panels will normally include at least two members from the Division, one of whom shall be appointed as Chair. For Validated Institutions, in addition to this at least one member external to the University will be appointed. For Partner Colleges, at the discretion of the Divisional Education and Student Experience Committee/Graduate Studies and Student Experience Committee, where appropriate subject expertise is not available within the Division, one member of the Division and an appropriate external adviser may be appointed.
2. With regard to external advisors for the approval of courses with Partner Colleges, where a proposal contains non-cognate provision, it will be the expectation that normally an external advisor will be appointed to the Panel. Where an adviser is required for a Panel, the Partner College should make a recommendation to their cognate School. Where an external adviser is not appointed to a Panel, the course will require the support in writing of an appropriate external adviser. The Partner College should identify the relevant external adviser and they should be asked to provide a statement on the appropriate pro-forma and in line with the requirements as detailed in Annex C: Appendix E: Guidance on the use of External Advisors for Course Approval.
3. Where a new course of study or a significantly revised existing course proposed by a **prospective Validated Institution** is subject to approval by a third party, the Division may consider establishing a conjoint panel with the third party organisation provided that the following conditions are met:
	1. that the Division will normally be represented on the approval panel by at least two of its members, one of whom should be a member of the relevant Divisional Committee, as appropriate to the level of the proposal, and a representative from a School cognate to that of the proposed course;
	2. that chairmanship of the panel resides with the University;
	3. that, such as it considers appropriate, the University retains the right to appoint external School experts to the panel;
	4. that the agenda and areas covered by the approval event are considered sufficient by the Division to allow for full consideration of the proposal as per the requirements of this Annex and the University’s Code of Practice;
	5. that the written report of any such event is subject to the approval of the Chair of the panel (normally the member of the relevant Divisional Education and Student Experience Committee/Graduate Studies and Student Experience Committee);
	6. that, following consideration by the Division, the proposal and the report of the conjoint validation event are subject to consideration by CASC before final approval is given by the University, as per the requirements of this Annex and the University’s policies and procedures for the approval of collaborative partnerships.
4. The Panel is responsible for making an assessment of and reporting on the following:
5. the appropriateness of design, content, coherence, currency, level and standards of the curriculum under review;
6. the capacity of the partner institution to deliver the award and assure the standards;
7. the capacity of the partner institution to provide sufficient teaching and learning facilities for the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes (for partner colleges, for non-cognate provision, and/or provision in a School where the college has not previously had provision only);
8. that the staff engaged in the course are appropriately qualified for their role;
9. whether the proposal should be approved or approved subject to conditions.
10. Based on its assessment, the Panel is empowered to make one of a number of recommendations. For Partner Colleges, the recommendations are made to the Division via the Divisional Committee using CMAS for the Committee to ratify. For Validated Institutions, the recommendations are made on the Division’s behalf. The possible recommendations are:
	1. that the proposal be given permission to proceed for consideration by the Course Approval Sub-committee (CASC) of the University, along with the panel’s report of the approval event;
	2. that the proposal be given permission to proceed for consideration by CASC subject to the prior satisfaction of specified conditions along with the panel’s report of the approval event. These conditions might include revisions to the proposal or provision of additional resources. The submission to CASC should include a statement from the prospective partner institution as to the steps it has taken to meet the Panel’s conditions;
	3. that the proposal be resubmitted in a revised form for further consideration by the Panel;
	4. that the proposal be rejected.
11. The proposal as submitted to CASC need not be accompanied by module specification since Divisional Committees are authorised to approve new modules.

2.4.10 Detailed guidance on the terms of reference and conduct of Panels convened to consider proposals for new or significantly amended validated courses of study is set out in Appendix A to this Annex.

## 2.5 Module Approval

1. Any new or substantially amended module(s) proposed separately to a new course should be submitted to the University. For Partner Colleges, they should be submitted to the relevant Board of Studies via the Academic Liaison Officer of the appropriate cognate School of the University. If the Board of Studies considers the module(s) to be satisfactory it will recommend them for approval by the Division via CMAS. For Validated Institutions, they should be submitted via QACO, to the Academic Liaison Officer of the Validated Institution’s cognate School. If the Academic Liaison Officer considers the module(s) to be satisfactory they will recommend them for approval by the Division.
2. For Validated Institutions, minor amendments to existing modules may be agreed by the Academic Liaison Officer. QACO should be consulted in advance about all such changes.
3. Where a module is non-cognate the partner institution should provide a supporting statement from a suitably qualified external subject expert.

