**Collaborative provision partner profile & checklist form**

Please complete the form in conjunction with the College’s Procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision available at: <http://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/Collaborative-Provision/collabprov.aspx>

The form has been designed to support **Stage One** (*Approval in principle to explore partnership*) in the process and should be submitted to the Collaborative Provision Review Group (CPRG) for consideration. The aim is to conduct a risk assessment to identify the individual risks (low, medium or high) specific to the proposal and a due diligence process to review the risks and determine how these will be mitigated for and managed. The information gathered[[1]](#footnote-1) will assist with understanding the risks associated and facilitate effective communication with the partner in discharging respective duties.

The final completed form and outcome report from CPRG should be submitted to the Programme Development and Approval Committee (PDAC) as per usual procedures for programme approval and modification.

**Section One: College contact arrangements**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of academic lead |  |
| Role |  |
| Department/Faculty (Institute/School): |  |
| Email address: |  |
| Phone number: |  |
| Name of professional services lead for monitoring and managing the day to day programme activity with the Partner |  |
| Who will be responsible for liaising with the Partner to ensure the accuracy of all published information, including CMA sheets, relating to the partnership arrangement? |  |
| Will any other staff be involved in managing the relationship with the Partner, including staff employed by the College to act as translators?  If yes, please provide details |  |

**Section Two: Proposed partner and rationale for proposed partnership**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name and web-link of proposed Partner organisation: |  |
| Name and role of academic lead at the proposed Partner: |  |
| Department/Faculty (Institute/School): |  |
| Email address: |  |
| Phone number: |  |
| Name of professional services staff involved in administering the programme with King’s |  |
| Status of partner? e.g. HEI with degree awarding powers, NHS, other education provider/ company: |  |
| What is the legal framework for the jurisdiction under with the Partner operates? |  |
| Does the Partner owns its own real property  If no, please advise who owns their real property. |  |
| Does the organisation own all intellectual property rights?  If no, please advise who owns their IPR. |  |
| Has the Partner submitted any quotations or tenders that are relevant to the proposal?  If yes, please provide details. |  |
| Please provide details of any third party rights in respect of the organisation which may affect the proposal: |  |
| Please provide details of all mortgages, charges or other security documentation attached to the Partner which may affect the proposal: |  |
| Please provide a brief rationale for how the proposed programme activity delivered with the Partner fits with strategic plans: |  |

**Section Three: Proposed partnership activities**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Please provide a brief description of how the arrangement will meet the key characteristics of the activity proposed (please refer to ‘*Definitions of collaborative activity’[[2]](#footnote-2)* for key characteristics): |  |
| Please indicate the key performance indicators that will be used to evaluate the partnership arrangement. |  |
| What is the name of the external organisation responsible for quality assuring the Partner? |  |
| What is their quality assurance approach and method for regulating the Partner? |  |
| How will the learning opportunity be evaluated to demonstrate adherence to the appropriate quality and academic standards required by King’s, including relevance of the learning opportunity at the appropriate level to enable students to meet the stated learning outcomes where this has been delivered by the Partner? |  |
| How has the Partner been made aware of their responsibilities in delivering the learning opportunity envisaged? |  |
| How does the structure of the learning opportunity delivered by the Partner equate to that of King’s? |  |
| Will the students be expected to have a minimum level of non-English language competency to complete the learning opportunity delivered by the Partner?  If yes, please provide details. |  |
| Will the same assessment be credited to both a King’s award and a Partner Award?  If yes, please provide details. |  |
| Will the Partners regulations and policies apply to a programme awarded by King’s e.g. assessment regulations, student conduct?  If yes, please provide details, including any variations in practice. |  |
| Will the Partner need to approve the programme through their own approval processes?  If yes please provide details including relevant timescales, external factors. |  |
| Will the King’s award need to be recognised in the Partner Country and will this have any impact on recognition or accreditation by a PSRB?  If yes please provide details. |  |