## 2.6 Course Amendment

1. Major amendments to approved courses should proceed in line with sections 2.3 and 2.4 above.
2. For Validated Institutions, course amendments should be submitted through QACO.
3. Minor amendments to existing course of study may be agreed by the Board of Studies (for Partner Colleges) or Academic Liaison Officer (for Validated Institutions), followed by the Division. For Validated Institutions, QACO should be consulted in advance about all such changes.

## 2.7 Further Information

 Information for Validated Institutions on the deadlines for course and module approval and amendment can be found at: [Information for Validated Institutions: Annual Timetable](https://www.kent.ac.uk/education/collaborative-partnerships/validated-institutions/additional-information-for-validated-institutions)

# Credit Transfer and RPL

1. Applications for Credit Transfer and RPL made by students studying for a University award at a Partner College or Validated Institution (as appropriate) will have their application assessed and a decision made by the relevant Course Leader/Admissions Tutor for the course in question. Recommendations will then be considered for approval by the relevant Divisional Education and Student Experience Committee/Graduate Studies and Student Experience Committee, as relevant to the provision. All decisions will be reported to the University’s Education and Academic Standards Committee.
2. All RPL claims and portfolios should also be referred to the University so that they can be considered and approved by the relevant Divisional Committee, as in 3.1 above).
3. All claims (Credit Transfer/RPL) MUST be made and approved prior to the start of the modules for which credit is being claimed via these means.

# Continuous Monitoring of Courses

1. Partner College and Validated Institution courses of study will be reviewed in accordance with the requirements of the University Code of Practice for Quality Assurance Annex E: *Continuous Monitoring of Courses*.
2. The partner institution will complete the continuous monitoring course report by submitting termly updates of the applicable sections for consideration by the relevant Board of Studies and Divisional Committee, as detailed in Annex E. Separate reports on UG provision and PG provision will be required.
3. For Partner Colleges, monitoring reports should be submitted through the University Academic Liaison Officer. For Validated Institutions, monitoring reports should be submitted to the Quality Assurance and Compliance Office . Reports will then be passed to the Board of Studies via the University Academic Liaison Officer of the cognate School and Divisional QACO contact.
4. For all partner institutions, on an annual basis (in the Autumn term) a report of the Academic Liaison Officer (or Course Adviser for non-cognate courses) will also be submitted to the Board of Studies and Divisional QACO contact.
5. The Board of Studies should comment on its consideration of the monitoring reports and any associated reports within its monitoring reports to the Division.

# Periodic Review of Courses

* 1. Partner College and Validated Institution courses will be subject to Periodic Review in accordance with the requirements of the University Code of Practice for Quality Assurance: Annex F.
	2. Partner College courses will be reviewed as part of the Periodic Review of the cognate School.
	3. Validated Institutions will undergo a separate review to that of the School responsible for oversight of its provision. Such reviews will normally be chaired by an academic member of staff from within the same Division as the Validated Institution’s cognate School, but not by a member of staff from the Validated Institution’s cognate School.
	4. The relevant Divisional Committee will determine the year in which each course will be subject to periodic review, and will receive reports of Review Panels and the response of the partner institution to such reports. The Division Committee will forward such reports, together with its views on them, to the Education and Academic Standards Committee.

# Boards of Examiners

* 1. A Board of Examiners will be appointed for each course of study. The Board will comprise:
* One or more External Examiner(s), appointed by or on behalf of Senate and Council on the recommendation of the relevant Division Board.
* A member of University academic staff from the relevant School who shall be appointed as Chair of the Board of Examiners by the relevant Division Board. The Chair of the Board of Examiners will normally be the Academic Liaison Officer.
* Partner College or Validated Institution examiners, normally comprising a marker for each module, appointed by the relevant Division Board on the recommendation of the Partner College or Validated Institution; one of whom shall be appointed as Deputy Chair (normally the course leader or director). See 6.2.1-6.2.2 below for further details regarding the appointment of examiners.
	1. The CVs of all Partner College or Validated Institution staff teaching on courses leading to University of Kent credit or award should be sent to the University (the Quality Assurance and Compliance Office) on both an annual basis and whenever a new teaching appointment is made throughout the academic year.
1. For those Partner College or Validated Institution staff being appointed as examiners, the CV(s) will be forwarded by QACO to the relevant Academic Liaison Officer, who will review the CV(s) prior to each staff member’s appointment as examiner. If satisfied, the Academic Liaison Officer will return the CV(s) to the Quality Assurance and Compliance Office, which will send them to the secretary of the Director of the relevant Division with a recommendation that the staff concerned should be approved as examiners by the relevant Division Board.
2. Should the Academic Liaison Officer determine that, on the basis of the information provided, it would be inappropriate to approve a member of teaching staff from the Partner College or Validated Institution as a Kent examiner, this outcome will be relayed to the Quality Assurance and Compliance Office, together with a recommendation for any professional development activities to be implemented prior to the resubmission of the staff member’s CV.
3. The Quality Assurance and Compliance Office will report all outcomes on the consideration of teaching staff for approval as Kent examiners to the relevant partner institution.
	1. Boards of Examiners will act in accordance with the University Code of Practice, Annex J: *Meetings of Boards of Examiners*, except as otherwise specified below.
	2. Before each meeting of a Board of Examiners, the Deputy Chair shall convene a meeting of a small number of internal members of the Board of Examiners (i.e. the Deputy Chair and normally no more than three members) to agree recommendations to be made to the Board regarding students about whom medical or other evidence in mitigation of extenuating circumstances has been received.
	3. Before each meeting of a Board of Examiners, and separate to the Mitigation Committee meeting, the Deputy Chair may convene a pre-meeting to consider other matters as deemed appropriate. Such matters might include deciding, based on the profile of marks, which candidates should have a *viva voce* examination (where such an option remains available under the regulations), which candidates should be drawn to the attention of the External Examiner, recommendations to be made regarding borderline candidates where such remain in operation, reviewing the range of marks awarded for each module and identification of other issues requiring discussion by the Board of Examiners. The identities of candidates shall not be made known to examiners during the course of this meeting.
	4. Board of Examiners will meet at least annually. The Deputy Chair will be responsible for making arrangements for meetings and for informing members of those arrangements.
	5. The Deputy Chair will ensure that all members of the Board of Examiners receive detailed information about the course, including assessment requirements; that arrangements for approval of examination papers and monitoring of internal marking are agreed between the Chair and the External Examiner(s); that draft examination papers and samples of student work are sent to the External and University Examiners as agreed; that appropriate documentation, including an agenda, is provided at meetings of Boards of Examiners and that all marks are entered on the student records system in time for the Board. The Deputy Chair will also ensure that the Board of Examiners is informed of any recommendations of the Mitigation Committee relating to evidence of mitigating circumstances submitted by students (see section 6.4 above).
	6. For Partner Colleges, the Deputy Chair will also ensure that the lists showing recommendations for the award of certificates, diplomas or degrees, as prepared by Medway Student Administration are provided at the Board.
	7. The partner institution will appoint a member of its staff to act as Secretary to the Board of Examiners.

6.9.1 The Secretary will record the decisions made by the Board including the consideration given to specific cases. Most decisions are recorded on the composite mark sheet which is signed and appended to the minutes (the format of the minutes should follow that of the agenda).

6.9.2 For Validated Institutions, the Secretary will attend meetings of the Board of Examiners, will ensure that all members of Boards of Examiners are provided with the relevant regulations and Examination Conventions, and that recommendations made by the Board of Examiners are approved by or on behalf of appropriate University bodies, i.e. that lists showing recommendations for the award of certificates, diplomas or degrees are prepared and submitted to the relevant Quality Assurance and Compliance Office representative in attendance at the Board.

* 1. The Deputy Chair will ensure that students are informed of decisions made regarding their results and any conditions which students have to fulfil in order to progress. Students should be informed that final year marks and classifications remain provisional until the pass list has been signed by the relevant Director of Division (or nominee).
	2. For Partner Colleges, a representative from the cognate School’s administrative staff will be in attendance at the Board, who will ensure that final composite mark sheets are signed and who will ensure that pass lists are circulated in the same way as pass lists for University courses; and sent to the Deputy Chair in the College.
	3. For Validated Institutions, a representative from the Quality Assurance and Compliance Office will be in attendance at the Board who will ensure that final composite mark sheets are signed and who will ensure that pass lists are circulated in the same way as pass lists for University courses. The representative from the School or Quality Assurance and Compliance Office respectively will also advise on regulations and conventions and their interpretation at the Board.
	4. Further information on Validated Institution Boards of Examiners can be found at: [Information for Validated Institutions: Annual Timetable](https://www.kent.ac.uk/education/collaborative-partnerships/validated-institutions/additional-information-for-validated-institutions)