**Section Four: Risk Assessment (complete all parts)**

Score: *1 point for ‘low’ risk; 2 points for ‘medium’ risk; 3 points for ‘high’ risk* and *enter* the relevant score in the end column to determine the broad overall level of risk category.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tick as appropriate | **Low** | **Medium** | **High** | **Score** |
| *Partner specific* | | | | |
| What is the overall risk category assigned to the partner from ethical and reputation risk process? |  |  |  |  |
| *Academic risks* | | | | |
| What is the activity being proposed? | Articulation/ Progression; DTC/P; Off-campus study; Placement; Student exchange | Co-operative partnership; Split-site PhD; Double or Multiple award; Dual award | Joint award or Validation[[3]](#footnote-3) |  |
| What experience does the Partner have of collaborating with other HEIs? | UK and international HEIs | International HEIs only | None |  |
| What is the HEI Partner’s quality assurance system or agency? | UK QAA | Equivalent to UK QAA | Not defined |  |
| Does the HEI Partner have its own Quality Assurance framework in place? | Yes, well-defined procedures | Developing procedures | Not defined or insufficient |  |
| *Legal risks* | | | | |
| What are the local laws that will be applied? | England and Wales only | Each party is solely responsible for complying with their own local laws | King’s may also be responsible for complying with Partner local laws |  |
| Does the Partner have the legal authority to recognise the qualification being awarded? | Qualification will only be recognised by King’s | No legal restrictions in recognising qualification(s) awarded | Legal restrictions in recognising qualification(s) awarded |  |
| *Financial risks* | | | | |
| What is the Partner’s source of income? | Funded by state or regional authorities | Funded by private sector | Poorly funded or incomplete accounts |  |
| Does the Partner have a minimum of three years of audited accounts? | Yes | Less than three | No |  |
| What employers and public liability insurance cover, including professional indemnity insurance will be used to cover the student? | King’s only | Partner only | Joint |  |
| *Resource risks* | | | | |
| What resources are being used to support the student and subject area and deliver the activity? | King’s only | Partner will provide limited resources | Joint |  |
| Does the partner have the necessary resources in place to support and deliver the activity in collaboration with King’s? | Large (broad range) and well resourced | Medium or specialist resourced | Limited or poorly resourced |  |
| *Total Score: (to automatically calculate final score, highlight cell in end column; click on ‘Table Tools’, ‘Layout’, ‘fx Formula’ and ‘OK’)* | | | | 0 |
| What is the final risk category? | 13 – 18 points | 19 – 28 points | 29 – 39 points |  |

**Section Five: Due diligence questionnaire (complete as appropriate)**

Please obtain evidence (in English) from the Partner and note (in appropriate column) either the relevant web-link to the evidence on their website or whether this has been obtained as a hard copy. If obtained as a hard copy please attach this to the questionnaire. Where there is no documentary evidence available please provide the reason for this. Please indicate how any risks identified will be mitigated

**Partner specific**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **All levels of risk proposals** | | |
| **Category of evidence** | **Evidence provided** | **How will any risk be mitigated?** |
| Evidence of the Partner’s overarching goals and purpose and how their organisation is structured (e.g. mission statement) |  |  |
| **Medium or High level risk proposals only (based on responses to risk assessment)** | | |
| Evidence used to determine why the Partner should be assigned a Medium or High level of ethical and reputational risk and the measures that will be put in place to mitigate for these risks |  |  |

**Academic risks**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **All levels of risk proposals** | | |
| **Category of evidence** | **Evidence provided** | **How will any risk be mitigated?** |
| Evidence of the Partner’s regulations, policies and guidance relating to the activity proposed |  |  |
| Evidence that the Partner has experience of collaborating with other HEI partners |  |  |
| Evidence that the Partner will be able to deliver the learning opportunity to enable King’s to meet the expectations of the QAA Quality Code (e.g. enquiries carried out with other external agencies) |  |  |
| Evidence that the Partner has a good understanding of working with a UK HEI |  |  |
| **Medium or High level risk proposals only (based on responses to risk assessment)** | | |
| Evidence that the Partner has an internal quality assurance framework (e.g. programme approval and monitoring processes) |  |  |
| Evidence that the Partner has established and successfully maintained a partnership for programme activity |  |  |
| Evidence of any recommendations or areas of concern reported by external quality assurance agencies or auditors |  |  |

**Legal risks**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **All levels of risk proposals** | | |
| **Category of evidence** | **Evidence provided** | **How will any risk be mitigated?** |
| Evidence of the constitutional documents for the Partner, highlighting any issues for King’s and its fulfilment of the UK quality code |  |  |
| Evidence of copies of all permits, authorities, registrations, licences, approvals, and consents (whether granted by public or private authorities or otherwise) held by the Partner and necessary to carry on both the Partner or the proposed activity |  |  |
| Evidence that the Partner’s legal system is compatible with English Law, including compliance with regard to UK legislation e.g. data protection, FoI, disability, equality, health & safety, employment law |  |  |
| **Medium or High level risk proposals only (based on responses to risk assessment)** | | |
| Evidence of any of the following which is current, or which is known to be pending, threatened or possible in relation to the Partner or the proposal itself:   * any litigation or arbitration proceedings (whether as claimant or defendant); * any prosecution; * any investigation or inquiry by a governmental or official body. |  |  |
| Evidence of the Partner’s legal requirements or conditions that King’s will be required to meet |  |  |

**Financial risks**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **All levels of risk proposals** | | |
| **Category of evidence** | **Evidence provided** | **How will any risk be mitigated?** |
| Evidence of the Partner’s audited accounts for the past three years showing sources of funding, including current credit rating |  |  |
| Evidence of all relevant grants, subsidies, payments or allowances taken out by the Partner in relation to the proposal |  |  |
| Evidence of the Partner’s insurance policies covering employers and public liability and professional indemnity |  |  |
| **Medium or High level risk proposals only (based on responses to risk assessment)** | | |
| Evidence of any financial risks not covered elsewhere such as legal charges on the Partner’s assets, overdrafts, loans and other indebtedness and facilities relating to the organisation that may cause a concern over their ability to meet their financial obligations |  |  |

**Resource profile risks**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **All levels of risk proposals** | | |
| **Category of evidence** | **Evidence provided** | **How will any risk be mitigated?** |
| Evidence that the Partner has the appropriate resources in place to effectively discharge their duties in delivering the elements of the programme for which they are responsible. Please complete the site visit checklist form[[4]](#footnote-4). |  |  |
| Evidence of HR policies relating to the employment of staff |  |  |
| **Medium or High level risk proposals only (based on responses to risk assessment)** | | |
| Evidence of how resources will be pooled together and jointly managed |  |  |

**Section six: Due diligence sign-off**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| This form and accompanying evidence has been reviewed by the following (please tick as appropriate) | |
| 1. Collaborative Provision Review Group |  |
| 2. Faculty (Institute/School) accountant |  |
| 3. Faculty (Institute/School) Director of Administration |  |
| 4. Chair of Faculty (Institute/School) Education Committee or Head of Graduate Studies |  |
| 5. Executive Dean of Faculty (Institute/School) |  |
| 6. Territorial Vice-Principal |  |
| 7. Other (please specify) |  |

**Section seven: Approval**

|  |
| --- |
| This form should be signed off as follows depending on the nature of the risk:  **Low risk**: the Executive Dean of Faculty  **Medium risk**: the relevant territorial Vice-President/Provost  **High risk**: the relevant territorial Vice-President/Provost or the Principal & President (or nominee) for top quartile of high risk (i.e. overall score 36 – 39)  Name:…………………………………………………………………………………..…………….  Signature:………………………………………………………………………………..…………...  Date:……………………………......................................................... |

Please return completed form to:

Quality and Academic Support Office

Room 8.14

James Clerk Maxwell Building

Waterloo campus

|  |
| --- |
| For QAS Use:  Date form received:…………………………………………..……………………..……………….  Date form considered by PDAC: ………………………….……… |

1. Where necessary, you are strongly advised to request relevant information and/or supporting documentation from the Partner to assist with completing the proposal. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/Collaborative-Provision/Definitions-of-collaborative-activity-Nov-2016.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Please note that there is only one validation arrangement in place and future agreements are extremely unlikely [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. A site visit checklist form template is available from the QAS Office for this purpose [↑](#footnote-ref-4)