# Reports of External Examiners

1. External Examiners are required to submit an annual report to the University via the online [External Examiners Report Submission System (EERSS)](https://www.kent.ac.uk/education/external-examiners-and-advisors/external-examiner-report-submission) within **four weeks** of the main annual meeting of the Board of Examiners.
2. Reports submitted via EERSS can be accessed by relevant parties (Chair of the Board of Examiners, Quality Assurance and Compliance Office and Director of Division) via the [University webpage: External Examiners Reports Submission System](https://www.kent.ac.uk/education/external-examiners-and-advisors).
3. Where the Deputy Chair of the Board of Examiners does not have access to the External Examiner’s report via EERSS, a hard copy of the report will be provided by the Quality Assurance and Compliance Office.
4. Within four weeks of receipt of the report, the Deputy Chair of the Board of Examiners will (via the Quality Assurance and Compliance Office for Validated Institutions), provide the Chair with a commentary on the report and an account of any actions planned in response to the External Examiners’ recommendations.
5. The Chair of the Board of Examiners will submit the official response to the External Examiner’s report via EERSS, first taking into consideration the commentary provided by the Deputy Chair of the Board.

# Student Feedback

* 1. Partner Institutions should seek the views of students on each of the modules they have taken and the course they have taken.
	2. This feedback should be obtained via questionnaires developed and administered by each partner institution and where applicable by the National Student Survey. Partner institutions should also establish a Student Voice Forum for each course.
	3. Partner institutions should take into account the requirements of Annex M: *Student Evaluation* of the Code of Practice when designing feedback mechanisms. Partner institutions should also take into account the requirements for Student Voice Committees as detailed in Annex M, section 5.
	4. In completing continuous monitoring report requirements, Partner institutions should make reference to consideration of student feedback on courses.
	5. Students on Partner institution courses will also be subject to an annual survey carried out by the University requesting direct feedback on their learning experience.

# Academic Liaison Officer

* 1. Each Partner institution will have a member of the University’s School staff appointed to act as an Academic School Liaison Officer who will:
* Act as the Chair of the Board of Examiners for the course concerned to
* review the marking of and confirm the marks to be awarded for all modules for which the School holds responsibility;
* make recommendations for the award of Certificates, Diplomas and Degrees to students who have successfully completed courses of study for which the School holds responsibility;
* make recommendations with regard to progression, referrals and termination of registration of students taking courses of study for which the School holds responsibility;
* ensure mitigation cases are not permitted to be re-opened during Board proceedings;
* ensure the reasons for awarding a student a higher class of degree than indicated by their marks are recorded on or appended to the official record of decisions made by the Board of Examiners;
* ensure the official record of decisions made by the Board of Examiners has been confirmed and signed by the Chair, the Deputy Chair and the External Examiners.
* Be a source of advice on learning and teaching matters (e.g. assessment strategies and course resource requirements).
* Assist with curriculum development and receive proposals for new modules and courses at an early stage in their development.
* Recommend proposals for new and substantially revised courses of study for approval (to Panel for Validated Institutions, to Board of Studies and Divisional Committee for Partner Colleges).
* Recommend the approval of new or substantially revised modules by the Division and approving minor changes to both existing courses and modules.
* Assist the Partner Institution in the nomination of External Examiners and external periodic review panel members.
* Ensure that the relevant Divisional Education Committee or Graduate Studies and Student Experience Committee has effective oversight of quality assurance procedures such as external examining and continuous monitoring, and ensure that periodic course reviews have been completed as required for the course concerned.
* Receive agendas and minutes of course team meetings.
* Be a suitable candidate to be a member of any review panels established to undertake periodic course reviews in Schools with similar provision.
* Inspect samples of marked student work (the purpose of such inspection will not be to moderate internal marking but to obtain information about student learning and achievement).
* Review the standard of student learning and achievement.
* Review the effectiveness of the strategy and criteria for assessment.
* Review whether marking is undertaken rigorously and in accordance with assessment criteria.
* Review whether arrangements for approval of examination papers and monitoring of internal marking are undertaken in accordance with the University’s Code of Practice.
* Submit an annual report to the University via the Quality Assurance and ComplianceOffice on the quality of the course and the learning experience of the students as per the template provided.
* Agree a schedule of visits to the partner institution during the academic year for the purpose of meeting the responsibilities set out above (to visit on three occasions, once per term, one of which must be made in order to attend the meeting of the Board of Examiners and, where possible, one of which should include a meeting with students [one of the three visits other than the Board of Examiners may be conducted virtually]).
* Submit the official response to the External Examiner(s) report(s) via EERSS, first taking into consideration the commentary provided by the Deputy Chair of the Board.
* Review the partner institution’s admissions decisions and ensure that they are made in compliance with University admissions protocols.
* Review the appointment of new partner institution staff appointed to be examiners on courses leading to University of Kent credit and awards. This will include reviewing CVs on an annual basis, and whenever there is a new appointment made throughout the academic year, prior to the approval of the partner institution staff as Kent examiners. Once agreed, staff CVs will then be returned to the Quality Assurance and ComplianceOffice for forwarding to the secretary of the Director of Division and further approval as Kent examiners by the Director of Division. Full details of the Appointment of Examiners process can be found in section 6.2 above.

# External Course Advisers for Partner Colleges

* 1. Where the University does not itself have appropriate subject expertise, it may appoint an External Course Adviser who will:
* Receive agendas and minutes of course team meetings.
* Be a non-chairing member of the Board of Examiners.
* Inspect samples of marked student work (the purpose of such inspection will not be to moderate internal marking but to obtain information about student learning and achievement).
* Advise on the currency of the curriculum and assist with its development.
* Submit an annual report to the University via the Quality Assurance and Compliance Office on the quality of the course and the learning experience of the students as per the [annual report template provided on the Kent University website](https://www.kent.ac.uk/education/external-examiners-and-advisors/external-examiners-for-taught-courses-of-study#partner).
	1. The report will cover the following areas:
* The currency of the curriculum and how the curriculum may be enhanced.
* The quality of the learning opportunities provided by the course in comparison with those provided by similar courses at other institutions.
* The standard of student learning and achievement.
* The effectiveness of the strategy and criteria for assessment.
* Whether marking is undertaken rigorously and in accordance with assessment criteria.
* Steps which might be taken to enhance the experience of students.
* The report will be copied to the designated HE liaison staff within the Colleges and to the Quality Assurance and Compliance Office. It will also be considered by the Divisional Committee i.e. Education/Graduate Studies and Student Experience Committee when considering the Continuous Monitoring Reports on the course submitted by the College.

# Appointment of External Course Advisers

* 1. Following the proposal of candidates by the College, the appointment of External Course Advisers will be undertaken by the Divisions and will require approval by the University’s Deputy Vice-Chancellor Education and Student Experience.
	2. External Course Advisers will normally be appointed, in the first instance, for a period of four years and are eligible for reappointment at the end of the initial period of appointment if considered appropriate.
	3. External Course Advisers are not External Examiners and may not concurrently hold appointment as an External Examiner for the same course.
	4. The University will be responsible for payment of fees and expenses which will only be payable following receipt of an annual report. External Course Advisers will be paid a fee for each visit to the College which will be equal to the minimum fee payable to University of Kent External Examiners.
	5. External Course Advisers will normally be expected to make three visits per annum to the College, including attendance at the Board of Examiners’ meeting.
	6. Where more than three visits in one year are deemed necessary, the approval of the University’s Head of Quality Assurance and Compliance should be obtained and the University will not pay fees and expenses in respect of such additional visits unless approval has been obtained.

# Periodic Strategic Review of Partner Colleges

* 1. Partner Colleges will be subject to periodic strategic review on a five-yearly basis.
	2. Periodic Strategic Review is a process with external involvement which provides an opportunity for in depth scrutiny of the strategic case for a partnership and the partner’s ability to continue with the partnership prior to the renewal of the Memorandum of Agreement.
	3. See Annex P section 24 of the Code of Practice for the full details of this process.
1. Franchised provision is approved by the University and is supported by University student numbers. Validation Plus provision is approved by the University and is supported by the College's student numbers; students also have access to a number of University services. Validation provision is approved by the University and supported by the College's student numbers but students do not have access to University services. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. With the exception of the proposed agenda for the visit of the Divisional Panel [↑](#footnote-ref-3)